Research Article

Received: 03 February, 2026
Accepted: 01 September, 2026
Published: 10 September, 2026

Diagnosing Employee Engagement in a Cross-Border Digital Bank: Evidence from Central Europe

Barbora Pankova
Department of Psychology, Faculty of Education, Charles University, Magdaleny Rettigove 4, 116 39 Prague, Czech Republic; barbora.pankova@pedf.cuni.cz

Juraj Fabus
Department of Communications, Faculty of Operation and Economics of Transport and Communications, University of Zilina, Univerzitna 8215/1, 010 26 Zilina, Slovak Republic

Martina Zapletalova
Faculty of Military Leadership, University of Defence, Kounicova 65, 662 10 Brno, Czech Republic

Miriam Garbarova
Department of Communications, Faculty of Operation and Economics of Transport and Communications, University of Zilina, Univerzitna 8215/1, 010 26 Zilina, Slovak Republic

Cite this article:
Pankova, B., Zapletalova, M., Fabus, J., and Garbarova, M. (2027). Diagnosing Employee Engagement in a Cross-Border Digital Bank: Evidence from Central Europe. Revista Cultura Científica, (25), pp. 103–112.
https://doi.org/10.70517/revcc272509

Abstract

Employee engagement is a strategic concern in digital banking because service quality, risk control, innovation, and customer responsiveness depend on coordinated work across specialised teams. This study diagnoses engagement in a cross-border digital bank operating in Czechia and Slovakia and identifies the workplace domains most relevant to managerial action. An anonymous multilingual online survey was distributed to all 394 eligible employees in November 2025; 363 complete responses were obtained, representing a 92% response rate. The questionnaire included six Say-Stay-Strive engagement items, 27 diagnostic items grouped into eight workplace domains, and one employee Net Promoter Score item. The results were compared with internal measurements from 2023–2024 and with an external European top-quartile reference. Overall engagement reached 75%, three percentage points above the 2024 level and six points above the benchmark, while the eNPS reached +45. The strongest domains were performance management (89%), identification with the company (81%), senior leadership (78%), and work-life balance (77%). The lowest-scoring domains were cross-team collaboration, reward, and time for strategic work, each scoring 61%. Engagement also varied across major organisational areas, ranging from 69% in Commercial to 86% in Finance. The findings show that a favourable aggregate engagement score can coexist with coordination and capacity bottlenecks. The article argues that cross-border digital banks should complement headline engagement indicators with diagnostics of interfunctional collaboration, perceived reward fairness, strategic-work capacity, and area-specific leadership priorities.

Keywords: employee engagement; digital banking; cross-team collaboration; reward fairness; Central Europe

Abbreviations: eNPS = employee Net Promoter Score; JD-R = Job Demands–Resources; pp = percentage points.

1. INTRODUCTION

Digital-first banking combines intensive regulation, rapid technological change, customer-facing operations, and highly specialised support functions. In cross-border organisations, these conditions create a management challenge: employees may be strongly attached to the institution while still experiencing friction at team interfaces, having limited time for high-impact work, or facing uncertainty about how their contributions are rewarded. Employee engagement is therefore not only an attitudinal indicator but also a diagnostic lens for assessing whether the organisation provides the psychological and operational conditions required for sustained effort.

The engagement construct has developed across several related traditions. Kahn [1] described personal engagement as the physical, cognitive, and emotional investment of the self in work roles. Schaufeli et al. [2] later conceptualised work engagement as a positive state characterised by vigour, dedication, and absorption. Management research has also used the term employee engagement to denote a broader combination of psychological states, organisational attachment, and behaviour. Macey and Schneider [3] warned that these levels should not be conflated, while Bailey et al. [4] showed that engagement research encompasses multiple definitions, measures, antecedents, and outcomes.

Despite this conceptual diversity, the practical importance of engagement is supported by substantial evidence. Business-unit research associates employee satisfaction and engagement with customer outcomes, productivity, profitability, turnover, and safety [5]. A quantitative review links work engagement to task and contextual performance [6], and the broader synthesis by Bailey et al. [4] concludes that engagement is relevant to both individual and organisational outcomes. These findings make engagement surveys attractive to management, but a single headline score is insufficient. Aggregate results can conceal uneven access to resources, differences among organisational units, and divergence among advocacy, retention intention, and discretionary effort.

This limitation is particularly relevant in Central Europe, where financial-services organisations often operate through cross-border structures and combine local market responsibilities with regional functions. Research in the region has shown that trust and a constructive conflict-management climate are associated with employee engagement among international employees in Hungary [7]. Related Central European business-excellence research has examined excellence assessment systems, award-winning organisations, and performance outcomes [8–10]. In parallel, recent multi-country evidence from financial education demonstrates that digital, game-based interventions can be rigorously evaluated across national contexts [11]. Together, these strands support the need for organisational diagnostics that are empirically grounded, context-sensitive, and useful for management practice.

The present study addresses this need through a survey with a high response rate conducted in a digital bank operating in Czechia and Slovakia. It contributes in three ways. First, it combines an outcome measure based on the Say-Stay-Strive framework with a profile of actionable workplace dimensions. Second, it examines whether a strong organisation-wide result is accompanied by meaningful variation among major organisational areas. Third, it translates the diagnosis into management priorities relevant to cross-border, knowledge-intensive service organisations. The analysis is descriptive and does not claim causal effects; its purpose is to identify where the organisation appears to support engagement and where managerial attention is most warranted.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Kahn's [1] foundational model proposes that people engage when work is meaningful, self-expression is psychologically safe, and sufficient physical and emotional resources are available. This view focuses on the degree to which individuals bring their full selves into role performance. The work-engagement tradition emphasises vigour, dedication, and absorption as a distinct positive state rather than merely the absence of burnout [2]. Both perspectives place energy, attention, and meaning at the centre of engagement.

Organisational practice frequently extends this state-based view to observable employee outcomes. Macey and Schneider [3] distinguish among trait, state, and behavioural engagement, thereby clarifying why a single label may refer to different phenomena. The present study adopts an organisationally directed definition: engagement is reflected in employees' willingness to speak positively about the organisation, remain with it, and exert discretionary effort. This operationalisation follows the Say-Stay-Strive model, in which each facet is represented by two items [12].

The three facets should not be assumed to move together. Organisational commitment captures identification with, involvement in, and willingness to remain within an organisation [13], but employees may intend to stay without feeling inspired to exceed role requirements. Conversely, employees can be deeply absorbed in their professional work while having a weaker attachment to the employer. Analysing Say, Stay, and Strive separately therefore helps distinguish reputational advocacy and retention from the energetic component most closely related to discretionary performance.

The Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model offers a flexible framework for interpreting workplace conditions. Job demands require sustained effort and may generate psychological or physiological costs, whereas job resources support goal achievement, reduce demands, and stimulate learning and growth [14]. Resources also activate a motivational process associated with engagement [15]. Because the model is not restricted to a fixed set of variables, it is suitable for diagnosing engagement in complex service organisations.

The workplace dimensions examined here can be positioned within this framework. Performance management and senior leadership provide clarity, feedback, and strategic meaning. Career and development opportunities support mastery and future growth. Cross-team collaboration supplies social and informational resources, while work-life balance and control over strategic time reflect the relationship between demands and available capacity. Reward practices communicate recognition and fairness. From a social-exchange perspective, employees are more likely to reciprocate with stronger engagement when they are treated fairly and supportively [16]. An integrated HR system can therefore shape engagement by aligning leadership, development, performance, reward, and work design [17].

The business-excellence literature adds a complementary management perspective. Vartiak and Jankalová [10] discuss the assessment of business excellence, while Rentková and Vartiak [9] review winners of the Rajiv Gandhi National Quality Award in an emerging-market context. Vartiak [8] compares the financial performance of excellent Slovak companies and shows why excellence claims should be examined against measurable indicators. For a digital bank, employee engagement diagnostics can be understood as part of this broader excellence logic: leadership, process quality, reward transparency, and strategic capacity are not isolated HR issues but elements of organisational capability.

Digital transformation also increases the need for evidence-based learning and coordination. Cannistrà et al. [11] evaluate an online game-based financial education course using multi-country experimental evidence, illustrating how digital financial-services environments can be studied across contexts using rigorous empirical designs. Although the present study focuses on employees rather than students, it shares the same need to connect digital capability, human behaviour, and measurable outcomes.

The research questions are:

RQ1. What was the overall level of employee engagement in 2025, and how did it compare with the 2023–2024 internal measurements and the European top-quartile benchmark?

RQ2. Which engagement-related workplace dimensions represented the strongest and weakest aspects of the organisational environment?

RQ3. How did engagement and the diagnostic dimensions vary across the bank's major organisational areas?

RQ4. What profile emerged across Say, Stay, Strive, and employee recommendation behaviour?

3. METHODOLOGY

First, we describe the research design, setting, and participants. The research used a descriptive organisational survey design. It was conducted in the Czech–Slovak branch of a Central European digital-first universal bank. The focal organisation is not named to protect organisational and respondent confidentiality, particularly because several results concern relatively small organisational units. The eligible population comprised full-time and agency employees integrated into the Czech–Slovak branch. Employees of the parent entity in its home market and workers engaged through limited-hours agreements were excluded from the sampling frame.

All 394 eligible employees were invited to participate. The survey yielded 363 complete questionnaires, representing a response rate of 92%. Women accounted for 61% of respondents and men for 39%. The largest age group was 31–40 years (45%); employees aged 30 or younger and those aged 41–50 each represented 24%, while 7% were aged 51 or older. Most respondents worked in Czechia (75%), followed by Slovakia (22%); 3% worked remotely from Poland for the Czech–Slovak organisation. Thirty-four per cent had five to ten years of tenure, and 85% held non-managerial positions. This structure broadly reflected the branch's operational workforce.

Next, we describe the instrument and measures. The questionnaire contained 36 items. Thirty-three statements used a six-point Likert agreement scale without a neutral midpoint. Six of these items measured engagement outcomes using two Say, two Stay, and two Strive statements. The remaining 27 Likert items covered eight diagnostic domains: identification with the company; career and development; cross-team collaboration; performance management; senior leadership; work-life balance and well-being; reward; and time for strategic work. A separate 0–10 measure of the employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS) was used. A customer recommendation item and an open-ended comment question were included in the full organisational survey, but they fall outside the scope of this article.

Most of the item wording was retained from earlier organisational surveys developed with an external engagement consultancy, thereby supporting longitudinal comparability. New items were included only in the current-year diagnostics and were not assigned retrospective values. The questionnaire was available in Czech, Slovak, and English. Before its launch, HR employees pilot-tested the electronic version for clarity, technical functionality, response flow, and data capture; no material problems were identified.

We then provide details about data collection and ethical safeguards. The dataset was analysed secondarily. The source dataset originated from an organisational engagement project documented in a master's thesis titled *Employee Engagement in a Selected Company*. Data were collected electronically from 12 to 26 November 2025. Five staged internal communications announced the survey, explained its purpose, reminded non-respondents, and reported the final response rate. Each employee received a unique link and access code that permitted one submission. Administrative identifiers were used solely to manage distribution and were removed before analysis.

Respondents received information about anonymity and data protection before participating. The analysis used aggregated results and did not include personal identifiers. Results for very small subunits were not used to make inferential claims. Because the data concerned employee perceptions within a specific organisation, the bank was anonymised, and the dataset was not publicly released.

The analytical procedure was as follows: For each respondent, the mean of the six engagement items was calculated. Respondents with an average above 4.5 on the six-point scale were classified as engaged, and the organisation-wide engagement rate was calculated as the proportion of respondents meeting this criterion. The established survey-reporting procedure expressed the diagnostic domains as percentage scores, preserving comparability with the 2023 and 2024 internal measurements and the external Europe Top Quartile reference. The eNPS was calculated as the percentage of promoters (ratings of 9–10) minus the percentage of detractors (ratings of 0–6), following the recommendation framework introduced by Reichheld [18]; respondents with ratings of 7–8 were classified as passive.

The analysis used descriptive statistics, percentage-point comparisons, and profiles across the four major organisational areas: Commercial, Finance, Risk, and Support. Small subunits were reviewed for internal diagnostic purposes, but they were not used to make inferential claims. The historical comparison covers only three measurement points and should be interpreted as short-term movement rather than as a confirmed longitudinal trend. Table 1 summarises the operational measures.

Table 1. *Operationalisation of the study measures*

Measure	Operationalisation
Engagement rate	Six Say-Stay-Strive items, six-point scale; respondent mean > 4.5 classified as engaged; reported as a percentage of respondents.
Diagnostic domains	Twenty-seven Likert items across identification, career and development, cross-team collaboration, performance management, senior leadership, work-life balance, reward, and strategic-work time; reported as percentage scores.
eNPS	One 0–10 recommendation item; percentage of promoters (9–10) minus the percentage of detractors (0–6); ratings of 7–8 classified as passive.
Comparators	Internal measurements from 2023 and 2024 and the survey provider's Europe Top Quartile benchmark.

Note. eNPS = employee Net Promoter Score.

4. RESULTS

We first discuss overall engagement and the benchmark comparison. The 2025 engagement rate was 75% (Table 2). This was three percentage points above the 2024 rate and two points above the 2023 rate. It also exceeded the survey provider's Europe Top Quartile benchmark of 69% by six points. The result therefore indicates a favourable organisation-wide position, although the small number of annual observations does not establish a stable upward trend.

The year-on-year improvement was driven by a larger engaged segment and a reduction in active disengagement compared with 2024. Nevertheless, one-quarter of the respondents did not meet the study's engagement threshold. The overall rate should therefore be interpreted as a strong aggregate result rather than as evidence that engagement risks had been eliminated.

Table 2. *Overall engagement and external reference*

Year/reference	Engagement	Difference from 2025
2023	73%	-2 pp
2024	72%	-3 pp
2025	75%	0 pp
Europe Top Quartile	69%	-6 pp

Note. pp = percentage points.

Next, we present the profile of engagement-related workplace dimensions. The diagnostic profile was uneven (Table 3). Performance management received the highest score (89%), suggesting that employees generally understood expectations, links to organisational goals, and communication from their direct managers. Identification with the company was also strong at 81%. Senior leadership scored 78%, work-life balance and well-being scored 77%, and career and development scored 75%.

Table 3. *Organisation-wide diagnostic profile in 2025*

Domain	Score	Change from 2024
Performance management	89%	N/A
Identification with the company	81%	N/A
Senior leadership	78%	+7 pp
Work-life balance and well-being	77%	+1 pp
Career and development	75%	0 pp
Cross-team collaboration	61%	N/A
Reward	61%	+4 pp
Time for strategic work	61%	−1 pp

Note. Historical comparisons were unavailable where the item configuration had changed.

Three domains jointly occupied the lowest position at 61%: cross-team collaboration, reward, and time for strategic work. Cross-team collaboration covered process clarity, the alignment of departmental goals, attention to organisation-wide consequences, and mutual consideration of perspectives. The reward score represented employees' belief that organisational success would be reflected in their income. Time for strategic work captured whether employees had sufficient capacity for high-importance, high-impact topics and projects.

Compared with 2024, senior leadership improved by seven percentage points, reward by four points, overall engagement by three points, and work-life balance by one point. Career and development remained unchanged, while time for strategic work declined by one point. Comparable historical values were unavailable for identification and cross-team collaboration because the corresponding item configurations had changed.

Variation across the major organisational areas was as follows. Engagement varied meaningfully across the four major areas (Table 4). Finance recorded the highest rate at 86%, followed by Risk at 83% and Support at 80%. Commercial, which included 200 classified respondents, recorded 69%. Because Commercial was by far the largest area, its profile had a substantial influence on the organisation-wide result.

Table 4. *Engagement and diagnostic profile by major organisational area*

Area (n)	Engagement	Diagnostic profile
Finance (36)	86%	Highest: performance management and senior leadership, 86%; lowest: collaboration, 66%.
Risk (61)	83%	Highest: performance management, 93%; lowest: reward, 64%.
Support (64)	80%	Highest: performance management, 90%; lowest: strategic time, 60%.
Commercial (200)	69%	Highest: performance management, 88%; lowest: strategic time, 51% (collaboration, 55%; reward, 57%).

Note. The table reports the four major organisational areas used for management-level interpretation.

The main area-level diagnostics show where this variation was concentrated. Commercial scored 55% for cross-team collaboration, 57% for reward, and 51% for time for strategic work, while performance management remained high at 88%. Risk displayed the strongest overall resource profile, including 92% for identification, 93% for performance management, and 90% for work-life balance. Finance scored 78% for reward and 80% for strategic time. Support was strong in performance management (90%) and career and development (80%) but scored lower in cross-team collaboration (61%) and strategic time (60

Selected small subunits ranged from 60% to 100% engagement, with sizeable year-on-year changes. These figures are managerially useful but statistically unstable because several teams contained fewer than ten respondents. The major-area results provide a more defensible basis for organisation-level interpretation.

Finally, we describe the Say-Stay-Strive facets and eNPS. The behavioural profile was strongest for Say (Table 5). Seventy-nine per cent of respondents reported that they spoke positively about their employment when the opportunity arose, and the same proportion would recommend the bank to a friend seeking employment. Both items exceeded the European benchmark and improved compared with 2024.

Table 5. *Positive responses across the Say-Stay-Strive facets*

Facet	Two-item scores	Position relative to the benchmark
Say	79%; 79%	+5 to +7 pp
Stay	72%; 72%	+7 to +11 pp
Strive	71%; 68%	+1 to +7 pp

Note. The two-item scores reflect the share of favourable responses for each item within the facet.

The two Stay items each received 72% favourable responses. Most employees rarely considered leaving and reported that leaving the organisation would be difficult. Strive was weaker: 71% felt motivated to perform beyond expectations, while 68% felt inspired to do their best work every day. The latter was the only Say-Stay-Strive item to decline year on year (-1 percentage point) and exceeded the benchmark by only one point.

The eNPS distribution comprised 57% promoters, 31% passive respondents, and 12% detractors, producing an eNPS of $+45$. This reinforces the positive advocacy result, but it should be treated as a supplementary loyalty indicator rather than as a substitute for a multidimensional engagement measure.

5. DISCUSSION

The first research question concerned the organisation-wide level of engagement and its benchmark position. The 75% engagement rate, the positive short-term movement, and an eNPS of $+45$ indicate a workforce with a strong attachment to the bank. The above-benchmark Say and Stay results are consistent with high identification and improved perceptions of senior leadership. From Kahn's [1] perspective, clear performance expectations and strategic meaning can support psychological meaningfulness and safety. From the JD-R perspective, clarity, feedback, and leadership communication function as job resources [14, 15].

At the same time, the second and third research questions reveal that the aggregate rate masks an uneven resource architecture. Performance management was rated very highly, yet cross-team collaboration, reward, and time for strategic work were all 28 percentage points lower. Employees may therefore understand their own objectives while encountering friction in the interdependent processes needed to achieve broader organisational outcomes. The pattern is particularly visible in Commercial, where individual performance management remained strong, but collaboration and strategic capacity were weak.

Cross-team collaboration is an important social and operational resource in a digital bank. Product development, customer channels, risk control, compliance, technology, and operations depend on one another, so unclear interfaces can lead to rework, delays, conflicts, and reduced control over task completion. The finding is compatible with evidence that trust and a constructive conflict-management climate support engagement in international work settings [7]. The present study does not test that relationship causally, but it identifies the cross-team interface as a priority for further analysis.

Reward was another weak domain despite a four-point improvement. In social-exchange terms, employees use recognition and reward practices as signals of whether the organisation values their contributions [16]. A low score does not necessarily establish that pay levels are objectively uncompetitive; it may reflect limited transparency, a weak line of sight between performance and outcomes, or inconsistent managerial explanations. These possibilities should be distinguished before changes are made.

Insufficient time for strategic work can be interpreted as a capacity constraint. High operational demands, frequent coordination, and competing priorities consume the resources required for focused, meaningful work. This issue is especially consequential because the weakest Strive item concerns daily inspiration to perform one's best work. The combination suggests that employees may be willing and loyal but not always able to convert that willingness into sustained discretionary effort.

The fourth research question shows a clear ordering: Say was the strongest, Stay was intermediate, and Strive was the weakest. This distinction supports the argument that engagement should not be reduced to commitment or recommendation behaviour. Organisational commitment has long been associated with identification and a desire to remain [13], whereas engagement also includes energy and adaptive, proactive behaviour [3]. A positive eNPS and strong employer advocacy can therefore coexist with a more modest level of daily inspiration.

For management, the implication is that retention-oriented indicators should not be interpreted as proof that employees have sufficient resources to go beyond minimum expectations. The most actionable question is not only whether people intend to stay but also whether work design, leadership, collaboration, and capacity enable them to contribute at their best.

The study adds a Central European, application-oriented case to the engagement literature. Cross-border digital banks combine local customer and regulatory responsibilities with regional platforms and functional specialisation. This configuration can produce a strong institutional identity while increasing coordination demands. The results suggest that engagement management in such organisations should move beyond a single corporate score and examine the quality of interfaces between functions and the distribution of resources across business areas.

The case also illustrates the value of linking engagement diagnostics with the broader logic of business excellence. Excellence assessment and quality-award research emphasise that organisational maturity should be examined through systems, processes, and measurable outcomes rather than through isolated claims of good management [8–10]. In the present case, a high engagement rate is an important outcome, but the weaker results for collaboration, reward, and strategic capacity show where the organisational system requires refinement.

Maintaining a core engagement index enables comparisons over time, while targeted domains identify emerging issues. This balance is preferable to either frequent redesign, which undermines comparability, or a completely fixed instrument, which may overlook changes in work organisation. The multi-country financial education study by Cannistrà et al. [11]

also reinforces the broader methodological point that financial-services research benefits from research designs that are both rigorous and sensitive to cross-national contexts.

6. PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

The findings support four linked management priorities. First, the bank should strengthen cross-functional coordination. Strategic projects can be assigned joint business ownership, shared success criteria, and cross-team retrospectives. Process-mapping workshops should focus on hand-offs that cause delays or require repeated clarification, particularly at Commercial interfaces. A realistic near-term target is a five-point improvement in the cross-team collaboration score within twelve months.

Second, reward practices should become more transparent. Employees need a concise explanation of how goals, performance calibration, organisational results, and variable pay are connected. Market benchmarking should be combined with manager training so that formal policy and day-to-day communication are consistent. A short pulse survey can determine whether understanding and perceived fairness improve before the next annual measurement.

Third, management should protect capacity for strategic work and strengthen Strive. A workload and meeting audit can identify recurring activities that consume time without providing equivalent value. Teams should reserve focused blocks of time for high-impact work, and leaders should connect individual objectives with customer and organisational outcomes. Leadership development should emphasise recognition, meaningful feedback, and the translation of strategy into daily work. The proposed target is to raise the weaker Strive item from 68% to at least 72% over twelve to eighteen months.

Fourth, interventions should be differentiated by organisational area. Commercial warrants qualitative follow-up through focus groups and interviews because its lower score may reflect several distinct causes. Area leaders should receive a concise diagnostic dashboard, agree on a limited number of actions, and report progress quarterly. Small teams with sharp year-on-year declines should be reviewed, but decisions should not be based solely on volatile percentages. Triangulation with turnover, absence rates, workload, and qualitative evidence is essential.

7. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Several limitations qualify the findings. The study concerns a single cross-border bank, so the results cannot be generalised to other financial institutions or countries. The design is cross-sectional, and the historical comparison uses aggregate annual results rather than a panel comprising the same respondents. Consequently, the study identifies diagnostic patterns but cannot establish that the lower-scoring domains caused the observed differences in engagement.

The instrument was designed for organisational continuity and management use rather than as a complete academic scale-validation study. The proprietary reporting procedure and external benchmark limit independent replication, and the six-point forced-choice format may influence response distributions. Self-reported data are also susceptible to common-method and social-desirability effects. Finally, some subunits were very small, making their percentages unstable.

Future research should combine the existing diagnostic survey with validated work-engagement and JD-R measures, test the reliability and factorial structure of the instrument, and use respondent-level multilevel models to separate individual, team, and area effects. Repeated measurements following interventions would permit a stronger assessment of change. Qualitative interviews should examine why cross-team collaboration, reward, and strategic time are rated differently across areas, while operational indicators could be used to determine whether improved engagement is associated with retention, service quality, productivity, or customer outcomes.

8. CONCLUSION

This research diagnosed employee engagement in a cross-border Central European digital bank using an organisational survey with a high response rate. The organisation achieved a favourable engagement rate of 75% and a strong eNPS of $+45$, supported by performance management, identification, leadership, and work-life balance. Nevertheless, the same workforce reported weaker cross-team collaboration, reward, and time for strategic work, with the most pronounced constraints occurring in the large Commercial area. Say and Stay exceeded Strive, showing that advocacy and retention intentions were stronger than daily inspiration and discretionary effort.

The central conclusion is that a high engagement score should be treated as the beginning, rather than the end, of organisational diagnosis. In cross-border digital banking, sustainable engagement depends on the quality of cross-functional interfaces, transparent recognition, protected capacity for meaningful work, and targeted leadership action. Monitoring these domains alongside the overall index can transform an annual survey into a practical management system.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank the participating employees and the organisational representatives who supported the administration of the survey. The bank has been anonymised to protect confidentiality.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

B.P. and M.Z. contributed to the conceptualisation, research design, interpretation of the engagement survey, and drafting of the empirical sections. J.F. and M.G. contributed to the theoretical framing, literature integration, methodological refinement, critical revision, and final editing. All authors approved the final manuscript and agreed to be accountable for its scholarly content.

FUNDING

This study was undertaken as part of research project CIS 07711134.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data are not publicly available because of organisational confidentiality and employee privacy restrictions. Aggregated results supporting the conclusions may be available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request and subject to organisational permission.

ETHICS APPROVAL AND INFORMED CONSENT

The study used secondary, anonymised organisational survey data collected for internal engagement diagnostics. Before participating, respondents were informed about the purpose of the survey, anonymity, and data protection conditions, and their participation was voluntary. No individual-level identifiers were available for the analysis, and the results are reported only in aggregate form to protect employee privacy.

DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES IN THE WRITING PROCESS

During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used ChatGPT to improve the linguistic quality and readability of the content. After using this AI tool, the authors comprehensively reviewed and revised the manuscript to ensure its accuracy, integrity, and scientific rigour. All authors bear full responsibility for the final content of the published work, including any errors or inconsistencies that may remain.

REFERENCES

[1] Kahn, William A. “Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work.” *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 33, no. 4, 1990, pp. 692–724.

[2] Schaufeli, Wilmar B., et al. “The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: A Two-Sample Confirmatory Factor Analytic Approach.” *Journal of Happiness Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2002, pp. 71–92.

[3] Macey, William H., and Benjamin Schneider. “The Meaning of Employee Engagement.” *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2008, pp. 3–30.

[4] Bailey, Catherine, et al. “The Meaning, Antecedents and Outcomes of Employee Engagement: A Narrative Synthesis.” *International Journal of Management Reviews*, vol. 19, no. 1, 2017, pp. 31–53.

[5] Harter, James K., et al. “Business-Unit-Level Relationship between Employee Satisfaction, Employee Engagement, and Business Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis.” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 87, no. 2, 2002, pp. 268–279.

[6] Christian, Michael S., et al. “Work Engagement: A Quantitative Review and Test of Its Relations with Task and Contextual Performance.” *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 64, no. 1, 2011, pp. 89–136.

[7] Alshaabani, Ayman, and Ildikó Rudnák. “Impact of Trust on Employees’ Engagement: The Mediating Role of Conflict Management Climate.” *Periodica Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences*, vol. 31, no. 2, 2023, pp. 153–163.

[8] Vartiak, Lukáš. "Comparing Financial Performance of Slovak Excellent Companies." *European Financial Systems 2016: Proceedings of the 13th International Scientific Conference*, edited by Jan Krajíček, Josef Nešleha, and Karel Urbanovský, Masaryk University, 2016, pp. 832–838.

[9] Rentková, Katarína, and Lukáš Vartiak. "Emerging Markets Excellence: A Review of Rajiw Gandhi National Quality Award Winners." *Education Excellence and Innovation Management through Vision 2020: From Regional Development Sustainability to Global Economic Growth: Proceedings of the 29th International Business Information Management Association Conference*, edited by K. S. Soliman, International Business Information Management Association, 2017, pp. 705–715.

[10] Vartiak, Lukas, and Miriam Jankalova. "The Business Excellence Assessment." *Procedia Engineering*, vol. 192, 2017, pp. 917–922.

[11] Cannistrà, Marta, et al. "The Impact of an Online Game-Based Financial Education Course: Multi-Country Experimental Evidence." *Journal of Comparative Economics*, vol. 52, no. 4, 2024, pp. 825–847.

[12] Aon Hewitt. *Aon Hewitt's Model of Employee Engagement*. Aon Inc., 2015.

[13] Porter, Lyman W., et al. "Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover among Psychiatric Technicians." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 59, no. 5, 1974, pp. 603–609.

[14] Demerouti, Evangelia, et al. "The Job Demands–Resources Model of Burnout." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 86, no. 3, 2001, pp. 499–512.

[15] Bakker, Arnold B., and Evangelia Demerouti. "The Job Demands–Resources Model: State of the Art." *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 22, no. 3, 2007, pp. 309–328.

[16] Saks, Alan M. "Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement." *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 21, no. 7, 2006, pp. 600–619.

[17] Albrecht, Simon L., et al. "Employee Engagement, Human Resource Management Practices and Competitive Advantage: An Integrated Approach." *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2015, pp. 7–35.

[18] Reichheld, Frederick F. "The One Number You Need to Grow." *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 81, no. 12, Dec. 2003, pp. 46–54, 124.