

# Insync's Alignment and Engagement Survey



## Psychometric analysis report

### Background

For more than 25 years, Insync has partnered with organisations to help them understand and strengthen the connection between alignment and engagement - the twin forces that shape performance and climate. Alignment ensures that people understand and support the organisation's strategy and direction, while engagement fuels the energy and commitment required to deliver it.

Insync's Alignment and Engagement ("AES") framework brings these concepts together through rigorous, data-driven analysis. Drawing on thousands of survey responses and decades of organisational research, it provides leaders with actionable insights into how alignment and engagement interact across seven key domains of organisational life.

Our goal is to equip leaders with a clear understanding of what drives their people, where energy is being lost, and how leadership, communication, and investment in people translate into measurable performance outcomes.

### Response scale

The AES uses a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree', with a neutral midpoint. This format produces interval-like data that allows for more precise analysis of employee engagement, as it captures subtle differences in attitudes and opinions.

Psychometric research consistently supports the reliability of multi-point Likert formats, including the 7-point version adopted by Insync. The response options are evenly spaced, making comparisons between responses meaningful and robust.

Because of these properties, the 7-point format is well suited to advanced statistical techniques such as calculating mean scores, conducting regression analyses, and performing factor analysis. Widely accepted in both academic and applied research, it provides an effective way of measuring employee engagement while offering the level of detail necessary for actionable organisational insights.

### Methodology

The AES was developed to assess the key factors influencing employee engagement within an organisation. Initially consisting of 76 items, it has since been refined through multiple rounds of psychometric testing and analysis. This process included descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, regression, and factor analysis, undertaken to improve efficiency without compromising predictive strength.

The survey was rigorously assessed with a sample of 5,222 respondents to ensure its validity across a broad respondent base. At each stage, items were carefully evaluated for their contribution to the tool. Through this iterative process, thirty-one items were removed, leaving only the most relevant and impactful items.

The revised version of the instrument consists of forty-five items grouped across seven domains (Engagement, Team Effectiveness, Senior Leadership, Strategy & Direction, Team Leadership, Investment in People and Tools and Support). These domains were confirmed through exploratory and confirmatory analysis to reflect critical aspects of employee experience and organisational performance.

Despite the reduction in items, the survey's reliability and predictive power were maintained, with  $R^2$  values remaining consistent, confirming that the shortened version retains its effectiveness in measuring employee engagement and its underlying drivers.

As the refinement of the survey was informed by repeated psychometric testing, the following section outlines the analyses undertaken to confirm the validity and reliability of the current 45-item survey.

### Survey psychometrics

The effectiveness of a survey is evaluated by examining its validity and reliability. Validity refers to how well a questionnaire captures the intended constructs. Reliability refers to the stability of survey data across different respondents or over time. The revised AES has been shown to be methodologically robust, showing strong results across various assessments of validity and reliability, as outlined in the remainder of this document.

## Descriptive statistics: response patterns and variability

To better understand overall response patterns, descriptive statistics were examined for all survey items, focusing on both average scores and variability. This step was important for assessing how employees generally responded and whether the questions captured meaningful differences.

Central tendency measures (mean, median, and mode) and variability (standard deviation and standard error) were analysed for each item. This helped identify whether responses were clustered too tightly (e.g., everyone selecting “Strongly Agree”) or whether they showed enough spread to provide useful insights.

Results showed mean scores ranging from 4.60 to 6.06, with standard deviations from 1.03 to 1.89. This indicates that respondents generally agreed positively with the items. The negative skewness values (-.56 to -1.84) are typical for engagement surveys, where employees often respond favourably, suggesting an overall positive engagement bias.

Finally, the dataset was reviewed for completeness. No missing responses were identified, confirming that all items were rated consistently and that the AES data were sound for further analysis.

### Item redundancy

An item redundancy analysis was undertaken to ensure the survey remained concise and free from unnecessary repetition. A correlation matrix was used to identify highly correlated items, as strong correlations may indicate that two items are measuring the same underlying concept. In such cases, one of the items can be removed to reduce duplication.

At the same time, items showing little or no correlation with the rest of the survey were also reviewed, as this may suggest they are not contributing meaningfully to the overall construct. Removing such items can improve the focus and consistency of the Survey.

This process informed earlier item reductions and was repeated as part of the final review of the remaining forty-five items. No items were found to have excessive or insufficient correlations at this stage, confirming the validity of their inclusion in the final Survey.

### Construct validity

Construct validity was examined through factor analysis, a statistical technique used to identify underlying dimensions that explain patterns in survey responses. This approach assists in determining how items align within broader domains and whether the structure of the instrument is sound.

Ideally, factor analysis produces item groupings consistent with the intended framework of the survey. Items showing strong correlations with one another typically reflect a shared construct. Within the AES survey, this process resulted in the identification of seven domains: Engagement, Team Effectiveness, Senior Leadership, Strategy and Direction, Team Leadership, Investment in People, and Tools and Support.

Individual items were assigned to domains based on their factor loadings, which indicate the strength of association between an item and a domain. Items with higher loadings were assigned to the domain they best represented, supporting the structure of the seven-domain model.

Factor extraction was performed using Principal Components Analysis with Varimax rotation, confirming the grouping of items into coherent and interpretable constructs. While a small number of items showed lower loadings, they were retained due to their conceptual relevance, and overall, the analysis supported the validity of the AES, with items aligning to the seven intended domains.

**Table 1. Items and their factor loading**

Factors and items	Factor loading
<b>Engagement</b>	
I go above and beyond for the benefit of	0.702
I would like to be working at [Client] two years from now	0.630
I am proud to be working here	0.604
I feel like I belong at [Client]	0.523
I would recommend [Client] to others as a good place to work	0.505
Overall, I am satisfied with my job	0.485
<b>Team effectiveness</b>	
We collaborate effectively in my team	0.770
My team looks for ways to improve how we work	0.762
My team adapts well to change	0.739
In my team, we set goals that help us improve	0.723
My team is decisive when it comes to resolving issues	0.709
[Client]’s Values are demonstrated in my team	0.632
My team is accountable for its performance	0.623
My team celebrates its achievements	0.563

Factors and items	Factor loading
<b>Senior leadership</b>	
Our ELT thank people for their contribution	0.725
Our ELT are open to feedback	0.713
Our ELT value employees	0.706
Our ELT are good role models	0.688
Our ELT encourage employees to come up with better ways of doing things	0.647
The reasons for organisational changes are explained to me	0.425
<b>Strategy and direction</b>	
[Client] continuously aims to provide a great customer experience	0.660
[Client] contributes positively to the community	0.657
Customer needs guide the decisions we make	0.608
I understand how [Client] expects to achieve its goals	0.564
[Client] is committed to high standards of performance	0.541
I feel connected to the organisation's purpose/vision	0.496
[Client] respects individuals and values their differences	0.462
I understand how my role contributes to [Client]'s goals	0.367
<b>Team leadership</b>	
The person I report to is a good coach	0.784
The person I report to values my opinions	0.784
The person I report to sets a good example for me	0.772
The person I report to cares about my job satisfaction	0.738
I am comfortable speaking up and raising issues	0.434
I am advised about changes that may affect me	0.353

Factors and items	Factor loading
<b>Investment in people</b>	
I am paid fairly for my role	0.729
I have the flexibility I need to manage my work and personal commitments	0.574
[Client] cares about me	0.490
People are recognised for their achievements	0.457
[Client] allocates resources (money, people and effort) towards achieving organisational goals	0.448
There are opportunities to improve my skills in this organisation	0.432
[Client] has effective processes for developing employees	0.425
<b>Tools and support</b>	
Our systems/technology enable us to serve our customers well	0.853
Our systems and processes allow me to be as productive as possible	0.762
[Client] is committed to ensuring our systems work well together	0.661
Different teams work well together to get things done	0.308

## Regression analysis

A regression analysis was undertaken to evaluate how well the survey model is predicted by the domains, using a multiple linear regression. In this model, Engagement was treated as the outcome variable, predicted by the average scores of the six other domains (Team Effectiveness, Senior Leadership, Strategy & Direction, Team Leadership, Investment in People, and Tools and Support).

This step assessed the strength of the relationship between each domain and overall employee engagement, confirming whether the model provides a reliable explanation of engagement outcomes. The results showed that the overall model was statistically significant ( $F(7, 5215) = 2066.03, p < .001$ ), with the 6 predictor domains collectively explaining 70.4% of the variance in Engagement ( $R^2 = 0.704$ ).

These results demonstrate that the survey model offers a robust framework for predicting engagement, with key domains explaining a substantial proportion of variation in outcomes.

**Table 2. Regression model summary**

R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate
0.839a	0.704	0.704	0.60347

a. Predictors: (Constant), Team Effectiveness, Senior Leadership, Strategy & Direction, Team Leadership, Investment in People, Tools and Support

**Table 3. Drivers of Engagement**

Predictor	Beta	t-value	Significance
Team effectiveness	0.038	3.049	0.002
Senior leadership	0.138	8.789	<0.001
Strategy and direction	0.248	17.198	<0.001
Team leadership	0.197	14.811	<0.001
Investment in people	0.316	19.920	<0.001
Tools and support	-0.009	-0.831	0.406

The findings further indicate that Senior Leadership, Investment in People, and Strategy and Direction are the primary drivers of Employee Engagement. These domains significantly influence engagement, highlighting the importance of leadership quality, employee development, and strategic alignment for fostering a highly engaged workforce.

The Tools and Support domain did not significantly predict engagement, suggesting that the others have a greater impact. While it may still play an indirect role in shaping satisfaction and the overall work experience, the domain did not show as strong a relationship with engagement.

Tools and Support, such as technology and systems, may be viewed as a baseline expectation; employees assume these tools should function properly. When they do, they may not be actively considered; however, when they fail, it can lead to frustration, affecting engagement over time.

## Reliability analysis

As a final step, a reliability analysis was undertaken at the domain level, with Cronbach’s Alpha calculated for the set of items within each domain. The analysis results indicate that all domains demonstrate excellent internal consistency, with Cronbach’s Alpha values ranging from 0.826 to 0.931.

A Cronbach’s alpha of .700 is the typical standard for reliability. Although the Tools and Support domain recorded a lower value than the other domains (0.826), it remains well above the accepted threshold, confirming its reliability.

This demonstrates that the AES survey reliably measures each of the seven domains, ensuring dependable results across the instrument.

**Table 4. Reliability coefficients for each factor**

Factor	Cronbach’s Alpha	Number of items
Engagement	0.898	6
Team effectiveness	0.925	8
Senior leadership	0.931	6
Strategy and direction	0.908	8
Team leadership	0.915	6
Investment in people	0.900	7
Tools and support	0.826	4

## Conclusion and recommendations

This psychometric analysis provides compelling evidence that the revised AES is a robust tool for measuring employee engagement and the associated domains that drive it. The tool has proven reliable and valid across multiple rounds of analysis, and the results provide actionable insights into the factors that organisations should focus on to enhance employee engagement.

Considering these results, the recommended next steps are:

**1. maintain the current model:**

the survey is psychometrically sound and provides a valid measure of engagement, requiring no immediate changes

**2. conduct regular reviews**

periodic reviews are recommended to ensure that the survey continues to reflect evolving organisational priorities

**3. prioritise actionable insights:**

organisations should focus on leadership, employee development, and strategic alignment to improve engagement levels foremost, and

**4. monitor Tools and support:**

while this domain did not emerge as a significant predictor, it is still essential to assess its ongoing relevance, especially with technological and organisational changes.