

Effect of Engaged Workforce on Job Performance: Study of Federal Polytechnic, Oko

¹Ifegwu A. Nduka & ²Okeagu, Charlse

¹Department of Public Administration, Federal Polytechnic, Oko

²Department of Public Administration, Abia State Polytechnic, Aba

Article DOI: 10.48028/iiprds/ijargpgm.v2.i1.01

Abstract

Managers often think that payment of salary and incentive are all the workers needs to be motivated. However, beyond motivation which has been adjudged necessary for productivity, is the matter of worker's engagement. This paper titled effect of engaged workforce on job performance: study of federal polytechnic, Oko, focused on examining what engages a worker and the effect of the engaged workforce on job performance. The work is hinged on Herzberg's Two-Factor theory. The study employed qualitative and quantitative method. The finding shows that both the motivational factors and the "hygiene" factor needs to be in place to "engage" a worker. Secondly, once the workforce is engaged the management spends less both in human and material resources in supervision and control, while recording optimal performance from the employees. It therefore recommends that managers should invest to engage the workers and save energy in supervision and control and yet achieved organizational objective.

Keywords: *Engaged workforce, Job performance, Hygiene factors, Social exchange, and organizational citizenship*

Corresponding Author: **Ifegwu A. Nduka**

Background to the Study

The reality of the ever competitive and rapidly changing business world is that organizations need to ensure maximum utilization of their resources to their own advantage; a necessity for organizational survival. Many organizations spend many resources to acquire the much needed human resources and equally spend fortune to train and equip them, but the challenge is actually engaging them. It is estimated that the costs associated with recruiting and training a new employee average between half and one and a half times the annual salary for the post in question, depending on the approaches used (Branham 2005: 3). The concern is finding the most important ways in which HR managers seek to maximize the return on this investment that is by seeking to maximize levels of employee engagement and to minimize levels of voluntary staff turnover (Derek, Laura, Stephen and Carol, 2014). Studies have shown that organizations can create and sustain competitive position through management of non-substitutable, rare, valuable, and inimitable internal resources (Barney, 1991). Engagement is defined as “a combination of commitment to the organization and its values and wiliness to help out colleague (organizational citizenship). It goes beyond job satisfaction and is not simply job motivation. Engagement is something the employee has to offer; it cannot be 'require' as part of the employment contract (Daniels, 2010). However, engaged workforce is something that you know when you see it.

Derek et al (2014) observed that “There was a time when most people employed by organizations were required simply to provide manual labor. Relatively little skill, experience or intelligence was needed to do the jobs. The requisite training was cheap and speedy to provide, and payment methods unsophisticated. Finding people to do the work was rarely a problem and there were no restrictions of significance when it came to firing those who were not satisfactory or who displeased managers in some other way. This remains the situation in some industries and in some parts of the world, but in industrialized countries it is now increasingly rare. Instead we have a situation in which the majority of jobs require their holders to have mastered some form of specialized skill, or at the very least to possess attributes which others do not share to the same extent”. The demand for higher-level skills has grown particularly quickly, there being a need for many more people to fill professional and managerial jobs than was the case twenty years ago. Moreover, almost all informed commentators believe that these established trends will accelerate in the future (UKCES 2012, Derek T. et al, 2014)

That Human resources are critical for effective organizational functioning (Terpstra and Rozell, 1992, Onah, 2015) is not in doubt. Njoku (2005:1), Corroborated this fact “availability of resources is a vital need for the survival of human venture. These include human materials and financial resources, which are very useful in the production chain. Out of all these resources, the human component appears to be the most vital and critical”

Statement of Problem

All over the world and ages, employers and management have been concerned with increase in production and/or optimal performance of the workers. Industrial technology was the focal point of good organization as there was search for ways to obtain more efficiency, and prevent

waste. (Ugbo, 2015pg. 13). This search dates back to the day of the classical writers yet remains the effort of the contemporary. The challenges of most developing countries both in the political scene and industrial arena may not be how to evolve sound policies, but how to translate these sound policies into the prescribed values. These problems stem from many factors, chief among them is the non-involvement of the instrumentalities that should implement the policies in the process of making or formulating these policies.

Expectedly, any organization that intends to achieve or realize its organizational goal needs to pay attention to the instrumentalities involved in translating the policies of the organization into an achieved goal. The workers or employees of any organization are indeed one of the greatest assets of that organization, therefore any attempt to neglect them in the mainstream of industrial affairs, could result in the failure to realize the goal of the organization. (Ifegwu, 2014).

So much have been written on how to motivate the workers. However, beyond motivating the worker there is the need to engage them if the organizational would achieve its goal. The question becomes how can the workers be engaged? What is the effect of this engaged workers in the area of job performance? What do managers benefit when the workers are engaged? These questions will constitute the focal point of this inquiry.

Objective of the Study

The general objective of this paper is to critically evaluate the effect of engaged workforce on job performance. The specific objectives are:

1. To find out what engages a worker in in organization.
2. To discover the effect of an engaged worker in an organization
3. To probe what management benefit when the workers are engaged.

Research Questions

To enable us attend the foregoing objectives, the following question should be sought to be answered:

1. What engages a worker in organization?
2. What are the effects of an engaged worker in an organization?
3. What management benefit when the workers are engaged?

Theoretical Framework

A theoretical frame work naturally involves linking the problem under investigation to the assumption, postulations and principles of a theory (Obasi, 1999, Ifegwu, 2014). The work adopts Herzberg's two factor theory and the social exchange theory. Frederick Herzberg's two-factor theory also known as motivation-hygiene theory or motivation-maintenance theory. He interviewed two hundred engineers and accountants, to find out the factors that actually motivate the workers. They identified factors at work which relate to man's need as an animal, to survive and avoid pain. These factors include policy, supervision, interpersonal relation, working condition and salary. According to them these factors (which they termed maintenance or hygiene factors) will give dissatisfaction at work when absent but will not necessarily motivate workers when present. (Ugbo, 2015).

The second group of factors- the motivators or satisfiers- are those that relates to man as human being growing psychologically. Recognition, work itself, responsibility and opportunity are job satisfiers that motivate people at work. Satisfier relates to the nature of work itself, and the reward that follows directly the performance of that work. They also foster a sense of personal growth and fulfilment. (Ugbo, 2015).

Ugbo (2015), further aver that “Herzberg and his colleagues proposed that recognition that produces good feeling about job can come from peers, customers or subordinates and not necessarily from supervisors. For employee engagement, both the hygiene or maintenance factors and the satisfiers must be in place to create engaged workforce. Social exchange theory is a sociological and psychological theory that studies the social behavior in the interaction of two parties that implement a cost-benefit analysis to determine risk and benefit. (Roeckelein, 2018). Social exchange theory says that if the costs of the relationship are higher than the rewards, such as a lot of effort or money put into a relationship and not reciprocated, this could lead to problems. (Emerson and Cook, 1976).

Even though Homans took an individualistic approach, a major goal of his work was to explicate the micro-foundations of social structures and social exchange. By studying such forms of behavior he hoped to illuminate the informal sub-institutional bases of more complex social behavior, typically more formal and often institutionalized. According to Homans, social structures emerge from elementary forms of behavior. His vision of the underpinnings of social structure and institutional forms is linked to the actions of individuals, for example to their responses to rewarding and punishment circumstances (*Homans, 1961; Wikipedia, 2020*). Homans developed five key propositions that assist in structuring individuals' behaviors based on rewards and costs. This set of theoretical ideas represents the core of Homans's version of social exchange theory.

1. The first proposition: The Success Proposition states that behavior that creates positive outcomes is likely to be repeated.
2. The second proposition: The Stimulus Proposition believes that if an individual's behavior is rewarded in the past, the individual will continue the previous behavior.
3. The third proposition: The Value proposition believes that if the result of a behavioral action is considered valuable to the individual, it is more likely for that behavior to occur.
4. The fourth proposition: The Deprivation-satiation proposition believes that if an individual has received the same reward several times, the value of that reward will diminish.

The fifth proposition discusses when emotions occur due to different reward situations. Those who receive more than they expect or do not receive anticipated punishment will be happy and will behave approvingly (*Homans, 1961; Wikipedia, 2020*).

Literature Review and Empirical Studies Review

Concept of Engaged Workforce

Credit for inventing the term 'employee engagement' is often given to the American psychologist Kahn (1990), who conceived of its being made up of two distinct elements:

emotional engagement: a situation in which employees have strong emotional ties to their managers, feel their opinions count and feel that their managers have an interest in their development; cognitive engagement: a situation in which employees know what is expected of them, understand their purpose or mission, are given opportunities to excel and grow, and are given information about how to improve their progress.

The term engagement can be used in a specific job-related way to describe what takes place when people are interested in and positive, even excited about their jobs, exercise discretionary behavior and are motivated to achieve high levels of performance. Erickson (2005), described the job as the key antecedent of the state of engagement. Truss et al (2006), stated that: “simply put, engagement means feeling positive about your job. The engaged employee is the passionate employee, the employee who is totally immersed in his or her work, energetic, committed and completely dedicate”

Subsequent researchers have taken up these ideas and have carried out many significant studies, refining their definitions of the term along the way. It remains the case, however, that we lack any kind of clear, precise, concise and widely agreed definition. The term 'engage', namely the act of 'engaging' someone's interest in an idea, or 'engaging' gear when driving a car. The metaphor of engaging a car's gear is particularly useful in the context of 'employee engagement' because it implies the need to make a conscious choice in selecting the right gear for the right circumstances. It is also useful because drivers disengage gears as well as engaging them. Similarly, just as employees can become engaged, they can become disengaged just as easily. (Derek et al 2014)

Engagement is defined as “a combination of commitment to the organization and its values and wiliness to help out colleague (organizational citizenship). It goes beyond job satisfaction and is not simply job motivation. Engagement is something the employee has to offer; it cannot be 'require' as part of the employment contract (Daniels, 2010). However, engaged workforce is something that you know when you see it. (Macleod and Clarke 2009). On the basis of the Balain and Sparrow analysis, engagement can be defined as follows: Engagement happens when people are committed to their work and the organization and motivated to achieve high levels of performance. It has two interrelated aspect: 1) *job engagement*, which takes place when employee exercise discretionary effort because they find their jobs interesting, challenging and rewarding; and 2) *organizational engagement*, when they identify with the values and purpose of the organization and believed that it is a great place in which to work and continue to work. (Balain and Sparrow, 2009, Armstrong, 2012).

Employee Engagement and Commitment

The notion of commitment appears to be very similar if not identical to that of organizational engagement which is focuses on attachment to, or identification with, the organization as a whole. Some commentators have asserted that commitment is a distinct although closely linked entity. As cited by Buchanan (2004:19), the US Corporate Executive Board divides engagement into two aspects of commitment: (1) *rational commitment*, which occurs when a job serves employees' financial, developmental, or professional self-interest; and (2) *emotional*

commitment, which arises when workers value, enjoy and believe in what they do and has four times the power to affect performance as its more pragmatic counterpart. The Corporate Executive Board (2004: 1) indicated that engagement is 'the extent to which employees commit to someone or something in their organization, how hard they work, and how long they stay as a result of that commitment'. Wellins and Concelman (2005: 1) suggested that 'to be engaged is to be actively committed'. And Macey and Schneider (2008: 8-9) observed that "Organizational commitment is an important facet of the state of engagement when it is conceptualized as positive attachment to the larger organizational entity and measured as a willingness to exert energy in support of the organization, to feel pride as an organizational member, and to have personal identification with the organization.

Clearly, organizational engagement and commitment are closely associated, and commitment was included by the Institute for Employment Studies in its model as an element of engagement. (Armstrong, 2012). Robinson, Ferryman and Hayday (2004:7) suggested that the closest relationship of commitment to engagement was "affective commitment, i.e. the satisfaction people get from their jobs and their colleagues and their willingness to go beyond the call of duty for the sake of the organization". Hewitt Associates defined engagement in line with commitment as they defined it as the state of emotional and intellectual commitment to an organization or group producing behavior that will help fulfill an organization's promises to customers - and, in so doing, improve business results.

Welch and Welch (2006) also equate engagement with commitment. They opined that "engagement is the extent of employees' commitment, work effort, and desire to stay in an organization'. Dell Inc. explains engagement from the component of commitment. For them, employee engagement is composed of the rational and emotional commitment of the employee. They opined that to compete today, companies need to win over the MINDS (rational commitment) and the Hearts (emotional commitment) of employees in ways that lead to extraordinary effort. (Vance, 2006). Ramsay and Finney (2006) Engagement describes how an employee thinks and feels about, and acts toward his or her job, the work experience and the company." Corporate Leadership Council (2004) aver that "engagement is the extent to which employees commit to something or someone in their organization, how hard they work and how long they stay as a result of that commitment."

Development Dimensions International noted that "engagement is the extent to which people enjoy and believe in what they do, and feel valued for doing it" while The Gallup Organization sees Employee engagement as the involvement with and enthusiasm for work. (Vance, 2006). Towers Perrin "Engagement is the extent to which employees put discretionary effort into their work, beyond the required minimum to get the job done, in the form of extra time, brainpower or energy."

Institute for Employment Studies (2004) understand engagement as a positive attitude held by the employee toward the organization and its values. An engaged employee is aware of business context, and works with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization. The organization must work to develop and nurture engagement,

which requires a two-way relationship between employer and employee. Kenexa cited in Vance (2006), also opined that 'engagement is the extent to which employees are motivated to contribute to organizational success, and are willing to apply discretionary effort (extra time, brainpower and effort) to accomplishing tasks that are important to the achievement of organizational goals (Vance, 2006).

Employee commitment according to employeepedia (2017). Refers to as the attachment that an employee has on their organization due to their experiences. It can indicate the level of satisfaction, and engagement among employees". Mayer and Schoorman (1992), defined employee commitment as "A belief in and acceptance of organizational goals and values and a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization the desire to remain a member of the organization".

From the above definitions, it is obvious that engagement and commitment are closely related that they can be used interchangeably since an engaged employee is likely a committed employee. Some of the definition of employees' commitment by expert also shows that the two concepts are interwoven, as such clear cut separation can only be academically possible but remain not feasible in reality.

In summary, *employee engagement* entails:

1. They have an intense desire to be a part of the organization and they stay with that organization;
2. They advocate for the organization by referring potential employees and customers, are positive with co-workers and are constructive in their criticism;
3. They exert extra effort and engage in behaviors that contribute to business success.

While *employee commitment* entail;

1. High value and emotional attachment for the organization and being proud of it (affective).
2. Desire to remain a member of the organization. (Continuance).
3. Willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization. (Normative).

Elements of Workforce Engagement

Owing to lack of clear, precise, concise and widely accepted definition of the term 'employee engagement' arriving at the factors that makes for engagement or elements of workforce engagement is not an easy task. The difficulty is further made demanding since engagement goes beyond job satisfaction and is simply not job motivation. Therefore it must be the combination of sets of elements that gets the employees committed and dedicated to the organization and its values to the extent that the workers are ready to offer his or her best for the success and development of the organization, engage in organizational citizenship as well as willingness to remain with the organization for a long period of time. Derek T et al (2014) collaborated this fact thus: "Engaged staff do not demonstrate enthusiasm and effort because they are forced to, but because they want to. We are not therefore talking here about responses to efforts on the part of managers to intensify work, squeezing more for less out of a reluctant

workforce. Finally, it is abundantly clear that 'employee engagement' can only be usefully defined as a multi-dimensional concept that encompasses a variety of different elements. Indeed, it is quite likely that the antecedents of employee engagement vary from person to person, let alone workplace to workplace.”

Perhaps, the work of Balain and Sparrow (2009) in Armstrong (2012), will help us. They refer to it as “the antecedent of engagement. These include: 1. Enriched and challenging jobs (job characteristics) 2. Qualities of the employee-organization relationship (perceived organizational support) 3. Qualities of the employee-supervisor relationship. (Perceived supervisor support) 4. Rewards and recognition. 5. Fairness in the processes that allocate resources or resolve disputes (procedural justice). 6. What is considered just or right in the allocation of goods in a society (Distributive justice).

However, employee engagement does not depend solely on the organization. Some intrinsic and extrinsic trait or characteristics of the employee has a role to play. Based on this, we are going to look at the elements of employee's engagement from these two broad band Organizational and Personal.

Organizational

1. The provision of fair deal: this has to do with matching the capacities of individuals to the demand of the work they have to do. This will also involve the procedural justice (Balain and Sparrow (2009). The promotion processes is also considered here.
2. Work-life balance: to engage the worker actively, there is the need to balance between work and life. The organization should evolve policies for flexible working conditions that will eject the need of the individual worker life outside of his job.
3. The provision of opportunity for growth: the organization should maximize skill variety, enriching the task and making it significant enough to challenge the workers. Giving the workers some level of autonomy and discretion, at the same time providing control and feedback.
4. Leadership/qualities of management: organizational engagement can be developed through high-involvement management.... the underlying hypothesis is that employees will increase their involvement with the company if they are given the opportunity to manage and understand their work. (Lawler, 1986, Armstrong, 2012). It is worthy to note that employees join companies and leaves management (Armstrong, 2012). When workers are treated as partners and their interest respected, it fosters a synergy and has multiplication effect (Lawler, 1986, Armstrong, 2012).
5. Involvement with colleague: Dereket *al.*, (2014) refers to it as organizational citizenship. It involves encouraging the development of social tie within the organization. In the words of Capelli (2000; 108) “Loyalty to company may be disappearing but loyalty to colleague is not. Man as a social animal thrives in a amiable social milieu.
6. The way people are treated: the organization should ensure that policies for controlling bullying and harassment especially the vulnerable, are in place and applied.

Personal

1. Expertise/experienced: it's an age long adage the bad workman quarrels with his tools. This predisposes that employees that lacked expertise and the requisite experience will be hard to engage no matter what the organization put in place. This becomes a serious factor in the developing economies like Nigeria as a result of the tribalism, nepotism, corruption and other vices.
2. Religious background: the religious faithful that are passionate about their affinity with their God can proved to be deadly committed and enthusiastic about their job. Their commitment may not be determined by the organization.
3. Patriotism: often the employee may show loyalty and committed with their job basically because of their patriotism to their community or the society, their engagement is not a function of any organizational or even personal affiliation.

Job performance

Employee Performance is defined as the attained outcome of actions with the skills of employees who perform in some situation (Prasetya and Kato, 2011)

Review of Empirical Studies on Employee Engagement and Job Performance

Staff Turnover and Organizational Commitment Research conducted by the institute for employment studies led to the conclusion that an engaged employee:

- a. Is willing to go extra mile.
- b. Believes in and identified with the organization.
- c. Worked to make things better.
- d. Understand the business context and the 'bigger picture'.
- e. Respects and helps colleague. (Robinson et al, 2004, Armstrong, 2012).

In agreement, Derek et al (2014) opined that “There is also a sufficient degree of common ground between the various definitions to make the concept of 'employee engagement' useful from a practical management point of view. There is, for example, a shared understanding that 'engagement' represents a step beyond 'job satisfaction' and 'commitment' or even 'motivation'. Engaged employees have an emotional attachment to their work and/or their organizations which leads them to expend greater energy. There is thus a link to other widely used terms in HRM such as 'organizational citizenship', 'going the extra mile', 'working beyond contract' and 'discretionary effort”.

Guest (2009) in Armstrong (2012) explained that “the benefits of engagement were as follows: employee engagement will be manifested in positive attitude(for example job satisfaction, organizational commitment and identification with the organization) and behavior (low labor turn over and absence and high citizenship behavior)on the part of employees; an evidence of perception of trust, fairness and a positive exchange within a psychological contract where two-way promises and commitment are fulfilled”. Engaged employee perform better, are more innovative than others, are more likely to want to stay with their employers, enjoy greater levels of personal wellbeing and perceive their workload to be more sustainable than others. (Alfes et al, 2010:2; Armstrong, 2012; 172).

Researches in the past have examined a number of elements that can affect job performance. Jaramillo et al. (2005) and Al Ahmadi (2009) showed that a crucial element is employees' commitment to their job. The need for espousing the employees and their job performance is becoming ever stronger and many organizations and discourse about the importance of employee commitment. Studies have highlighted that Commitment has a great impact on the successful performance of an organization (Bandula *et al*, 2006). In fact, a vast number of studies have found positive relationships between organizational commitment and employee behaviors such as a greater effort exerted by the employee in performing tasks, better work attendance, increased willingness to engage in citizenship behavior and higher delivery of service qualities. Hence this shows an all-round higher employee performance is effective (Bandula et al, 2006).

Appelbaum *et al* (2000:183) noted that: 'The willingness to exert extra effort is the aspect of organizational commitment that has been shown to be most closely related to an employee's job performance' Nabukeera et al (2015) states that "employees' commitment has become a major determinant of the organizational performance in particular the performance of government institutions or program". Abelson (1976) in Banadula et al (2006) stated that "Higher level of employee commitment in the organization for individual projects or business is assumed as a major reason for better employee performance that leads to organizational success". Performance, according to Tahir et al. (2014), refers to the accomplishment of something or mere working effectiveness in an organization (Atoko et al 2018). The high levels of effort exerted by employees with high levels of organizational commitment would lead to higher levels of performance and effectiveness of both the individual and the organizational levels (Andrew, 2017). In the today's dynamic environment in which jobs are conducted and accomplished more than ever in teams and the environment flexibility finds great importance, organizations need employees who exhibit appropriate citizenship behaviors as well. (Howeyda et al, 2014).

Lambert, et al. 2008 examined facts of a positive correlation between organizational commitment and job performance. Chen, et al. (2006) who studied the relationship between organizational commitment, and job performance found that there was a positive relationship between organizational commitment and job performance. Their study suggested that companies needed to strengthen their employees' commitment towards organization in order to enhance organizational performance. Research by Caldwell et al. (1990) found that organizational commitment is associated with employee motivation. Evidence that reveal employee's engagement is observed by their actions, or extraordinary behavior within the organization, like their agreement to work after hours.

Other studies have established the link between organizational behavior and demonstrations of organizational citizenship behavior (Carson and Carson, 1998; Moorman et al., 1993; Morrison, 1994; Munene, 1995; Shore and Wayne, 1993; in Maria *et al*, 2015). Research by Feather and Rauter (2004) states that there is a positive correlation between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviours. Schappe (1998), argue that only organizational commitment is a predictor for the meaning of organizational behaviour actions. Increase in commitment level of employers in organization ultimately increases the performance of their employees (Bandula et al, 2006).

Committed employees develop a bond with an organization and that creates better organizational performance. If that emotional connection to their career, relationships with other employees and the organization are present, they perform better and serve the organization better (Demovsek, 2008 in Andrew 2007).

One way in which the demonstrations of organizational citizenship behaviour of employees may improve the efficiency of a company is through the release of various types of resources. Have more productive uses, such as when employees help each other with work-related problems. Allows the manager to spend more time on productive tasks, such as strategic planning, business processes improvement and ensure effective utilization of valuable resources, among others. Similarly, when employees engage in self-development activities, they improve their ability to do their job and this also can reduce the need for supervision. This conduct creates a natural consequence of helping behaviours encouraging and maintaining industrial peace that fosters team spirit, morale and cohesion. In all of the organizations, organizational commitment influences organizational performance positively. (Sayedali et al, 2016).

Methods

This study employed quantitative and qualitative approach research. Secondary and primary sources were engaged for data instruments. A structured questionnaire based on Armstrong prototype engagement survey, was used to collect information from respondents from a population of about 2,100. Yaro Yamane's formula was used in selecting the sample size

$$\begin{aligned} N &= \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2} \\ N &= \frac{2100}{1+2100(0.05)^2} \\ &= \frac{2100}{494} \\ &= 4.25 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the sample size is 494

Simple percentage was used to analyze the data collected for this study. This involves frequency tables and percentage.

Table 1: Showing engagement survey and analytical tool

S/N	Item	Strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly disagree (%)	Total (%)
1	I am very satisfied with the work I do	230(47)	108(22)	70(14.3)	82(16.7)	490(100)
2.	My job is interesting	307(62.7)	70(14.3)	62(12.7)	51(10.4)	490(100)
3.	I know exactly what I am expected to do	105(21.4)	154(31.4)	53(11)	178(36.3)	490(100)
4.	I am prepared to put myself out to do my work	270(55.1)	54(11)	63(12.9)	103(21)	490(100)
5.	I have plenty of freedom to decide how to do my work	104(21.2)	182(37.1)	102(20.8)	102(20.8)	490(100)
6.	I get lots of opportunities to use and develop my skills in this job.	210(42.9)	97(19.8)	87(17.8)	96(19.6)	490(100)
7	The facilities and equipment or tools provided are excellent	74(15.1)	70(14.3)	154(31.4)	192(39.2)	490(100)
8.	I get good support from my boss	142(29)	107(21.8)	112(22.9)	129(26.3)	490(100)
9.	My boss gives me helpful feedback on how well I am doing	167(34.1)	123(25.1)	97(19.8)	103(21)	490(100)
10.	I am rewarded well for my contribution	212(43.3)	96(19.6)	112(22.9)	70(14.3)	490(100)
11.	I think this organization is a great place in which to work	267(54.5)	145(29.6)	51(10.4)	27(5.5)	490(100)
12.	I would recommend this organization to people as a good employer	290(59.2)	165(33.7)	10(2)	25(5.1)	490(100)
13.	I believe I have a good future in this organization	301(61.4)	175(35.7)	8(1.6)	6(1.2)	490(100)
14.	I intend to go on working in this organization	171(34.9)	134(27.3)	87(17.8)	98(20)	490(100)
15	I am happy about the values of this organization- the ways in which it conduct its business	186(38)	162(33.1)	86(17.6)	56(11.4)	490(100)
16.	I believe that the product/services provided by this organization are excellent	176(36)	187(38.2)	76(15.5)	51(10.4)	490(100)
17.	The management of this organization is really concerned about the wellbeing of employees	123(25.1)	109(22.2)	113(23.1)	145(29.6)	490(100)
18	I have no problems in achieving a balance between my work and private life.	176(36)	173(35.3)	82(16.7)	59(12)	490(100)
19.	I like working for my boss	145(29.6)	134(27.3)	105(21.4)	106(21.6)	490(100)
20.	I get on well with my works colleague.	212(43.3)	153(31.2)	80(16.3)	45(9.2)	490(100)
	Total	3868(39.5)	2598(26.5)	1610(16.4)	1724(17.6)	9800(100)

Source: Field survey. (2020).

Using Armstrong prototype engagement survey, the research examines the level of engagement of the staff of the Federal Polytechnic, Oko.

Discussion of Findings

From the table above a set of twenty questions was administered to the staff of Federal Polytechnic Oko, the first ten questions are based on job engagement while the last ten is based on organizational engagement. The result shows that the staffs are engaged. Total of 3868 constituting 39.5% tick the column for strongly agree, 2598 (26.5%) agreed while 1610 that is 16.4% disagree and 1724 amounting to 17.6 strongly disagree. Therefore 6466(66%)

were in the agreed divide-engaged workforce, 3334(34 %) constitute those that shows sign of disengagement. The empirical vividly showed the relationship between workforce or employee engagement and job performance.

Summary

The staffs of the Polytechnic are engaged. Many of them are impressed with the organization and their job. However, there are lapses in the area of training, communication and feedback because good chunk of the workers do not know exactly what is expected of them. Then the working environment and tools are significantly deficient among other grey areas.

Conclusion

Most of the elements or drive of engagement are present in the institution. From the survey, it shows the leadership knows their onion, the job is made interesting and balanced, and there are opportunities for growth in the establishment, above all there is organizational citizenship in the institution. There is thus evidence of high performance as shown from the survey vis-à-vis the empirical study, the staff engages in organizational citizenship behavior, ready to go the extra mile, working beyond contract and bringing their discretionary effort to the workplace. The management spends less in supervision and control owing to the positive attitude of the workers

Suggestions

The management should mitigate the lapses in the area of training, communication and feedback because good chunk of the workers do not know exactly what is expected of them. Then the working environment and tools should be improving significantly. Management is advised to keep maintaining and sustaining the competitive position through management of non-substitutable, rare, valuable, and inimitable internal resources- the engaged staff. It follows that enhancing levels of engagement, must be a major aim of any professionally managed HRM function.

Reference

- Abelson, R. P. (1976). Script processing in attitude formation and decision-making. In J. S. Car-rol & J. W. Payne (Eds.), *Cognition and social behavior*, 33-45. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Alfes, K, Truss, C., Soane, E. C., Rees, C. & Gatenby, M. (2010). *Creating an engaged workforce*, London; CIPD.
- Andrew, A., (2017). Employee commitment and its impact on organizational performance, *Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting*. 5 (2) 1-13 AJEBA. 38396 ISSN; 2456-639X
- Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P., & Kalleberg, A. L. (2000). *Manufacturing advantage: Why high performance work systems pay off*, Ithaca, NY, ILR Press.
- Armstrong, M. (2012). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice*, London: Ashford Colors Press.
- Armstrong, M., Brown, D. & Reilly P. (2010). *Evidence-based reward management*, London: Kogan page.
- Atoko, S., Taylor, T. K., & Sichinsambwe, C. (2018). Empirical Analysis of the Relationship between Training and Development, Affective commitment, Relational Contract and Productivity in Organisations Based in Lusaka, Zambia. *Proceeding of the international conference on Human Resources and talent management (ICHR18 Geneva conference)* Geneva- Switzerland. July 9-11, 2018.
- Balain, S. & Sparrow, P. (2010). Understanding the value of engaged, In (eds) Sparrow, P, Hesketh, A., Hird, M and Cooper C. (2010) *Leading HR*, Basingstoke; Palgrave Macmillan.
- Balain, S. & Sparrow, P. (2019). *Engaged to Perform: A new perspective on employee engagement*, Lancaster: Lancaster University Management School.
- Bandula, P. M., & Jayatilake, V. K. (2016). Impact of employee commitment on job performance: Based on leasing company in Sri Lanka, *International Journal of Art and Commerce*, ISSN 1929-7106. www.ijac.org.uk.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage, *Journal of Management*, 17 (1) 99-120.
- Branham, L. (2005). *The seven hidden reasons employees leave*, New York: The American Management Association.

- Buchanan, L. (2004). The things they do for love, *Harvard Business Review*, December,
- Caldwell, D. F., Chatman, J. A., & O'Reilly C. A. (1990). Building organizational commitment: A multi-firm study, *Journal of Occupational psychology* (1990), 63,245-261.
- Cappelli, P. (2000). *A market-driven approach to retaining talent*, Harvard Business Review, January/February.
- Chen, J., Silverthorne, C., & Hung, J. (2006). Organizational communication, job stress, organizational commitment and job performance of accounting professionals in Taiwan and America, *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal* 27(4) 242-249.
- CIPD (2009). *Recruitment, retention and turnover: Annual survey report 2009*, London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Conference Board (2006). *Employee engagement: A review of current research and its implication*, New York: Conference Board.
- Corporate Executive Board (2004). *Driving performance and retention through employee engagement*, www.corporateleadershipcouncil.com/Images/CLC/PDF/CLC12KA DBP.pdf, accessed 13 September 2005.
- Daniels, K. (2010). *Employee engagement CIPD factsheet*. www.cipd.co.uk.
- Derek, T., Laura, H., Stephen, T. & Carol, A. (2014). *Human resources management: Pearson education limited*, Edinburgh: United Kingdom, Ninth edition.
- Erickson, T. J. (2005). *Testimony submitted before the US Senate committee on health, Education, Labour and Pension*. May 26,
- Guest, D. (2009). *Review of employee engagement: Note for a discussion*. (Unpublished). Prepared specifically for the Macleod and Clarke (2009). Review of Employee engagement.
- Homan, G. (1961). *Social behavior: it's Elementary Form*. New York: Harcourt brace Jovanovich.
- Howeyda, R., Schaul, S., & 'Arefnejad, M., (2014). The relationship between good morality and the work life quality with organizational citizenship behavior, *The Scientific-Research Journal of Cognitive and Behavioral Sciences*, 4(6)39-54.
- Ifegwu, A. N. (2015). *The impact of employee participation in decision making on organisational Performance in Abia state Polytechnic, Aba*. An (Unpublished) M.Sc. Dissertation. Imo state University, Owerri, Nigeria.

- Jaramilloa, F., Mulki, J. P., & Marshall, J. W. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational commitment and salesperson job performance: 25 years of research, *Journal of Business Research*, 58, 705-714.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work, *Academy of Management Journal*, 33 (4), pp 692-724.
- Kendra, C. (2020). *How social exchange theory is used: How it Influences Relationship*.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Griffin, M. L. (2008). Being the good soldier: Organizational citizenship behavior and commitment among correctional staff, *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*. 2008.
- Lawler, E. E. (1986). *High involvement management*, San Francisco: CA. Jossey-Bass
- Macleod, D. & Clarke, N. (2009). *Engaging for success: Enhancing performance through employee engagement*, London: Department for Business Innovation and Skills.
- Maria, Z., Ernesto, R., Eulalie, M., & Pablo, C. G. (2015). Relationship between Commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in a sample of private banking employees, *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 35, ISS pp 91-106.
- Mayer, R. C., & Schoorman, F. D. (1992). Predicting participation and production outcome through a two-dimensional model of organizational commitment, *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 671-684.
- Nabukeera, M., Ali, B. & Raja, N. B. (2015). Performance Evaluation of Public service institutions (CQS) framework, *World Journal of Social Science* 2 (1) 1-25 available: <http://wjss.sciedupress.com>
- Oluwabukunmi, F. (2019). *Strategy for mitigating employee's turnover in the Nigerian financial services industry* Walden dissertation and doctorate Studies. (Retrieved from; <https://scholarworks.walden.edu/dissertation/>)
- Onah, F. O. (2015). *Human resource management*, Enugu: University of Nigeria Press Limited. Bookshop/ Bank Building complex, UNN. 4th edition.
- Ramsay, C. S. & Finney, M. I. (2006). *Employee engagement at intuit*, Mountain View, CA: Intuit Inc.
- Robinson, D., Perryman, S. & Hayday, S. (2004). *The drivers of employee engagement*, Brighton: Institute for Employment Studies.
- Roeckelein, J. E. (2018). *Elsevier's dictionary of psychological theories*, Credo References Elsevier's B. V Retrieved 21st October, 2018.

- Sayedali, N., Bandar, L. A., & Khaleh, C. (2016). The relationship between organizational commitment, Components and organizational citizenship behaviour in nursing Staff, *International Journal of Medical Research and Health Sciences*, 5, 5 (s) 173-179.
- Tahir, N., Yousafzai, K. I., Jan, S., & Hashim, M., (2014). The impact of training and development on employees performance and productivity, A Case Study of United Bank Limited Peshawar City, KPK, Pakistan, *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4 4 ISSN: 2222 – 6990. pp. 86 – 98
- Truss, C., Swan, E., Edward, C., Wisdom, K., Croll, A. & Burnett, J. (2006). *Working Life: Employee attitude and engagement*, London; CIPD.
- Ugbo, I. E. (2015). *Administrative & management theory and practice*, Anambra: C.P. Globe Printers and Publishers.
- UKCES (2012). *Working futures 2010-2020: Evidence report 41*, Uk Commission for Employment and skills.
- Vance, R. J. (2006). Organizing for customer service, In L. Fogli (Ed.), *Customer service delivery: Research and best practices* (pp. 22 – 51). Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, Calif
- Welch, J., & Welch, S. (2006). *Ideas the Welch way: How healthy is your company?* Business Week, 126.
- Wellins, R., & Concelman, J. (2005). *Personal engagement: Driving growth at the see-level*, www.ddiworld.com/pdf/ddipersonalengagement.ar.pdf, accessed 29 April.