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Abstract

The concept and discourse on Employee Engagement is fast becoming an emergent concern in the field of human resource management and in literatures. Therefore, the purpose of the study is to investigate the relationship between Employee Engagement and Performance of Nurses in Lagos State Public Hospitals. A quantitative approach was used and data for this study were collected from two (2) selected public hospitals. The main instrument of data collection is questionnaire. The questionnaire was given to 180 nurses who were selected based on purposive sampling techniques, finally 166 (92.5%) usable responses were received that were used for further analysis. The hypothesized relationships were used using Pearson Product Moment correlation analysis. The study showed that perceived supervisor support, perceived organisation support and reward and recognition play a significant role at confirming employee engagement level in the healthcare industry. The study therefore recommends that organisations should put in place appropriate measures that can guarantee employee involvement which will in turn influence higher performance of employees.
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Introduction

The intense competition in industries across the globe is forcing captains of industries to look for a more dynamic and objectives approach that will guarantee employees that are optimistic, concerned, inspired, committed and were importantly, dedicated to the organisation goal (Vance, 2006). Due to globalisation work attitudes within organisations have changed in recent years, business competition is now tense and technological revolution is on the rise everyday (Reilly, 2014). Considerable changes in the international market have necessitated the need for organisations to find more innovative ways to address new technological, demographic and marketplace realities. As a result, organisations want employees that are fully involved and can put in extra effort and priceless contribution in every possible way (Vance, 2006). Thus, employee engagement is increasingly becoming one of the most emerging topics and concepts in human management literature (Chartered Institute of Personnel Development 2012).

Essentially, employee engagement has generated a great deal of interest in recent years as it is fast becoming a widely used term in organizations, amongst HR practitioners/consulting firms
and recently the academia (Macey & Scheider, 2008; Markos & Sridevi, 2010). Meanwhile it has been argued that Human Resource (HR) practitioners as well as other relevant organizational stakeholders must position their organizations to stay alive with competitive advantage. (Reilly, 2014)

Suffice it to say that employee engagement is a strategic approach for driving performance and encouraging organizational change in this global market, especially in this 21st century when captains of organisations regard the management of human resource as powerful source of sustainable competitive advantage, (Aninkan & Oyewole, 2014). Furthermore, a high level of engagement is a strategic tool for a improving the competitive advantage of organizations in many industries, including healthcare (Gibbons & Schutt, 2010). Engaged employees are a to their employer, satisfied with their work and willing to give extra effort to achieve the organization’s goals. Evidence suggests that engagement influences other major human resources goals, such as retention, job performance, absenteeism and organisation behaviour.

Several factors have been identified to affect healthcare organisation’s capability to provide quality patient care. The factors are not just standard medical technology, but the organisation’s number of service providers, especially the nurses and or even assistant health workers designed to promote preventative care (Cornerstone, 2014). The cornerstone reports stated that healthcare organizations can create the most profound improvements in patient care and satisfaction levels simply by improving employee engagement.

Nursing is a unique profession that harmoniously blended of compassion, knowledge, skill and critical thinking. Nurses are well known as dedicated professionals who work tirelessly for their patients. However, several studies show that nursing is career characterized by heavy workload and tend to experience significant stress and reporting high level of burnout (Rao, 2012; Laschinger, Wilk, Cho & Greco, 2009; Freeney & Tiernan, 2009; Willoughby, 2011). The heavy workload attached to this profession has been identified as a major factor affecting the on the job performance of the nurses despite the high prestige of the job, that is why management and direct supervisors of employees should understand and adopt the best approach or drivers to engage their subordinate so as to induce the optimum job performance.

Several studies have been done on the drivers of employee engagement, out of which Saks (2006) five (5) drivers of engagement is prominent. These are job characteristics, perceived organisational support, perceived supervisor support, rewards and recognitions and procedural justice and distributive justice. Though several other studies have excluded procedural and distributive justice and emphasized that other elements are the core drivers of engagement. This study therefore, incorporate Saks’ (2006) framework of engagement in measuring and predicting engagement drivers in the nursing profession of Nigeria.

Statement of the Problem

The concept employee engagement remains one of the emerging concepts in the practice and management of human resource, coupled with academic knowledge gap even in human resource literatures. The reality today is that, engagement of employee is declining due to high materials and equipment concern in organisations, hence a trend of deepening disengagement among employees (Saks, 2006). This leads to “engagement gap” in the workplace and it is a drawback
for the organization as disengaged employee will cost organisation more. Few available studies (Reilly, 2014, Wilk, Cho & Greco, 2009; Aninkan & Oyewole, 2014; Willoughby, 2011) have looked at the level of influence that employee engagement had on performance in mostly the manufacturing and academic environment; this study therefore wants to consider how the concept of engagement applies to healthcare workers and its effect on performance in the healthcare delivery. Lastly, the unavailability of study and data on employee engagement in Nigerian healthcare organisations made it difficult for this study to have a relative built on tool, which has been the case in other industries. This paper therefore wants to fill these gaps.

**Objective of the Study**

In relation to the established dimensions of Saks (2006), the main aim of this study is to analyse the relationship between employee engagement and job performance of nurses in the Nigeria healthcare industry.

The specific objectives of the study are:

i. To examine the relationship between perceived supervisor support and job performance in nursing profession.

ii. To examine the relationship between perceived organization support and job performance in nursing profession.

iii. To examine the relationship between reward and recognition and job performance in nursing profession.

iv. To examine the relationship between self-efficacy and job performance in nursing profession.

**Research Question**

In relation to the objectives of this study, this paper will provide answers to the following questions:

i. Does perceived supervisor support influences job performance in nursing profession?

ii. Does perceived organization support influences job performance in nursing profession?

iii. Does reward and recognition influences job performance in nursing profession?

iv. Does self-efficacy influences job performance in nursing profession?

**Research Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis One**  
\( H_0^1 \): There is no significant relationship between perceived supervisor support and job performance in nursing profession.

**Hypothesis Two**  
\( H_0^2 \): There is no significant relationship between perceived organization support and job performance in nursing profession.

**Hypothesis Three**  
\( H_0^3 \): There is no significant relationship between reward and recognition and job performance in nursing profession.
Hypothesis Four

H04: There is no significant relationship between self-efficacy and job performance in nursing profession.

Literature Review

Research has shown that there are many factors that influence employee engagement; this study therefore, reviews a few from previous researches. Factors discussed are employee engagement, employee performance, engagement strategies, and employee engagement drivers.

Conceptual Clarification

Employee Engagement: The concept of employee engagement is relatively new to both the business and academic world. However, research is continuing to link employee engagement to various organisational outcomes, including customer loyalty and employee’s performance (Gonring, 2008), profitability, customer-focused behaviour, safety and turnover (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002). In a review of high performing organizations literature, De Waal (2007) identified that leaders of high performance organisations are “committed to the organisation for the long haul by balancing common purpose with self-interest, and teaching organisational members to put the organisation first.

Furthermore, employee engagement according to Little and Little (2006) is the level of commitment and involvement an employee has towards his organisation and its values. An engaged employee will demonstrate an unpredicted behaviours towards the job for the benefit of the organisation. The basic aspects of employees engagement according to Little and Little (2006), are the employees and their own unique psychological makeup and experience, the employer and their ability to create the conditions that promote employee engagement and the interaction between employers at all levels.

Employees Performance: There are many factors affect the performance of employees at the organizational level, either in a manufacturing or service industries, as posited by (Kenichi &Kreitner, 2003) these factors could be internal or external domain. Employee performance can be reflected from the height of togetherness and the level of employee satisfaction (Zuriekat, Salameh & Alrawasdeh, 2011; Pandla, 2016), beside the level of satisfaction, (Tze San, Mei Theen & Boon Heng, 2012) explained that performance is also influenced by the concept of rewards that are implemented in the employee by the organisation. Even though many factors influence employee performance. Beside the financial, non-financial interest or other rewards and the management support (Uzonna, 2013) that the high employee engagement also will strengthen the spirit of employees to improve their performance (Albdour & Altarawneh, 2014; Ram & Prabhakar, 2011).

Theoretical Framework

Various studies on employee engagement (Meere, 2005; Pandita and Bedarkar, 2014; Harter, Schmidt and Hayes, 2002) have been used to draw relationship between employee engagement
and various variables resulting to diverse conclusions and recommendations, this implies that the study of employee engagement is anchored on multiplicity of theories. This study therefore, relates employee engagement concept to two theories namely Self-determination theory and Social exchange theory

**Self Determination Theory (SDT):** The self-determination theory (SDT) was developed by Edward L. Deci and Richard M. Ryan in 1985. SDT identifies two forms of motivation that is intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation refers to doing an activity for its own sake out of enjoyment and interest while extrinsic motivation refers to doing an activity for instrumental reasons (Meyer and Gagne’ 2008). According to SDT, extrinsic motivation can reflect a desire to gain rewards or avoid punishment (external regulation), boost ones ego or avoid feelings of guilt (introjections), attain a valued personal goal (identification) or express one sense of self (integration). Identification and integration together with intrinsic motivation are considered forms of autonomous regulation. External regulations together with introjections are considered forms of controlled regulation.

According to Deci and Ryan (2000), autonomous regulation has been demonstrated to lead to higher levels of performance, persistence, initiative and creativity. Meyer and Gagne’ (2008), assert that the concept of autonomous regulation overlaps with Macey and Schneider conceptualization of state engagement (satisfaction, involvement, and empowerment), and that the behavioral outcome associated with autonomous regulation, corresponds with what Macey and Schneider (2004) describe as behavioral engagement (extra role behavior, proactivity, role expansion).

**Social Exchange Theory (SET):** Social exchange theory (SET), evolved from Thorndike’s (1932, 1935) reinforcement theory and Mill’s marginal utility theory (1923). It arose out of the philosophical traditions of utilitarianism, behaviorism, and neoclassical economics. SET stipulates that obligations are generated through a series of interactions between parties who are in a state of reciprocal interdependence. A basic principle of SET is that relationships evolve overtime into trusting, loyal and mutual commitments as long as the parties abide by certain rules of exchange (Crospranzano and Mitchel, 2005).

Such rules tend to involve reciprocity or repayment rules, so that the action of one party leads to a response or action by the other party. Crospranzano and Mitchel (2005) further note that Social exchange theory suggests that individuals who perceive the presence of reciprocity in their social relationships are more likely to feel satisfied with and maintain such relationships. Therefore employee engagement has its explanation in SET since it represents a reciprocity or two way relationship. Schaufeli (2013) states that when employees receive particular resources from their organization (e.g., decent pay, recognition, opportunities of development) they tend to respond in kind and repay the organization. That is employees’ engagement levels will depend on the resources they receive from the organization.

**Employee Engagement and Employee’s Performance**

Why should companies invest in employee engagement? The answer is because employee engagement is interwoven significantly with important business outcomes. Studies have found
positive relationship between employee engagement and employee’s performance outcomes: employee retention, productivity, profitability, customer loyalty and safety (BlessingWhite, 2006; Baumruk and Gorman, 2006, Meere, 2005 and Perrin Report, 2003). Researches also indicate that the more engaged employees are, the more likely their employer is to exceed the industry average in its revenue growth. Employee engagement is found to be higher in double-digit growth companies. Engaged employee consistently demonstrates three general behaviours which improve organizational performance, they are:

i. **Say**—the employee advocates for the organization to co-workers, and refers potential employees and customers

ii. **Stay**—the employee has an intense desire to be a member of the organization despite opportunities to work elsewhere

iii. **Strive**—the employee exerts extra time, effort and initiative to contribute to the success of the business (Baumruk and Gorman, 2006)

**Employee Engagement Drivers**
Many researchers have tried to identify factors leading to employee engagement and developed models to draw implications for managers. Most notable amongst the studies is the Gallup Q12 questionnaire of engagement. Gallup, potentially the most prominent firm association with employee engagement, characterised engaged employees as “those who work with enthusiasm and feel a philosophical connection to their organisation and job, along with innovative mind-set to move the organisation forward” (Gallup, 2006). Gallup researchers established 12 key expectations to which, they argued, form the foundation of strong feelings of employee engagement. These sets of questions, according to Gallup, are basic questions that every engaged employee should be able to answer yes to. So far, 1.5 million employees have participated in the Q12 instrument (Robinson et al., 2004). The questions are summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Do you know what is expected of you at work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Do you have the materials and equipment to do your work right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. At work, do you have the opportunity to do what you do best every day?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. In the last seven days, have you received recognition or praise for doing good work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Does your supervisor, or someone at work, seem to care about you as a person?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Is there someone at work who encourages your development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. At work, do your opinions seem to count?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Does the mission/purpose of your company make you feel your job is important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. Are your associates (fellow employees) committed to doing quality work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. Do you have a best friend at work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. In the last six months, has someone at work talked to you about your progress?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. In the last year, have you had opportunities to learn and grow?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another widely accepted drivers pack for employee engagement was presented by Saks (2006). He is one of the few academics to study employee engagement. His research on engagement itemised five dimensions as the basis for employee engagement. These are

i. Job characteristics

ii. Perceived organisational support,

iii. Perceived supervisor support,

iv. Rewards and recognitions,
v. Procedural justice and distributive justice.
Excluding procedural and distributive justice, other elements have also been recognised by other studies as drivers of engagement. This study therefore, incorporate Saks’ (2006) framework of engagement drivers in measuring and predicting performance in the nursing profession of Nigeria.

**Research Design and Methodology**

For the purpose of this study, the causal research design is chosen. It shows the effect of one variable on another and it is used to determine the relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable(s). When there is a cause-and-effect relationship between variables the causal research is considered appropriate.

The population for the study comprised nurses in two public owned hospitals in Lagos State (Badagry and Igando General Hospital). The nurses’ population in Badagry general hospital is 84 nurses while the nurses in Igando general hospital are estimated to be 200 approximately based on supplied information from the admin office. Thus the populations of nurses in the two hospitals are two hundred and eighty-four (284). The purposive sampling technique was adopted for this study to select respondents that are ready to create time to respond to the questions in the research instrument.

The purposive sampling was adopted because it is easy to identify the respondents that the study focused on. The sample size of the study is one hundred and eighty (180) respondents. The research instrument used was a 21 items standardised scale adopted questionnaire developed by Saks (2006), which was administered and collected from respondents by the researcher and a research assistant. Data were collected from respondents within a period of three days of consistent visit to the two hospitals.

The research instrument had been earlier subjected to a reliability test, using the test-retest approach on 25 randomly selected respondents, the reliability coefficient obtained was 0.75 for the employee engagement and 0.70 for employee performance. Pearson Correlation Coefficient Analysis was adopted to test all the study hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

**Analysis of Administered Instrument**

This section contained the reports of the administered instruments in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF DISTRIBUTED INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>NUMBER OF VALID RETURNED INSTRUMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badagry General Hospital</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igando General Hospital</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above contain the staff spread from the hospital visited. From Badagry General Hospital there were 60 distributed instrument to sixty selected sample while the Igando General hospital had one hundred and twenty participant that the questionnaire were distributed to.
Test of Hypotheses
The hypotheses stated earlier are empirically tested using the responses from the research instrument-questionnaire.

**Hypothesis One:** There is no significant relationship between perceived supervisor support and job performance in nursing profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perceived Supervisor Support</th>
<th>Employees Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Supervisor Support</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.715**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Performance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.715**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Source: Field Survey, 2017

The analysis of Pearson product moment correlation from table 1 above shows that the Pearson Correlation is significant since its value (p = 0.000). The PPM value of .715** and significant (p = 0.000) suggest that there is statistical significant association between perceived supervisor support and job performance in nursing profession.

Since the P value of Pearson Correlation is less than the benchmark of 0.05, the stated hypothesis is rejected and concludes that there is high degree of association between perceived supervisor support and job performance in nursing profession.
Hypothesis Two: There is no significant relationship between perceived organization support and job performance in nursing profession.

Table 2: Summary of Pearson Product Correlation for perceived organization support and job performance in nursing profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employees Engagement</th>
<th>Perceived Organization Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>job performance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.822**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organization Support</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.822**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Source: Field Survey, 2017

From table 2, the coefficients of job performance and perceived organization support is .822** with significance value of 0.000(p<0.05). Since the P. Value (0.000) is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and concludes that job performance and perceived organization support has high degree of association. This by implication it suggest that there is strong relationship between job performance and perceived organization support in nursing profession.

Hypothesis Three
There is no significant relationship between reward and recognition and job performance in nursing profession.

Table 3: Summary of Pearson Product Correlation for reward and recognition and job performance in nursing profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employees Engagement</th>
<th>Reward and Recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>job performance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.813**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward and Recognition</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.813**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Source: Field Survey, (2017)
Analysis of PPM correlation in Table 3 shows the correlation coefficient of job performance and organization reward and recognition is .813** with significance value of 0.000. The p value which measures the significance of the variables suggest that, 81 percent of the changes in job performance is explained by changes in reward and recognition. Therefore, since the P. Value (0.000) is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and concludes that employees’ job performance and organization reward and recognition have strong correlation. This implies that any change in reward and recognition of employees is likely to affect job performance in nursing profession.

**Hypothesis Four**

There is no significant relationship between self-efficacy and job performance in nursing profession.

**Table 4: Summary of Pearson Product Correlation for self-efficacy and job performance in nursing profession.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employees Engagement</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>job performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.741**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.741**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

Source: Field Survey, (2017)

Analysis of the degree of relationship between job performance and in table 4 shows the coefficient of employees and self-efficacy as .741** with significance value of 0.000. The p value which measures the significance of the variables suggest that, 74 percent of the variation in job performance is explained the variation in employee’s self-efficacy.

In conclusion, Since the P. Value (0.000) is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and conclude job performance and self-efficacy of the employees are strongly correlated. This implies that there is strong relationship between job performance and self-efficacy of employees in nursing profession. This suggests that any changes in employees’ self-efficacy are likely to affects job performance in nursing profession. Conclusively therefore, each of the four hypotheses showed a positive correlation and significant relationship with employee engagement.
Discussions of Findings

Hypothesis 1: Perceived Supervisor Support (PSS)
According to the result from hypothesis 1, the $H_1$ is accepted as the Pearson Correlation is significant since its value ($p=0.000$). The PPM value of .715** and significant ($p=0.000$) suggest that there is a statistical significant association between perceived supervisor support and job performance in nursing profession. Hence, this shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between perceived supervisor support and job performance. This hypothesis is proved and supported by various previous researches and studies. According to Law, 2011, definition of supervisor support is the perceived social support valued by the employees from supervisors, involving emotional and instrumental support. One of the element of job resource which consistently proved in several researches that has being conducted with result that, social support from supervisor was positively related with work performance (Bakker & Demerouti; 2008).

Hypothesis 2: Perceived Organization Support (POS)
According to the result of the second hypothesis, the coefficients of job performance and perceived organization support is .822** with significance value of 0.000 ($p<0.05$). Hence, this shown that, there is a positive and significant relationship between perceived organization support and job performance. This result is supported by various previous studies. The exchange relationship between the employee and the organization is focused on perceived organization support (POS). In another instance, it can be said that, employer is committed to employee (Wayne, Shore, Bommer&Tetrick, 2002; Gyekye&Salminen, 2007).

Hypothesis 3: Reward and Recognition (RR)
In the result of hypothesis three (3) above the correlation coefficient of job performance and organization reward and recognition is .813** with significance value of 0.000. Hence, this shown that, there is a positive and significant relationship between reward and recognition and job performance. This hypothesis is proved and supported by various previous researches and studies. According to Bhattacharya and Mukherjee (2009); Salie and Schlechter, (2012), there are two categories of rewards namely intrinsic and extrinsic. Accomplishment or satisfaction which more towards an individual internal feeling are intrinsic rewards. While, rewards such as increase in pay, praise and promotion are extrinsically and more towards an individual external experience.

Hypothesis 4: Self-efficacy (SE)
According to result from the fourth hypothesis, it was recorded that the coefficient of employees and self-efficacy as .741** with significance value of 0.000. Hence, this shown that, there is a positive and significant relationship between self-efficacy and job performance. This hypothesis is strongly supported by several studies. Perceived self-efficacy always refers to the faith of an individual that, one’s abilities in performing and coordinating the courses of action needed to create given attainments as cited in Deese (2009).

Conclusion and Suggestions
The concept of Employee Engagement can be concluded has having a positive attitude by employees towards the organization and its values. It is rapidly gaining popularity and
importance in the workplace and impacts organisations in many ways. Organisation should thus recognize employees, more than any other variable, as powerful contributors to its competitive advantages. It has been observed that organisations’ with higher levels of employee engagement outperform their competitors in terms of performance and profitability. Therefore all organisations that desire competitive advantage should ensure that employee engagement is a continuous process of learning, improvement, measurement and action. The relationship between employee engagement and performance outcomes would be stronger if better measures are used.
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