



How Supervisor, Workplace Support, and Training affects Employee Engagement in the Cement Industry

Original Article

Muhammad Shahid Khan

MPhil Management Scholar
Department of Management Sciences
Qurtuba University, Dera Ismail Khan, Pakistan
Email: kmuhammadshahid89@gmail.com

Dr. Muhammad Imran

Associate Professor, Department of Management
Sciences Qurtuba University DIKhan, Pakistan.
Email: muhammadimran@qurtuba.edu.pk

Muhammad Taous

Lecturer, Department of Management Sciences
Qurtuba University DIKhan, Pakistan.
Email: taous@qurtuba.edu.pk

Citation

Khan, M.S., Imran, M., & Taous, M. (2023).
How supervisor, workplace support, and training
affects employee engagement in cement
industry. *Open Access Organization and
Management Review*, 1(2): 1-9.

WEBSITE: www.mdPIP.com

PUBLISHER: MDPIP

ABSTRACT:

One of the most important aspects that can have a significant effect on an organization's efficiency is the level of employee engagement. Management uses a number of incentives to inspire and reward employees, increasing the likelihood that they will work hard but happily toward the advancement of the organization and the realization of its stated objectives. The study's objective was to analyze the reasons that influence satisfaction of the employees in the Lucky Cement Plant, where 200 hundred employees were surveyed. Data was analyzed through SPSS version 20. Frequency tables, percentages, and bar charts were used for descriptive analyses, while inferential statistics was used to determine predictors and employee engagement. All three independent factors (supervisor support, peer support, and training) were found to have a statistically significant relationship with the dependent variable (employee engagement). All demographic characteristics and independent variables, excluding stress, are positively associated with high levels of employee engagement.

Keywords: Employee Engagement, Supervisor Support, Coworker Support, Training and Stress.





Introduction

Getting employees invested in the company's mission is currently a critical step for most businesses. In the current economic climate, where many businesses are struggling to survive, an engaged crew is a company's sole chance at gaining a competitive edge in the market. A recent survey of 447 human resource considered recruitment being the most challenging issue in 2018 followed by retention 36%, planning and succession 26%, and an employee engagement 44% (Muller-Heyndyk, 2019). The financial costs associated with disengaged workers make employee engagement a pressing concern for businesses today. Employees who aren't invested in their work could act in a robotic or lethargic manner, resulting in poor output that could hurt the company's growth prospects (Allam, 2017). Low employee engagement can have negative effects on performance, productivity, and customer service (Mone, Eisinger, Guggenheim, Price, & Stine, 2011). Yet, as the pace of modernization increases, organizations are looking for employees who can quickly adjust to new circumstances (Othman, Kamal, Alias, *etc.*, 2018). The problems in the today's organizations workplace are pressing hard the managers to investigate the issue of employee engagement as a tools to maximize the employee outcomes and to aggressively compete globally by materializing the organizational objectives (Al Mehrzi & Singh, 2016). The company has a hard time keeping its workers inspired since it challenges them spiritually and intellectually in addition to physically (Bakker & Albrecht, 2018). When a manager helps an employee out, the worker is able to focus on their work and, in turn, the company benefits (Alias, Othman, Koe, & Ridzuan, 2017). This exemplifies the significance of giving attention to the intellectual and emotional stimulation of staff.

Studies on motivation got influence from the work of Eldor & Vigoda-gadot (2016). Likewise, employee engagement got popularity since two decades, and used a standard tool now in corporate and human resources (Khodakarami, Dirani, & Rezaei, 2018). Predictive of employee engagement has been proven to be a number of characteristics, including communication, work-life balance, training, and career advancement (Bedarkar & Pandita, 2014). Many previous studies have confirmed the importance of factors including leadership style, salary, and business culture in shaping employees' levels of commitment to their organizations (Karthikeyan, Devi, & Mirudhubashini, 2013). Surveys on employee engagement reveal a global decrease in engagement levels while inverse increase could be observed regarding disengagement, Attridge (2009); Bailey, Madden, Alfes, & Fletcher (2017) investigated that how an increased engagement could affect the profitability and competitiveness of an organization. (Saks, 2017) reported that it is a serious problem with employee engagement in USA because 34percent employees are "involved" and 13percent are "actively disengaged". According to Harter (2017), five-thirds employees are considered "not engaged". Further research shows that Malaysia is still one of the least employee-involved countries in the region, falling behind even low-involvement neighbors like Indonesia and the Philippines despite a slight increase of four percentage points to 63% this year (Oehler & Adair, 2018).

When workers are invested in the company's success, the company is better able to realize its vision, implement its strategy, and achieve significant financial gains (Noordin, 2023; Hayat, Imran, & Taous, 2023; Saadat, Shah, Tauqeer, Ullah, & Fatima, 2023). Employee engagement can be boosted through a variety of human resources (HR) practices (Vance, 2006). Businesses that invest in their employees, use strategic people management, and maintain open lines of timely, accurate, and honest communication with their workforce will not only thrive in the future, but also weather the current market volatility (Robison, 2009). Involvement from workers is a key factor in the success of an organization in terms of reaching its goals, carrying out its strategy, and reaping substantial financial gains. Job design, recruitment, selection, compensation, training, and performance management are just some of the human resources techniques that have been shown to promote employee engagement (Vance, 2006). Encourage employee participation, practice strategic management, and maintain open, honest lines of communication with your workers if you want your future business success (Robison, 2009). The study was conducted to determine how a supervisor, workplace support, and training affects employee engagement inter alia to learn about the influence of an employee involvement on stress. To achieve the study objectives following research questions were developed:



1. Does an employee engagement is influenced by the supervisor support?
2. Does an employee engagement depends on the co-workers support?
3. Does stress affects an employee's motivation level?
4. Does trainings have an effect on the employee engagement?

Literature Review

Employee Engagement

Many different interpretations of what it means for employees to be "engaged" in their workplace have been proposed. For instance, MacLeod (2011) lists more than 50 definitions. According to Macey and Schneider (2008), employee engagement can be observed in both outward and inward manifestations, and it necessitates a deep emotional investment in one's work. Employee engagement has been found to be a significant predictor of organizational performance by a number of studies (Macey, Schneider, *et al.*, 2009). The Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) distinguishes between three distinct forms of employee engagement: emotional, cognitive, and physical (2006). (Demonstrating a willingness to make sacrifices for the benefit of the group). The information now available reveals that employee involvement greatly affects a company's performance and competitiveness (Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010). This is a rare scientific hypothesis that has received serious consideration from established researchers. The concept of employee engagement has garnered a lot of interest due to the many benefits it may provide to businesses (Macey *et al.*, 2009; Saks & Gruman, 2014). Employee engagement has always received high honors from academics, who see it as crucial to business success, employee productivity, and smooth HR and financial operations. Studies claim that it has a major impact on employees' attitudes and behaviors while on the job, as well as on a company's bottom line, its ability to attract and retain top talent, its ability to produce a profit for its shareholders, and its rate of growth (Bates, 2004; Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002).

Supervisor's Support

Throughout the workday, workers frequently talk to each other and also with their management on a wide array of issues. When a supervisor is able to inspire and encourage their subordinates through effective performance review and feedback, the entire workplace benefits (Huynh, Do, & Truong, 2019). MacLeod and Clarke (2011) argue that supervisor's support is imperative for promoting employee engagement to clarify the goals and to recognize the efforts of employees and accomplishments *inter alia* deals them as special individuals by providing them a productive work conditions free of work barriers to feel physically and emotionally supported in carrying out their duties. Hakanen *et al.* (2006) in: Armstrong & Taylor, 2014) reported that leadership could accelerate the pace of engagement when they allow them to choose their own work. Employee engagement may be boosted by encouraging employees to take the initiative, providing feedback on their performance, and involving them in strategic decision-making (Elicker, Levy, & Hall, 2006; Potoski & Callery, 2018). Likewise, according to Seijts and Crim (2006, the behavior and supports from the supervisor have positive effect since employees invest more in the organization. Thus leaders provide clear goal explanations and manage their employees in best way to succeed (Yukl *et al.*, 2009). Employees who want greater freedom at work may find their jobs more satisfying if their supervisors adopt more positive attitudes (Malik, 2013). Effective communication between supervisors and employees may have an effect on engagement, as found by Lockwood (2007), and a leader who explains ideas to subordinates favorably may increase engagement. According to Robbins and Judge (2012), a leader's principal function is to help their followers achieve their own objectives while simultaneously contributing to organizational success.



Co-Worker Support

The term "coworker support" refers to the emotional and practical help received from one's fellow employees while on the job. According to Langford, Bowsher, Maloney, and Lillis (1997), there are four methods to offer social support: emotionally (via compassion, empathy, and trust), instrumentally (by providing tangible goods or services), informatively (by providing useful information that aids in problem resolution), and appreciatively. Because of non-availability of a well-defined social support, most of studies recommended creation of own social support measurement mechanism (Thoits, 1982). Further, an access to the relevant professional resource is necessary for ensuring a healthy self-perceptions besides enhancing the level of motivation through resource conservation (Demerouti *et al.*, 2001). The social support thus could provide an additional source of extrinsic motivation that can help people succeed in their careers. In a cross-sectional study, Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) revealed that the engagement traits of vigor and devotion were positively correlated with social support from coworkers. In their cross-sectional analysis, they found that white-collar workers were more likely to receive support from their coworkers than physical workers. Montgomery, Peeters, Schaufeli, and Van Ouden (2003) revealed a positive association between the engagements constructs of vigor and devotion and social support from coworkers. Bakker, Demerouti, and Schaufeli found that women who have strong social support networks at work are more likely to be enthusiastic and committed to their jobs (engagement). They conclude that women may gain more from some resources than men. Simpson discovered an association between interacting with nurses and feeling invested in one's work (2008). If your coworkers don't boost your spirits, you might as well stay home. A number of studies have been done on the topic of social support in the workplace, with an emphasis on supervisor support in particular.

Stress

Around a quarter of a person's life will be spent working. They spend more time talking to their coworkers than they do with their family members on a daily basis (Mughal & Malik, 2023; Imran, Ali, & Taous, 2023). Collateral harm to physical and mental health at work can occur in a society that sets a premium on profits, production, and efficiency, especially in high-stress industries (Jeyaranjan, 2017). An employee is stressed when they undergo "physiological and/or psychological reactions to an experience that is seen as harmful or unpleasant," as defined by psychologist and author Robert (2009: 247). The interpersonal conflicts, scheduling pressures, workplace worries, besides absence of expertise are some of the potential sources of workplace stress. He argues that males and females experience and respond to stress in various ways based on the specifics of the given scenario. Job stresses can have an impact on productivity, as suggested by the research of Spector and Jex (1998, p. 278). Because of them, people are unable to "transfer effort and ability" into meaningful results. Yet, a 2002 study by Fay and Sonnentag found that stressors can occasionally improve performance. Although many studies of employee engagement focus on encouraging loyalty and a sense of belonging in the workplace, Robertson and Cooper (2010) contend that this is often at the expense of the employees' mental health. Srivastava argues that the dynamics of huge organizations are not uniformly negative or positive (2009, p. 51). Worker stress may rise as a result of the added pressure to perform well and accomplish objectives. According to Butcher, Hooley, and Mineka (2015), one possible source of stress is feeling stuck in a meaningless role at work. The current state of the economy also plays a role in the high levels of employee stress (Moura *et al.*, 2014). Modrek and Cullen (2013) researched the emotional toll of layoffs in many companies hit hard by the recession. Surveys conducted in 2006 and again between 2008 and 2012 found that employees who had been laid off during the crisis indicated higher levels of stress than the number from 2006. Stress levels were reported to be higher than they were in similar workplaces where there were fewer layoffs.

Training

According to Kirke (2012), businesses that want to succeed and expand need to hire people who have the right set of skills and knowledge. In today's rapidly evolving business environment, training and development initiatives have assumed more significance in ensuring continued employee interest and productivity. Having well-thought-out



strategies for training and developing talent can boost employee enthusiasm. According to Khan et al. (2016), an employee's performance is affected by their level of job satisfaction as well as their access to opportunities for professional growth and development. They were interested in learning if and how training and development improved employee productivity and happiness on the job. We studied data from 105 Pakistani telecom workers. The findings showed that investment in employee training and development increases both productivity and satisfaction on the job.

Hypotheses of the Study

- H₁: Supervisor's support significantly influences staff engagement.
- H₂: Employee engagement is significantly influenced by coworker's support.
- H₃: The level of employee engagement is significantly influenced by the workplace stress.
- H₄: Training significantly predicts an employee engagement.

Method

The research setting for data collection was Lucky Cement Plant with 2100 employees. The study employed simple random sampling (Sekaran, 2013). Some experts recommend at a sample size of 30 as reasonable, but other suggest it 500 (Field, 2013). These suggestions will be taken under consideration when a sample of 230 workers is selected for this study's questionnaire survey distribution. After collecting data using a revised survey instrument from an earlier study, the data was analyzed through SPSS. Some of the methods include correlation and regression (Pearson's correlation, 1880).

Results and Findings

Table 1

Correlation Analysis

	EE	SS	CS	S	T
EE	1	.781**	.719**	-.415**	.770**
SS	.781**	1	.714**	-.472**	.731**
CS	.719**	.714**	1	-.386**	.571**
S	-.415**	-.472**	-.386**	1	-
T	.770**	.731**	.571**	-.399**	1

** The 0.01 level of significance for correlation (2-tailed).

When a correlation is significant, it is 0.05. (2-tailed). n=230

The above table and the Pearson's correlation matrix for five interval scale variables display the results. Positive and statistically significant correlations between the predictors (workplace community, stress, education, and management support) and the outcome (productivity) (employee engagement). An extremely high degree of significance (one hundred percent) exists between employee engagement and employee engagement ($r=1$) (0.00 p-value). Employee involvement is positively correlated with factors such as coworker support, training, and management endorsement. Yet, we do recognize that stress is the sole independent variable that has a negative association with employee engagement, as seen in the table above.

Employee involvement served as the dependent variable, while supervisor support served as the independent variable, in the aforementioned multiple regression table (employee engagement). According to the R Square value, the independent factors accounted for 1.611, or 65.2%, of the total variance in the dependent variable.

Table 2

Regression Analysis

Effect	R ²	F	P-value	Beta	P-value
H ₁	.609	310.352	.000 ^b	.781	.000
H ₂	.516	212.104	.000 ^b	.719	.000
H ₃	.172	174.524	.000	.414	.000
H ₄	.593	288.907	.000	.770	.000

- Dependent Variable: EE
- Predictors: (Constant)

To check the impact of Supervisor's support on the employee engagement, regression analysis was run, supervisor support explained 60.9% variance on employee engagement with goodness of fit value F 310.352, p-value .001. This means that one percent change in supervisor support could bring 78.1 % increase or decrease in employee engagement, thus hypothesis H₁ is substantiated. Likewise, effect of coworker's support on employee engagement is also found significant with R² 51.6%, F value 212.104, P-value > 0.01 with Beta value .719, p > 0.01. Similarly, it could be seen in the above table that workplace stress also significantly influence employee engagement with R² 17.2%, F 174.524, p > 0.01, Beta 0.414 p > 0.01. While the study found that training has significant effect on employee engagement with R² 59.3%, F 288.907, P > 0.01, Beta .770, P. 0.01, all lead us to the conclusion that H₂, H₃, and H₄ are also substantiated

Conclusion

According to study, there is a substantial association between the dependent variable, employee engagement, which is reliant on human performance and output, and the independent factors (supervisor support, colleague support, training, and stress). It is common knowledge that motivation raises all forms of employee engagement. Regression analysis and correlation were used as statistical approaches to study the factors affecting employee engagement. The results of the study showed that managers can use external factors to increase worker productivity (supervisor support, colleague support, training, and stress). This survey suggests that corporations and workers alike should make employee engagement a top priority. The current study found a statistically significant correlation between the factors studied, prompting the recommendation that companies prioritize this area in their efforts to innovate and gain a competitive edge. Employee morale can be boosted, potentially leading to higher performance and, in turn, greater firm-wide productivity, if employers provide proper supervisor assistance, peer support, and training management. In this study, we looked at employee engagement in the manufacturing sector, and we found that demographic parameters specific to factory workers had an impact on engagement levels. Employee engagement is significantly influenced by demographic factors including age, education level, and years of experience in the workplace. Research shows that workers at the Lucky Cement Plant in Lucky Marwat, KPK, Pakistan, need to feel appreciated in order to produce their best work.

Significance and Contributions

One of the most important factors in any successful business is a dedicated and enthusiastic workforce. As a result, employees are happier, work harder, and generate more revenue. Without it, a business risks having a personnel that is uninspired and uncommitted to their work. The findings of this study have important implications for the analytical and empirical studies of business strategy conducted by a wide range of organizations at the corporate and divisional levels. Human resources managers can benefit from this research by learning more about the elements that affect employees' motivation to work hard for the company. Employers have always rewarded employee loyalty with promises of lifetime employment, but with the advent of fierce global competition, companies have begun to rewrite the terms of that contract. It's crucial since it will give organizations insight into the results of implementing excellent work life policies and practices. The importance of incentives, prizes, and recognition will also be determined in this research. In addition to exploring the impact of career dedication on employee satisfaction and organizational success, this research will also examine the role that work-life balance plays in both. The study's authors also believe that it



will help the company's upper management understand the importance of employee engagement and use that knowledge to foster an environment that motivates workers to give their all. It is believed that the results of this research will help organizations sustain and increase their already high levels of employee engagement and productivity. It is hoped that this information can be used as a springboard for further study of this topic. Finally, this research will add to the scant literature on the topic of putting into practice the elements that are positively associated to employee engagement. Practitioners and academics alike can benefit from a deeper understanding of what they are trying to anticipate and measure thanks to the findings of this study.

Future Research Directions

Although this research contributes significantly to our understanding of the topic, it is limited by its focus on a single site and industry (the Lucky Cement Factory) due to a few serious flaws (Lucky Marwat). Second, the researcher acknowledged in Chapter 1 that future researchers may want to take a few other factors into account because of the limitations of the study. Second, a future researcher could use a larger or smaller sample to generalize these findings to a new industry. Finally, additional aspects, such as compensation, teamwork, firm management, and learning, might contribute to a more complete knowledge of what drives employee engagement than what is considered in the current study.

References

- Al-dalameh, M., Masa'deh, R., Abu Khalaf, R. K., & Obeidat, B. Y. (2018). The effect of employee engagement on organizational performance via the mediating role of job satisfaction: The Case of IT employees in Jordanian Banking Sector. *Modern Applied Science*, 12(6): 17.
- Allam, Z. (2017). Employee disengagement : A fatal consequence to organization and its ameliorative measures. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 7(2): 49-52.
- Amhalhal, A., Anchor, J., & Dastgir, S. (2016). *The effectiveness of the use of multiple performance measures: The influence of organizational contingencies*. EURAM 15th Annual Conference, 17- 20th June 2015, Warsaw Poland, (September).
- Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2014). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice*. London, UK: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Attridge, M. (2009). Measuring and managing employee work engagement: A review of the research and business literature. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15555240903188398>
- Azoury, A., Daou, L., & Sleiaty, F. (2013). Employee engagement in family and non- family firms. *International Strategic Management Review*, 1(1-2): 11-29.
- Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., & Fletcher, L. (2017). The meaning, antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19(1): 31-53.
- Bakker, A. B., & Albrecht, S. (2018). Work engagement: current trends. *Career Development International*, 23(1): 4-11.
- Bedarkar, M., & Pandita, D. (2014). A study on the drivers of employee engagement impacting employee performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.174>
- Blizzard, R. (2003). Employee engagement: Where do hospitals begin?' *The Gallup Poll Tuesday Briefing*, November, 2, p.91.
- Calvin, O. Y. (2017). The Impact of Remuneration on Employees' Performance : A Study of Abdul Gusau Polytechnic, Talata-Mafara and State College of Education Maru, Zamfara State. Nigerian Chapter. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*. <https://doi.org/10.12816/0037554>
- Chandani, A. Mehta, M., Mall, A., & Khokhar, V. (2016). Employee engagement and training: A correlational study. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology* 9(15).
- Chandani, A., Mehta, M., Mall, A., & Khokhar, V. (2016). Employee engagement: A review paper on factors affecting employee engagement. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 9(15). <https://doi.org/10.17485/ijst/2016/v9i15/92145>
- Cufaude, J. (2004) in: Lanphear, S. (2004). Are your employees highly engaged?' *Credit Union Executive Newsletter*, 19: 1-2. Credit Union National Association, US.





- Dari, A. T., Jabeen, F., & Papastathopoulos, A. (2018). Examining the role of leadership inspiration, rewards and its relationship with contribution to knowledge sharing Evidence from the UAE. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 30(6): 488-512.
- Gibbons, J. M. (2006). *Employee engagement: A review of current research and its implications*. New York, NY: The Conference Board.
- Gupta, M., Ganguli, S., & Ponnampalani, A. (2015). Employee engagement and leadership. *Qualitative Report*, 20(4): 498-515
- Hallberg, U., & Schaufeli, W. (2006). Same but different? *European Psychologist*, 11(2): 119-127. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.11.2.119>.
- Hayat, A., Imran, M., & Taous, M. (2023). Mediating effects of CSR on the relationship between ethical leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. *Open Access Organization and Management Review*, 1(1): 16-24.
- Hoque, A. S. M. M., Awang, Z. Bin, Siddiqui, B. A., & Sabiu, M. S. (2018). Role of employee engagement on compensation system and employee performance relationship among telecommunication service providers in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 8(3): 19.
- Imran, M., Ali, L., & Taous, M. (2023) Factors effecting employees absenteeism at workplace: Moderating Effect of Supervisor Support.. *Open Access Organization and Management Review*, 1(1): 54-66.
- Kahn, W. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4): 692-724.
- Kahn, W. A. (1992). To be fully there: Psychological presence at work. *Human Relations*, 45(4): 321-349.
- Linh Giang Thi Nguyen, Huyen Thi. (2020). PHAM. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(8): 495-507.
- Lloyd, J. (2004). Offer empowerment to encourage engagement. *Triangle Business Journal*, 15(1).
- Lockwood, R. (2007). Leveraging employee engagement for competitive advantage: HR's strategic role. *HR Magazine*, 52(3): 1-11.
- MacDonald, M. (2002). How companies can find renewed focus during uncertain times. *Journal of Communication Management*, 6(3): 220-227.
- Macey, W., & Schneider, B. (2008). The Meaning of Employee Engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1): 3-30.
- Macey, W., Schneider, B., Barbera, K., & Young, S. (2011). *Employee Engagement*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- MacLeod, D., & Clarke, N. (2011). *Engaging for success: enhancing performance through employee engagement*. A Report to Government. London, UK: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. <http://www.bis.gov.uk/files/file52215.pdf>
- Malik, H. (2013). Relationship between leader behaviors and employees' job satisfaction: a path-goal approach. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 7(1): 209-222.
- Markos, S., & Sridevi, M. S. (2010). Employee Engagement: The Key to Improving Performance. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12).
- May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77: 11-37
- Mehrzi, A. N., & Singh, S. K. (2016). Competing through employee engagement: a proposed framework. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 65(6): 831-843.
- Mughal, Y.H., & Malik, S.Y. (2023). Does commitment moderate relationship between green human resource management practices and employee performance. *Open Access Organization and Management Review*, 1(1): 33-53.
- Noordin, Z.B. (2023). Investigating conflict management styles of leadership in secondary schools through structural theory of conflict. *Open Access Organization and Management Review*, 1(1): 1-15.
- Othman, R. B., Rapi, R. B. M., Alias, N. E. B., Jahya, A. B., & Loon, K. W. (2019). Factors Affecting Employee Engagement: A Study among Employees in the Malaysian Construction Industry. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(7): 784-797.





- Perrin, T. (2003). *Working today: Understanding what drives employee engagement the 2003 Towers Perrin Talent Report U.S Report*. Retrieved October 30, 2008, from http://www.towersperrin.com/tp/getwebcachedoc?Webc=HRS/USA/2003/200309/Talent_2003.pdf
- Popli, S., & Rizvi, I. A. (2016). Drivers of employee engagement: The role of leadership style. *Global Business Review*, 17(4): 965–979.
- Rashid, A. M. A., Othman, M. N. A., Othman, M. Z., & Abdullah, N. F. (2016). *The influence of compensation on job performance among employees in Malaysia*. In International Conference on Business Management and Social Science.
- Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). The drivers of employee engagement. Brighton, UK: Institute for Employment Studies, Report 408. *Advanced Science Letters*, 23(8): 7857-7860.
- Saadat, U.R., Shah, M.I., Tauqeer, A.M., Ullah, A., & Fatima, M. (2023). Exploring the impact of microfinance on socio-economic characteristics of borrowers in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *Open Access Organization and Management Review*, 1(1): 25-32.
- Seijts, G., & Crim, D. (2006). What engages employees the most, or the ten Cs of employee engagement. *Ivey Business Journal*, 70(4): 1-5.
- Soltis, B. (2004) in Lanphear, S. (2004). Are your employees highly engaged?' *Credit Union Executive Newsletter*, 19: Pp. 1-2
- Yuan, C. K., & Lee, C. Y. (2011). Exploration of a construct model linking leadership types, organization culture, employees performance and leadership performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 25: 123-136.
- Yukl, G., O'Donnell, M., & Taber, T. (2009). Influence of leader behaviors on the leader-member exchange relationship. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(4): 289-299.

Submit your manuscript to MDPIP Open Access journal and benefit from:

- Convenient online submission
- Rigorous peer review
- Open access: articles freely available online
- High visibility within the field
- Retaining the copyright to your article

Submit your next manuscript at ➤ mdpip.com

