INVIGORATING THE JOB ENGAGEMENT ATTRIBUTES IN THE MIDST OF COVID-19

Cresyl M. Canonigo, Francis Eric L. Demetria, Enrico Y. Gesta, Ronnie M. Lauron, Ben Bradpitt M. Lopez, Jaypee Lourdes T. Paypa, Sheila L. Teves, Ruselle C. Ruelan, Remegio Bergamo Jr.

Corresponding Author: Cresyl Canonigo email: cresylcanonigo@gmail.com

Abstract: Administrators have an array of responsibilities. From maintenance, to staff development, to producing quality graduates and to linking with stakeholders. This study assessed the extent of employee's engagement in their respective stations. The researchers used the descriptive research method to gather information about the respondents' relevant information, domain on employee's engagement and t-test for the significant difference, utilizing 0.05 level of significance. Results of the study showed that administrators have possessed the necessary attributes on how to be effective leaders. On the other hand, the employee's response on their level of employee's engagement puts a challenging role to administrators at present. Although the results suggest that employees were mostly satisfied on their management, data suggest that there is a need for the employs to continually develop themselves to fully provide quality service. By recognizing the impact of this results, it is very important to provide appropriate support to the employees especially in this new normal Moreover, the results of the study show that despite covid-19 pandemic employees and administrators were seen as one in attaining the aims and objective of their respective stations.

1. Introduction

Human capital is a vital asset for an organization to meet its goals. Human capital, together with employee effort and performance, determines business success (Handa & Gulati, 2014). Organizations are social systems, and placing workers first is an approach to improving employee engagement (Albrecht, Bakker, Gruman, Macey, & Saks, 2015). Organizational leaders should consider people before the needs of business to achieve success. Organizations need to understand the factors that influence employee motivation and behavior (Handa & Gulati, 2014). Organizations with satisfied, performance driven, and engaged employees may achieve better operational results and better retain the results than institutions that have disgruntled employees who lack involvement and enthusiasm (Grant & Marshak, 2011).

Employee engagement is quickly becoming one of the most important indicators in gauging work satisfaction (Wang et al., 2020). Employees today are looking for more than just a 9-to-5 job. They want to be involved in their work, enthusiastic about the organization they work for and committed to their fellow workers. Engaging employees is critical for retaining valuable talent and is an important piece of the employee satisfaction puzzle; as disengaged employees are more likely to leave their jobs. According to Forbes (2019), employees who are engaged in their work are more likely to be motivated and remain committed to their employer. Moreover, engagement has become increasingly recognized as a key research topic in the organizational sciences (Sonnentag, 2011). For example, engagement is positively related to productivity (Rich et al., 2010), organizational commitment (Chalofsky & Krishna, 2009), and organizational citizenship behaviors and negatively related to outcomes such as turnover intentions, and burnout (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Van Rhenen, 2009).

Moreover, employee engagement refers to a motivational state (Meyer & Gagné, 2008; Rich, LePine, & Crawford, 2010), characterized by exerting one's full self in a work role (Kahn, 1990). Seminal paper on engagement, researchers have treated employee engagement as both a trait-like and momentary construct, resulting in confusion over the stability of the construct. For example, conceptualizations range from supposition that engaged states have a highly dynamic temporal quality, to Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, and Bakker's (2002) treatment of engagement as a lasting affective state. Other researchers have proposed engagement as a process inferring trait-like and momentary qualities. For example, Macey and Schneider (2008) suggested that engagement is a process with behavioral, momentto-moment, and trait-like aspects.

Employee engagement is not a new term. However, participation has received significant attention in the past 20 years. The concept of employee engagement is rapidly gaining popularity and importance in the workplace (Welch, 2011). Defining the term is a challenge because human resource generalists, educational consultants, and researchers have developed various definitions. According to Schaufeli and Salanova (2014), an engaged employee is energetic, mentally resilient, dedicated to working, and enjoys the challenges at work. Handa and Gulati (2014) defined employee engagement as an employee's cognitive, emotional, and behavioral state directed towards desired organizational outcomes. Employee engagement can apply to workers, employees, leaders, and managers.

Some theories contribute to the construct of engagement such as 2 motivation theory, leadership theory, and social exchange theory. A model that shows how four key HRM practices focused on engagement influence organizational climate, job demands and job resources for psychological conditions related to engagement or disengagement at work that individual employee psychological and motivational factors will need to be implemented in the policies and procedures (Gruman & Saks, 2011). Kahn et al. (2010) described engagement, in people to express themselves cognitively, mentally, physically, and emotionally during task performance Further, engaged employees are so dedicated to their work that they find difficulty detaching them from their job (Handa & Gulati, 2014).

Schuck and Reio (2014) proposed to define employee engagement as an individual employee's cognitive, emotional, and behavioral state directed towards desired organizational outcomes. Vanpoucke and Vereecke (2010) believed that leaders' behavior influences organizational success. Leaders' communication behavior is a determining factor in the quality of information sharing, with a degree of feedback

from organization members. Employees equate the communication style of the leader with the leadership employed. Bakker, Albrecht, and Leiter (2011) suggested that effective communication is an important driver of employee engagement.

Employee engagement involves an array of methodologies, hypotheses, and propositions (Adler, 2012). Engagement is a wide-ranging concept embracing an assortment of approaches, definitions, and measures. Energetic employees are highly motivated and focused on organizational goals (Kataria et al., 2012). Engaged employees are energized and optimistic (Gruman, & Saks, 2011). Organizational research studies are beginning to report these positive indications of employee engagement in association with organizational citizenship behaviors (Kataria, et al., 2012). Kataria, Garg, and Rastogi (2012), defined organizational citizenship behavior as an approach of engaged employees towards work and organization. The engagement of a 23 motivated employee drives organizational citizenship behavior and creates a holistic framework for positive psychological, social, and organizational context of work. Motivation theories suggest the mental state of the employee that drives motivation for engagement social theories identify engagement as ethical behaviors driven by cognitive moral development (Glavas, 2012) while Kataria et al., (2012) indicated that psychological theories identify concepts of engagement in association with work creativity, safety climate, and resource availability. Employee engagement has captured the attention of corporate leaders because it can drive the bottom-line of an organization. Employee engagement has a long history because of the payoff it can add to an organization and the value it can add to the well-being of an employee Therefore, the goal of the current study is to address the issue of the stability of the construct of employee engagement.

2. Purpose of the Study

This research assesses the employee's engagement in the advent of pandemic. The extent of employee's engagement in terms of: Attitude, work/life balance, fairness, communication, respect for co-worker, respect for management and opportunities for growth and development were considered in the main problem. Challenges relating to employee's engagement in times of pandemic was also included.

3. Research Methodology

The descriptive method of research was used in this study, which described data and the characteristics of the population under study. This method answered the questions who, what, where, when, and how. In particular, the present conditions of the respondents as regards to the extent of employee's engagement and perceived issues and concerns by the employees. Data described and analyzed through data gathered using the research instrument and the respondents of the study were the employees and administrators. This questionnaire was adopted the study of Weston (2016) and Merrick (2018) on their study about employee engagement from the viewpoint of employees in academia and Employee Engagement: Understanding the Construct's Stability.

4. Results and Discussions

Table 1 shows the perception of employees and administrators' engagement in terms of attitude. Data shows that the statement refers to my job does not cause unreasonable amounts of stress in my life got the highest weighted mean of 2.63 which verbally described as well manifested, while the statement refers to the environment in this organization supports a balance between work and personal life got the lowest weighted mean of 2.12 which verbally described as manifested.

Table 1. Attitude

Indicators	Employees		Administrator	
	Mean	VD	Mean	VD
The environment in this organization supports a balance between work and personal life.	2.12	M	3.00	WM
Administrator understands the benefits of maintaining a balance between work and personal life.	2.14	M	2.80	WM
I am able to satisfy both my job and family/personal responsibilities.	2.51	WM	3.00	WM
The pace of the work in this organization enables me to do a good job.	2.41	WM	2.80	WM
The amount of work I am asked to do is reasonable.	2.31	WM	2.50	WM
My job does not cause unreasonable amounts of stress in my life.	2.63	WM	3.00	WM
Grand Mean	2.35	WM	2.85	WM

Administrators' response on the other hand, the three statement refers to My job does not cause unreasonable amounts of stress in my life, the environment in this organization supports a balance between work and personal life, and I am able to satisfy both my job and family/personal responsibilities got the highest weighted mean of 3.00 which verbally described as well manifested, while the statement refers to the amount of work I am asked to do is reasonable got the lowest weighted mean of 2.50 which verbally described as well manifested. This indicates that administrators show a positive relationship to the employees.

Table 2. Respect for Management

Indicators	Employees		Administrator	
	Mean	VD	Mean	VD
I respect the senior leaders of this organization.	3.00	WM	2.80	WM
Our senior management leads by example.	2.68	WM	2.50	WM
I respect my manager as a competent professional	3.00	WM	3.00	WM
The leaders of this organization know what they are doing.	2.54	WM	2.50	WM
Our senior managers demonstrate strong leadership skills.	2.61	WM	3.00	WM
I am very satisfied with my manager.	2.64	WM	2.50	WM
Grand Mean	2.75	WM	2.72	WM

Table 2 shows the perception of teachers and administrators' engagement in terms of respect for management. Data shows that the statements refer to, I respect the senior leaders of this organization and I respect my manager as a competent professional got the highest weighted mean of 3.00 which verbally described as well manifested, while the statement refers to the leaders of this organization know what they are doing got the lowest weighted mean of 2.54 which verbally described as well manifested. Administrators' response on the other hand, the statements refer to, I respect my manager as a competent professional and our senior managers demonstrate strong leadership skills got the highest weighted mean of 3.00 which verbally described as well manifested, while the statements refer to our senior management leads by example, the leaders of this organization know what they are doing, and I am very satisfied with my manager got the lowest weighted mean of 2.50 which verbally described as well manifested.

Table 3 shows the perception of teachers and administrators' engagement in terms of respect for co-worker. Data shows that the statements refer to this organization respects its employees got the highest weighted mean of 2.68 which verbally described as well

manifested, while the statement refers to administrator listens to what I'm saying got the lowest weighted mean of 2.08 which verbally described as well manifested.

Table 3. Respect for Co-worker

Indicators	Employees		Administrator	
	Mean	VD	Mean	VD
Administrator always treats me with respect.	2.63	WM	3.00	WM
Administrator listens to what I'm saying.	2.08	WM	3.00	WM
This organization respects its employees.	2.68	WM	3.00	WM
Administrator values my talents and the contribution I make.	2.42	WM	3.00	WM
Employee job satisfaction is a top priority of senior management.	2.54	WM	3.00	WM
My coworkers care about me as a person.	2.61	WM	3.00	WM
Grand Mean	2.49	WM	3.00	WM

This indicates that all levels of workers respect each other and administrators should listen to understand intentions of the employees and encourage them to offer their ideas, thoughts and concern in order to build a cohesive team. Administrators' response on the other hand, all statements related to respect for co- workers are in highest mean of 3.00 which verbally described as well manifested. This indicates that administrators respect, listens, values and prioritize the growth of everyone. This entails that respect of co-workers is important in management, improves the workplace morale and provide greater motivation to all workers to be productive.

Table 4. Communication

Indicators	Employees		Administrator	
	Mean	VD	Mean	VD
Information and knowledge are shared openly within this organization.	2.12	M	2.80	WM
Communication is encouraged in this organization.	2.16	M	2.50	WM
My manager does a good job of sharing information.	2.08	M	2.80	WM
Senior management communicates well with the rest of the organization.	2.22	M	2.50	WM
Senior management is held accountable for achieving results.	2.04	M	2.50	WM
Information and knowledge are shared openly	2.17	M	2.50	WM
Grand Mean	2.13	M	2.60	WM

Table 4 shows the perception of employees and administrators' engagement in terms of communication. Data shows that the statements refer to senior management communicates well with the rest of the organization got the highest weighted mean of 2.22 which verbally described as manifested, while the statement refers to senior management is held accountable for achieving results got the lowest weighted mean of 2.04 which verbally described as manifested. This indicates that senior managements approached to accountability leads the path for workers to follow and accomplish the goal and produce positive and measurable results. This entails that senior management should create communicative environment for everyone, listens well without exception and build common purpose that will allow to achieve the vision. Administrators' response on the other hand, the statements refer to, information and knowledge are shared openly within this organization and my manager does a good job of sharing information got the highest weighted mean of 2.80 which verbally described as well manifested, while the statements refer to communication is encouraged in this organization, senior management communicates well with the rest of the organization,

senior management is held accountable for achieving results, and information and knowledge are shared openly within this organization got the lowest weighted mean of 2.50 which verbally described as well manifested. This indicates that effective communication starts with the senior management and trickles down to every level of the workers which includes feedbacking, addressing problems, establishing personal action plans and even celebrating success.

Table 5. Fairness

Indicators	Employees		Administrator	
	Mean	VD	Mean	VD
Administrator treats all his/her employees fairly.	2.08	M	2.5	WM
The organization's policies for promotion and advancement are always fair.	2.02	M	2.8	WM
Favoritism is not an issue in raises or promotions.	2.17	M	2.5	WM
Administrator is always consistent when administering policies concerning employees.	2.22	M	2.5	WM
I am always treated fairly by my manager.	2.12	M	2.5	WM
Everybody is treated fairly in this organization.	2.14	M	2.5	WM
Grand Mean	2.13	M	2.55	WM

Table 5 shows the perception of employees and administrators' engagement in terms of fairness. Data shows that the statement refers to administrator is always consistent when administering policies concerning employees got the highest weighted mean of 2.22 which verbally described as manifested, while the statement refers to the organization's policies for promotion and advancement are always fair got the lowest weighted mean of 2.04 which verbally described as manifested. This indicates that fairness in advancement and promotion were core issues of some employees. This entails that the management should provide equal opportunity and support for professional development, promotion is handled fairly and transparency to the result. Administrators' response on the other hand, the statement refers to, The organization's policies for promotion and advancement are always fair got the highest weighted mean of 2.80 which verbally described as well manifested, while the statements refer to administrator treats all his/her employees fairly, favoritism is not an issue in raises or promotions, administrator is always consistent when administering policies concerning employees, I am always treated fairly by my manager, everybody is treated fairly in this organization got the lowest weighted mean of 2.50 which verbally described as well manifested. This indicates that administrators think that promotions are fairly awarded at their workplaces contradictory to what some employees believe that promotion is mishandled and unfair.

Table 6. Opportunities for Growth and Development

Opportunities for Growth and Development	Employees		Administrator	
	Mean	VD	Mean	VD
I have adequate opportunities for professional growth in this organization.	2.14	M	2.8	WM
I receive the training I need to do my job well.	2.08	M	2.8	WM
My manager is actively interested in my professional development and advancement.	2.20	M	2.5	WM
My manager encourages and supports my development.	2.12	M	2.5	WM
I am encouraged to learn from my mistakes.	2.42	M	2.5	WM
My work is challenging, stimulating, and rewarding.	2.24	M	2.8	WM
Grand Mean	2.20	M	2.65	WM

Table 6 shows the perception of employees and administrators' engagement in terms of opportunities for growth and development. Data shows that the statement refers to, I am encouraged to learn from my mistakes got the highest weighted mean of 2.42 which verbally described as manifested, and while the statement refers to, I receive the training I need to do my job well. This indicates that training and upskilling of employees to improve productivity. Administrators' response on the other hand, the statements refer to, I have adequate opportunities for professional growth in this organization, I receive the training I need to do my job well, and my work is challenging, stimulating, and rewarding got the highest weighted mean of 2.80 which verbally described as well manifested, while the statements refer to my manager is actively interested in my professional development and advancement, my manager encourages and supports my development, I am encouraged to learn from my mistakes got the lowest weighted mean of 2.50 which verbally described as well manifested. This indicates that administrators receive adequate opportunity to grow their knowledge and improve their skills compare to the employees. This entails that the management should be committed in providing top quality employees training and upskilling to increase efficiency and performance in their current roles.

Table 7. Test of significant Difference

Employees Engagement	Mean	P-value	Decision
Attitude	2.2 2.65	0.00030	Reject Ho Highly Significant
Respect for Management	2.125 2.55	00.00002	Reject Ho Highly Significant
Respect for Co-worker	2.131 2.6	0.00004	Reject Ho Highly Significant
Communication	2.49 2.55	0.595	Failed to Reject Ho
Fairness	2.745 2.72	0.832	Failed to Reject Ho
Opportunities for Growth and Development	2.35 2.85	0.0015	Reject Ho Highly Significant

Table 7 shows the significant difference between employees and administrators' perception on the domain of employee's engagement. Data shows that difference was seen on the aspect of attitude, respect for management and co-worker, and opportunities for growth and development. while no significant difference was seen on the aspects of communication and fairness. Thus, majority of the domain of employee's engagement in reject the null hypothesis. This indicates that there is significant difference on the perceptions of employees and administrators.

Conclusion

This study was conducted to determine the level of employee's engagement in their respective management. Based on the findings, the employee's response on their level of employee's engagement puts a challenging role to administrators at present. Although the results suggest that employees were mostly satisfied on their management, data suggest that there is a need for the employs to continually develop themselves to fully provide quality service. By recognizing the impact of this results, it is very important to provide appropriate support to the employees especially in this new

normal Moreover, the results of the study show that despite covid-19 pandemic employees were still able to attain trainings and seminars.

References

Albrecht, S. L., Bakker, A. B., Gruman, J. A., Macey, W. H., & Saks, A. M. (2015). Employee engagement, human resource management practices and competitive advantage: An integrated approach. Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance, 2(1), 7-35.

Adler, S. (2012). Review of work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research. Personnel Psychology, 65, 204–207. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01242_2.x

Bakker, A. B., Albrecht, C. Leiter B.. (2011). Towards a model of work engagement. Career Development International, 13(3), 209-223.

Levinson, H. (1965). Reciprocation: The relationship between man and organization. Administrative science quarterly, 9, 370-390. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391032

Welch, M. (2011). The evolution of the employee engagement concept: Communication implications. Corporate Communications, 16, 328–346. doi:10.1108/13563281111186968

Schaufeli, W. B., & Salanova, M. A. R. I. S. A. (2014). Burnout, boredom and engagement at the workplace. People at work: An introduction to contemporary work psychology, 293-320.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. Career Development International, 13(3), 209-223.Journal

Bledow, R. Schmitt, A., Frese, M., & Kühnel, J. (2011). The affective shift model of work engagement. The Journal of Applied Psychology, 96, 1246–1257. doi:10.1037/a0024532

Chalofsky, N., & Krishna, V. (2009). Meaningfulness, commitment and engagement: The intersection of a deeper level of intrinsic motivation. Advances in Developing Human Resources, 11, 189-205. doi: 10.1177/1523422309333147

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. Journal of applied psychology, 71(3), 500-507. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500

Handa, M., & Gulati, A. (2014). Employee engagement: does individual personality matter. Journal of Management Research, 14(1), 57.

Grant, D. & Marshak, R. J. (2011). Toward a discourse-centered understanding of organizational change. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 47, 204–235. doi: 10.1177/0021886310397612

Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. Human Resource Management Review, 21, 123–136. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.09.004

Kataria, A., Garg, P., & Rastogi, R. (2012). Employee engagement and organizational effectiveness: The role of organizational citizenship behavior. International Journal of Business Insights & Transformation, 6, 102–113.

Khan, K. U., Farooq, S. U., & Ullah, M. I. (2010). The relationship between rewards and employee motivation in commercial banks of Pakistan. Research Journal of International Studies, 14, 37-52.

Meyer, J. P., & Gagné, M. (2008). Employee engagement from a self-determination theory perspective. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1, 60-62. doi: 10.1111/j.1754- 9434.2007.00010.x

Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationship. Academy of management journal, 43(4), 738-748. https://doi.org/10.2307/1556364

Saks, A. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Journal of managerial psychology, 21(7), 600-619. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169

Schaufeli, W. B. & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25, 293-315. doi: 10.1002/job.248

Shuck, B., & Reio, T. G. (2014). Employee engagement and well-being a moderation model and implications for practice. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 21(1), 43-58.

Sonnentag, S. (2011). Commentary: Research on work engagement is alive and well. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 20(1), 29-38. doi: 10.1080//1359432X.2010.510639

Vanpoucke, E., & Vereecke, A. (2010). The predictive value of behavioral characteristics on the success of strategic alliances. International Journal of Production Research, 48, 6715–6738. doi:10.1080/00207540903307623

Wang, C., Xu, J., Zhang, T. C., & Li, Q. M. (2020). Effects of professional identity on turnover intention in China's hotel employees: The mediating role of employee engagement and job satisfaction. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, *45*, 10-22.