



Employee productivity and its contribution to economic performance: A narrative review of recent evidence

Dr. Yashika

Lecturer, Department of Management, Bharathidasan University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract

Productivity growth is widely treated as the main long-run source of higher living standards, yet gains in advanced economies have been uneven since the early 2000s. This paper reviews recent literature, emphasizing 2023–2026, on how employee productivity is generated inside organizations and how it feeds into economic performance. Drawing on official statistics, field experiments, quasi-experiments, and meta-analyses, it examines four families of drivers: human capital and training, engagement and well-being, work organization (especially hybrid work), and generative artificial intelligence (AI). Training shows a small-to-moderate average association with organizational performance ($\rho = .13$ across 159 studies), happiness has a causal effect on sales productivity, two-day hybrid schedules cut quits by one-third without measurable performance loss, and one large customer-support study found AI-related task gains of roughly 15 percent. Macroeconomic projections nonetheless remain modest. Barriers include measurement error, uneven effects across workers, burnout, weak wage pass-through, and the need for complementary organizational change. Micro-level improvements translate into broad economic performance only when diffusion, complementary investment, and the sharing of gains are deliberately supported.

Keywords: Employee productivity, labor productivity, economic performance, human capital, engagement, hybrid work, generative AI

Introduction

Output per hour worked determines how much an economy can produce, and ultimately consume, without people working longer. A Congressional Research Service (CRS, 2025) ^[6] overview calls productivity growth the most consequential determinant of long-term income growth and living standards. The recent record is mixed. U.S. labor productivity grew by about 2.2 percent a year between 1950 and 1999 and about 2.0 percent between 2000 and 2024, while total factor productivity (TFP) growth slowed from roughly 1.4 to 0.9 percent (CRS, 2025). Across the OECD, preliminary estimates put 2024 ^[13] labor productivity growth at only about 0.4 percent, with a handful of economies above 2.5 percent (OECD, 2025). The United States did better in 2025 ^[1], when annual average nonfarm business productivity rose 2.1 percent (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS], 2026b).

These aggregates raise a question for managers and policymakers alike: what makes employees more productive, and how do those gains accumulate into national performance? Employee productivity is not a fixed personal trait; it reflects skills, motivation, health, work design, and available tools. This review asks (a) how employee productivity shapes economic performance, (b) what recent evidence says about the effectiveness of major productivity-enhancing practices, and (c) which barriers limit their impact.

Review Approach

This is a targeted narrative review, not a formal systematic review. In October 2026, I searched the web for combinations of terms such as labor productivity, employee engagement meta-analysis, hybrid work randomized trial, generative AI field experiment, training and organizational performance, and burnout and job performance. Peer-reviewed articles, meta-analyses, working papers from

established research networks, and official statistics were prioritized, with 2023–2026 publications preferred. Blogs and commentary without original data were excluded. Where full texts were unavailable, conclusions rest on published abstracts and are limited accordingly. Because the search was neither exhaustive nor protocol-driven, relevant studies may have been missed, and one vendor-produced source (Gallup) is flagged where used.

Drivers of Employee Productivity: Approaches and Evidence

From Employee Output to Economic Performance

Labor productivity is usually measured as output per hour worked, such as GDP per hour in OECD comparisons. Its growth stems from capital deepening, changes in workforce quality, and TFP, the residual capturing technology, organization, and management. U.S. data for 2025 illustrate this: private nonfarm business output rose 2.6 percent while combined inputs rose 1.7 percent, leaving TFP growth of 0.8 percent (BLS, 2026c). Employees contribute through each channel by supplying effort and skill, using capital and software effectively, and staying long enough to build firm-specific know-how.

Productivity also interacts with costs and incomes. Unit labor costs equal hourly compensation divided by productivity; in 2024 ^[13], U.S. nonfarm productivity rose 2.3 percent while hourly compensation rose 5.0 percent, lifting unit labor costs 2.6 percent (BLS, 2025) ^[14]. Aggregation is a further issue. Acemoglu (2025) ^[1] shows that when technology works through task-level cost savings, the economy-wide gain is roughly the share of tasks affected multiplied by the average saving on them. Firm-level improvements are therefore necessary but not sufficient for aggregate performance; breadth of adoption matters as much as depth.

Human Capital and Training

Human capital theory predicts that investing in skills raises output. A meta-analysis of 159 studies ($N = 75,033$) found a positive but modest link between organization-level training and organizational performance ($\rho = .13$, 95% CI [.11, .16]), with strength varying by training dimension, type of human capital, outcome, timing, industry knowledge intensity, firm age, and region (Kim *et al.*, 2026)^[10]. Another meta-analysis, covering 44 studies, 68 managerial-skills programs, and 431 estimates, reported favorable average returns for management practices, productivity, profits, and survival; programs focused on human resources, soft skills, marketing, and finance, and those run by local organizations, tended to do better (Busso *et al.*, 2023)^[5]. Training investment is supported, but returns depend on content, delivery, and context.

Engagement and Well-Being

A second approach treats motivation and health as productive assets. Gallup's tenth Q12 meta-analysis, spanning 456 studies in 276 organizations, 54 industries, and 96 countries, relates unit-level engagement to eleven outcomes including productivity and profitability; Gallup's summaries cite top-quartile advantages of about 14 percent in productivity and 23 percent in profitability (Gallup, n.d.). Because the source is a survey vendor and the design correlational, these are associations rather than effects. Stronger causal evidence comes from Bellet *et al.* (2024)^[2], who tracked almost 1,800 telesales workers in 11 UK call centers for six months, measured happiness weekly, and used differences in visual exposure to weather as a source of exogenous mood variation. Happier workers sold more, chiefly by converting more calls and, to a lesser degree, by making more calls per hour; attendance and break-taking did not change. The opposite risk is documented by Corbeanu *et al.* (2023)^[7]: across 45 studies, job performance correlated negatively with exhaustion ($r = -.17$), depersonalization ($r = -.16$), and inefficacy ($r = -.23$).

Work Organization: Hybrid Work

Work design shapes effort, collaboration, and retention. Bloom *et al.* (2024)^[3] randomly assigned 1,612 employees of a Chinese technology company in 2021–2022 to a schedule with two home days a week. Hybrid work raised job satisfaction and cut quit rates by one-third, while equivalence tests found no effect on performance reviews over two years or on engineers' lines of code. Managers who had expected a 2.6 percent productivity loss afterward expected a 1.0 percent gain. Retention matters economically because departures destroy firm-specific skills and create hiring and training costs, so a schedule that holds output steady while reducing turnover can raise productivity indirectly.

Generative Artificial Intelligence

The newest driver is generative AI. In a preregistered experiment with 453 college-educated professionals doing mid-level writing tasks, ChatGPT access cut completion time by about 40 percent and raised graded quality by 18 percent while narrowing gaps between workers (Noy & Zhang, 2023)^[11]. In the field, Brynjolfsson *et al.* (2025)^[4] studied the staggered rollout of an AI assistant to 5,172 customer-support agents and found a 15 percent rise in issues resolved per hour, concentrated among less

experienced, lower-skilled agents; the most experienced gained little speed and saw slight quality declines. Broader evidence is more restrained. Linking surveys of about 25,000 workers to Danish administrative records, Humlum and Vestergaard (2025)^[9] found no detectable effect of chatbot adoption on earnings or recorded hours; in the initial version of their study, reported time savings averaged only 2.8 percent. At the macro level, Acemoglu (2025)^[1] projects TFP gains of no more than about two-thirds of one percent over a decade, and less once harder-to-automate tasks are considered.

Evidence on Effectiveness

The evidence is consistently positive in direction but varies in magnitude and credibility (Table 1). Randomized trials, staggered rollouts, and a natural experiment show clear gains in specific settings: faster task completion with AI, more sales when workers are happier, and lower turnover under hybrid work. The meta-analyses, largely correlational, show smaller average associations and imply that outcomes hinge on moderators. Two patterns recur. AI gains are largest for less experienced workers, compressing the productivity distribution (Brynjolfsson *et al.*, 2025; Noy & Zhang, 2023)^[4, 11]. And task-level gains far exceed economy-wide ones: a 15 percent throughput improvement in one occupation contrasts with a 2.8 percent average time saving across exposed occupations and projected aggregate TFP effects below one percent (Acemoglu, 2025; Humlum & Vestergaard, 2025)^[1, 9].

Table 1: Summary of Key Studies by Design and Main Result

Source	Design and sample	Main result
Noy & Zhang (2023) ^[11]	Preregistered experiment; 453 professionals	Time –40%; quality +18%
Brynjolfsson <i>et al.</i> (2025) ^[4]	Staggered rollout; 5,172 agents	Issues resolved per hour +15%
Bellet <i>et al.</i> (2024) ^[2]	Natural experiment; ~1,800 call-center workers	Happiness raised sales
Bloom <i>et al.</i> (2024) ^[3]	Randomized trial; 1,612 employees	Quits down one-third; performance unchanged
Kim <i>et al.</i> (2026) ^[10]	Meta-analysis; 159 studies	Training–performance $\rho = .13$
Corbeanu <i>et al.</i> (2023) ^[7]	Meta-analysis; 45 studies	Burnout–performance $r = -.16$ to $-.23$
Humlum & Vestergaard (2025) ^[9]	Surveys plus administrative data; ~25,000 workers	No detectable earnings or hours effect

Barriers and Challenges to Implementation

Measurement: Productivity is hard to observe in services and knowledge work. Studies rely on narrow proxies, such as issues resolved per hour or lines of code that can miss quality, learning, and collaboration. Official figures also move: the preliminary estimate of fourth-quarter 2025^[14] U.S. nonfarm productivity growth was 2.8 percent, but the revised estimate was 1.8 percent (BLS, 2026a, 2026b).

Heterogeneity and validity: Many of the strongest studies come from a single firm or occupation, and effects differ by worker experience, so findings may not transfer across sectors or countries. The engagement evidence is largely correlational.

Human strain: Pursuing output through intensity can backfire, since exhaustion and cynicism are tied to weaker performance (Corbeanu *et al.*, 2023)^[7].

Weak pass-through: Even where productivity rises, workers may not share the gains. Humlum and Vestergaard (2025)^[9] detected no earnings effect, and Acemoglu (2025)^[1] anticipates that AI may widen the gap between capital and labor income.

Complementarities and diffusion: Benefits depend on supporting investment in training, management, and process redesign, which helps explain why training effects vary with industry and firm characteristics (Kim *et al.*, 2026)^[10]. Nationally, few OECD economies exceeded 2.5 percent productivity growth in 2024 (OECD, 2025)^[6, 13], suggesting that firm-level successes have not yet spread widely.

Discussion and Implications

Taken together, the studies suggest that employee productivity is a system outcome rather than an individual trait: skills, well-being, work design, and technology interact, and each can amplify or dampen the others. Three implications follow.

For organizations, the evidence favors a portfolio approach. Training should target content and delivery models with demonstrated returns (Busso *et al.*, 2023; Kim *et al.*, 2026)^[5, 10]; well-being and burnout prevention are performance investments (Bellet *et al.*, 2024; Corbeanu *et al.*, 2023)^[2, 7]; flexible schedules can serve as a retention tool without sacrificing output (Bloom *et al.*, 2024)^[3]; and AI should be introduced alongside coaching and process redesign, with attention to quality and to senior staff, whose measured gains were smallest (Brynjolfsson *et al.*, 2025)^[4].

For policy, expectations should be realistic and diffusion-focused. Because aggregate gains scale with the share of tasks affected (Acemoglu, 2025)^[1], spreading skills, management capability, and technology adoption beyond frontier firms likely matters more than any single innovation. Distribution deserves equal attention: if gains are not reflected in pay, support for productivity-enhancing change may erode.

For research, priorities include multi-firm, multi-country field experiments, longer follow-up, better measures of quality, and work linking firm-level gains to sector and national statistics.

Conclusion

Employee productivity contributes to economic performance through skills, motivation, work design, and technology, but the path from individual output to national growth is neither automatic nor uniform. Recent evidence shows meaningful, context-specific gains from training, well-being, hybrid arrangements, and AI assistance, alongside modest aggregate numbers and persistent barriers in measurement, burnout, and gain-sharing. The practical lesson is to pair productivity-raising practices with complementary investment and transparent measurement, and to ensure gains are diffused and shared. Linking credible micro-level experiments to aggregate outcomes will be essential for judging how far today promising results can scales.

References

1. Acemoglu D. The simple macroeconomics of AI. *Economic Policy*, 2025;40(121):13–58.
2. Bellet CS, De Neve J-E, Ward G. Does employee happiness have an impact on productivity?

- Management Science, 2024;70(3):1656–1679. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2023.4766>
3. Bloom N, Han R, Liang J. Hybrid working from home improves retention without damaging performance. *Nature*, 2024;630(8018):920–925. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07500-2>
4. Brynjolfsson E, Li D, Raymond L. Generative AI at work. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2025;140(2):889–942. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjae044>
5. Busso M, Park K, Irazoque N. The effectiveness of management training programs: A meta-analytic review. Inter-American Development Bank, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.18235/0004815>
6. Congressional Research Service. Productivity growth: Trends and policy issues (Report No. R48695), 2025. <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R48695>
7. Corbeanu A, Iliescu D, Ion A, Spînu R. The link between burnout and job performance: A meta-analysis. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 2023;32(4):599–616. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2023.2209320>
8. Gallup. Q12 employee engagement meta-analysis [Web page]. <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/236927/employee-engagement-meta-analysis.aspx>
9. Humlum A, Vestergaard E. Large language models, small labor market effects (NBER Working Paper No. 33777). National Bureau of Economic Research, 2025.
10. Kim J, Chang H, Bell BS. Organizational-level training and performance: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Management*, 2026;52(5):1772–1809. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063251327588>
11. Noy S, Zhang W. Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. *Science*, 2023;381(6654):187–192. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adh2586>
12. OECD. Insights on productivity developments in 2024. In *OECD compendium of productivity indicators 2025* (chap. 9). OECD Publishing, 2025. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/oecd-compendium-of-productivity-indicators-2025_b024d9e1-en/full-report/insights-on-productivity-developments-in-2024_c4061fb7.html
13. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Productivity up 2.3 percent in 2024. *The Economics Daily*, 2025. <https://www.bls.gov/opub/ted/2025/productivity-up-2-3-percent-in-2024.htm>
14. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Productivity and costs: Fourth quarter and annual averages 2025, preliminary, 2026a. https://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/prod2_03052026.htm
15. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Productivity and costs: Fourth quarter and annual averages 2025, revised, 2026b. https://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/prod2_03242026.htm
16. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Total factor productivity increases 0.8% in 2025, following a 1.5% increase in 2024, 2026c. <https://www.bls.gov/mfp/mprd.htm>