

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND EMPLOYEE JOB SATISFACTION IN THE UGANDA MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE, UGANDA: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY

ODUBUKER PICHO EPIPHANY, MAKERERE UNIVERSITY, UGANDA
Email: epipicho@gmail.com

BENON C. BASHEKA, UGANDA TECHNOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT UNIVERSITY
Corresponding Email: bbasheka@yahoo.co.uk
MARY BASAASA MUHENDA, UGANDA MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between employee engagement and employee job satisfaction in the Uganda Management Institute. A cross-sectional survey design was used with the target sample size being 118. Purposive, stratified and systematic sampling techniques were used to select respondents. Data analysis involved frequencies and percentages, Spearman rank correlation, coefficient of determination, regression, and ANOVA. There was a moderate positive relationship between employee engagement and employee job satisfaction. Employee engagement accounted for 21.3% of variance in employee job satisfaction; hence there is a relationship between employee engagement and engagement job satisfaction.

Key Words: Job Satisfaction, Employee Engagement, Productivity

INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is viewed as a positive emotional state resulting from the pleasure a worker derives from the job, a state where one's needs and outcomes match well, and is conceptualised in terms of satisfaction with work, involvement in work and commitment to work. Job satisfaction is a much studied phenomenon because many experts believe that it has some relationship with labour market behaviour and is likely to influence productivity, work effort and employees' decision to leave a job (Gazioglu & Tasel, 2002). Organisations have significant effects on the people who work for them as evidenced by how people feel about their work (Spector, 1997). Employees are expected to be happy in their work, which makes job satisfaction important to both employees and employers.

Unfortunately, many organisations have failed to include job satisfaction on their list of priorities (Gazioglu & Tasel, 2002), perhaps because they have failed to assess its actual impact or failed to measure it. Despite the emphasis on job satisfaction worldwide, one of the limitations in the literature is that it is not clear how employee engagement, as a Human Resource Practice affects employee job satisfaction. This article focuses on employee engagement and establishes its relationship with employee job satisfaction.

The ideas and innovations which had indirect or direct influence on people management date back to the 1780s. Chronologically, there has been development from Social Reformers in

the 1780s to Welfare or Caring from the 1840s to 1902, Employment Management from 1910 to 1920; Personnel Management from the 1920s to 1940s; Specialist Personnel Management from the 1940s to 1960s and Professional Personnel Management from the 1960s to 1980s. Finally, Human Resource Management (HRM) made its appearance in the late 1980s. There are two schools of thought regarding HRM. The first argues that it is a synonym for personnel management and is a mere 're-titling' of the personnel management function in organisations (Fowler, 1987; Blyton and Turnbull, 1992, Legge, 1995, Torrington and Hall, 2005).

This point of view has been expressed in a number of ways. For some writers, HRM is "traditional personnel administration dressed up" (Sisson, 1990; Hendry, 1995); and it is regarded as either "old wine in new bottles" or the "Emperor's new clothes" (Armstrong, 2007). For others, it is "personnel management re-christened" (Strauss, 1999); a "wolf in sheep's skin" and the "epitome of good personnel" (Keenoy, 1990); and denotes the "re-labeling" or "repackaging" of progressive personnel management (Torrington and Hall, 1989; Bratton and Gold, 1999).

This camp opines that the term 'human resource management' does not give new meaning to what has traditionally been called 'personnel management'; instead, it is used to accommodate or capture the prevailing mood and contemporary fashion (Redman and Wilkinson, 2001; Storey, 1992). This point is echoed by Bratton and Gold who posit that the vocabulary of management, like language as a whole, is not immune to fashion; with growing awareness among practitioners and management scholars of the need to use gender-neutral language, HRM has been adopted by some to avoid gender-biased phrases such as 'manpower planning' and 'manpower administration' (1999, p.14). In developing countries in Africa, the terms 'manpower management', 'manpower administration' and 'personnel' have been predominantly used in the public sector, particularly in the public service for a long time. Only in the recent past has the term 'HRM' been adopted to describe the employee management function.

According to Guest (1989), HRM does not offer anything new; it is simply "good personnel management described in a fashionable way". The supporters of this viewpoint contend that proactive and dynamic personnel practitioners have always applied the concepts that are embodied in HRM (Cumming, 1993; Torrington, *et al*, 2005). This suggests that HRM is more of an attitude of mind than a new approach (Armstrong, 2007). Moreover, supporters of this school of thought argue that HRM is used as a way of "re-conceptualizing and reorganizing personnel roles and describing the work of personnel departments" (Guest, 1987; Storey, 1992). Others claim that the HRM model remains an elusive concept and contains contradictions and paradoxes. Detractors view HRM as rhetoric adopted to disguise the consequences of deregulation and down-sizing: a mask for the less acceptable face of organisational culture. The concept neither offers a completely new management philosophical outlook, nor discards elements of previous approaches. It essentially builds on approaches noted above that preceded its evolution.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The term 'employee engagement' is a widely used, yet widely misunderstood term in the Human Resources field today. Yet, the relevance of this simple catchphrase to workplace managers is paramount to any organisation's success. Understanding employee engagement is key to employee retention, productivity, and profitability. Employee engagement is all about people; people who fulfill their workplace contract by fuelling an organisation's successful operations.

Employee engagement is derived from studies of morale or a group's willingness to accomplish organisational objectives which began in the 1920s. Morale was used by US Army researchers during World War II to predict unity of effort and attitudinal battle-readiness before combat. In the post-war mass production society that required unity of effort in execution, (group) morale scores were used as predictors of speed, quality and militancy. With the advent of the knowledge worker and emphasis on individual talent management (stars), a term was needed to describe an individual's emotional attachment to the organisation, fellow associates and the job; thus, the birth of the term 'employee engagement', which is an individual emotional phenomenon, whereas morale is a group emotional phenomenon with similar characteristics. In other words, employee engagement is the raw material of morale which, according to Scarlett Surveys (2001) is composed of 15 intrinsic and extrinsic attitudinal drivers.

Harter, Schmidt and Hayes (2002) define employee engagement as "the individual's involvement and satisfaction with as well as enthusiasm for work" (p. 269). Lucey, Bateman and Hines (2005:12) interpret the Gallup Engagement Index as measuring "how each individual employee connects with your company and how each individual employee connects with your customers". They call the opposite of engagement 'emotionally unemployed'. Development Dimensions International (DDI) (2005) provides the following definition of employee engagement: "The extent to which people value, enjoy and believe in what they do" (p1). The DDI also states that its measurement is similar to employee satisfaction and loyalty. Fleming, Coffman and Harter (2005) [Gallop Organization researchers] use the term 'committed employees' as a synonym for engaged employees, while Gallup's Human Sigma website (2005) likens employee engagement to the concept of customer engagement, which has the dimensions of confidence, integrity, pride and passion.

Wellins and Concelman (2004:1) call employee engagement "the illusive force that motivates employees to higher levels of performance". "This coveted energy" is similar to commitment to the organisation, job ownership and pride, more discretionary effort (time and energy), passion and excitement, and commitment to execution and the bottom line. They call it "an amalgam of commitment, loyalty, productivity and ownership". They also refer to it as "feelings or attitudes employees have toward their jobs and organizations" (Wellins and Concelman (2004:2).

Robinson, Perryman and Hayday (2004) define engagement as "a positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its values".

An engaged employee is aware of the business context, and works with colleagues to improve job performance for the benefit of the organisation. The many definitions scholars have generated relate well to one another in communicating similar ideas of what employee engagement is. However, Schmidt's (1997) definition of employee engagement as the extent to which employee commitment, both emotional and intellectual, exists relative to accomplishing the work, mission, and vision of the organisation, is adopted in this study. Thus, engagement can be seen as a heightened level of ownership where each employee wants to do whatever they can for the benefit of their internal and external customers, and for the success of the organisation as a whole.

In similar vein, there are numerous definitions of job satisfaction. Greenberg and Baron (1997) define job satisfaction as an individual's cognitive, affective, and evaluative reactions towards his or her job; while according to Cranny, Smith and Stone (1992), job satisfaction is a combination of cognitive and affective reactions to differential perceptions of what an employee wants to receive compared with what he or she actually receives. Job satisfaction would induce an employee to remain with an organisation. In the absence of job satisfaction the organisation faces the cost of recruitment caused by staff turnover. This is a good reason for organisations to focus on employee job satisfaction.

Suzuki (2006) believed that job satisfaction is a positive or negative attitude that an employee has toward his or her job or specific aspects of the job, and is the internal state of mind of an individual. Disch, Edwardson and Adwan (2004) pointed out that it is a feeling or affection held by a member of an organisational system; if the feeling is positive or the response is active, then the member is satisfied, and *vice versa*. Similarly, Melnyk (2006) proposed that job satisfaction is an employee's feeling about his or her work environment, which includes the job itself, their supervisor, work group, organisation, and life. Castle, Engberg and Anderson (2007) suggested that the level of job satisfaction depends on the difference between what a person actually gains from his or her job and what he or she expects.

Judge, Timothy and Joyce (2001) proposed that job satisfaction is the degree to which an employee likes or dislikes his or her job. Best and Thurston (2004) also pointed out that job satisfaction is an employee's feelings about his or her job and a general attitude derived from an evaluation of all aspects of a job. It is noted that the many definitions of job satisfaction are similar, with some having an edge over others. This study adopts Locke's (1976) definition that defines job satisfaction as the state where one's needs and one's outcomes match well. That is, job satisfaction is a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it to be offering.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The researcher used a descriptive cross-sectional survey design as the study intended to select only representative sample elements of the cross section of the population. The study was cross-sectional, as it was conducted across a range of participants over a short period of time. It did not require the researcher to conduct follow-up of the participants.

The survey method was also preferred because it allowed the researcher to obtain detailed information on the relationship between HRM practices and job satisfaction among the staff of the Uganda Management Institute (UMI). Quantitative and qualitative approaches were adopted. The former enhanced the understanding of the meaning of numbers, while the latter gave precise and testable expression to qualitative ideas.

The study population consisted of 175 employees, both administrative and academic staff. These are the key players in running the UMI, and they are therefore conversant with the affairs of the institute. The sample and sampling technique used are demonstrated in table 1 below:

Table 1: Parent Population, Sample Population, Sampling Techniques and the Data Collection Methods

Categories of Respondents	Stratified Categories	Sampling Technique	Method of Data Collection	Target Population	Sampled Population
Governing Council	Governing Council	Purposive sampling	Interviews	17	06
Administrative staff		Stratified sampling	Interviews	09	04
		Purposive sampling	Questionnaires	68	41
Academic Staff		Systematic sampling	Interviews	11	07
		Purposive stratified sampling	Questionnaires	35	31
Staff who have voluntarily left		Convenience sampling	Interviews	35	14
Total				175	118

Purposive and stratified sampling techniques were used to select the members of the governing council and the administrative staff. Purposive sampling was used for members of the governing council because they were few in number, and were the policymakers hence, they understood the policies. (Amin, 2005) recommends such knowledgeable people as good for interviews. Stratified sampling was used to select administrative staff representative of the institute's various departments.

The systematic sampling method was used to select the representative sample for both the academic and administrative staff; this helped to avoid bias during selection and allowed for comparative analysis. Two separate lists of administrative and academic staff were compiled and every n^{th} person on the list was selected from each list. To get the n^{th} for the academic staff, the total number of academic staff was divided by the sample size of academic staff, thus $a/b = c$. Therefore, every n^{th} academic staff on the list was selected (e.g. that is, the 4th, 8th, 12th and so forth) until a total representative sample for academic staff was realised. The same was done for administrative staff. The staff that had left the institute was conveniently sampled, since accessibility was uncertain.

Guided by the nature of the problem under investigation, the researcher used three types of data collection methods; questionnaires, interviews, and documentary analysis that allowed for methodological triangulation (Amin (2005)). Information was gathered by administering individual questionnaires to UMI staff and having these personally filled out as recommended by Amin (2005). Where required, the researcher offered necessary explanations with reference to the questions. It was more convenient and cost effective to collect information using the questionnaire survey. This was a suitable method for collecting data from a large sample. This method was impersonal and it avoided bias, which could develop as a result of interaction between the researcher and the respondent. It ensured some degree of anonymity of the respondents. They felt more free, to express their views through this method than they would have in personal interaction with the researcher. Less pressure was placed on the respondents for immediate responses, because they completed the questionnaires in their own time and at their own pace.

The strategic managers were interviewed to solicit information on the relationship between HRM practices and job satisfaction among the UMI staff. The interview provided a face-to-face interface between the researcher and UMI management, which involved the researcher talking and listening to UMI management. Interviews allowed for the collection of in-depth information on the topic and were useful as follow-ups to certain responses to the questionnaires; this served the purpose of triangulation (Amin, 2005).

For secondary data, the researcher sourced available relevant institute records and reports to collect information on HRM practices and job satisfaction. This helped to corroborate the findings from the questionnaires and interviews and showed how the variables relate. For purposes of triangulation, the researcher used three types of instruments, which were developed in accordance with the objectives of the study, conceptual framework and the literature reviewed. These included structured questionnaires, interview guides, and documentary analysis guides (Kothari, 2004).

Structured questionnaires containing closed-questions were preferred because of the number of subjects, cost and time constraints and the nature of the topic. Thus, data collected using this method were quantitative (Kothari, 2004). One set of questionnaires consisting of six sections was administered to both the academic and administrative staff. The interview guide was a tool, which consisted of open-ended questions as recommended by Amin (2005). The guide consisted of four sections: employee rewards, employee training and

development, employee engagement and leadership. A set of items was developed for each of the sections. A documentary analysis checklist was drawn up in order to guide the researcher on the documentary information required for the study. This checklist was used to request such documents from the UMI. Kothari (2004) notes that ‘Data are only useful if they are *valid* (i.e., measure what they are supposed to measure) and *reliable* (i.e., collected in the same way by different people and at different locations)’. To obtain valid and reliable data, the researcher had to determine that the two met statistical requirements.

Accuracy of information was assured by the use of relevant instruments. The questionnaires were adapted from previous studies and were subjected to the scrutiny of the researcher’s supervisors who are experts in this field of research; their recommendations were used to formulate the final instruments to solicit the expected relevant data. Strategic managers were interviewed to obtain crucial data. Questionnaires were administered to the administrative and academic staff; after having been designed, these were subjected to rating and the Content Validity Index (CVI) was computed using the following formula:

$$\text{CVI} = \frac{\text{No. of items rated as relevant}}{\text{All items in the questionnaire}}$$

Table 1: Validity

Raters	Relevant Items	Not Relevant Items	Total
Rater 1	35	14	49
Rater 2	37	12	49
Total	72	26	98

Thus, the CVI = $\frac{72}{98} = 0.735$

The CVI for the questionnaire for both the academic and support staff was 0.735. Amin (2005) recommended a validity measure of 0.7. Hence, the questionnaires were considered valid for data collection.

The questionnaires were piloted in three similar institutions to ensure reliability, namely the Uganda College of Commerce - Pakwach, National Teachers’ College - Muni and Nile Institute of Management Studies – Arua (NIMSA); this helped to ensure the consistency and dependability of the research instruments and their ability to tap data that answer the objectives of the study. Raw data from the instruments were subjected to a reliability factor analysis and reliability test from which a CVI was computed as recommended by Amin (2005); the findings are tabulated below.

Table 1: Reliability

Variables	No. Of items	Crombach Alpha
Employee Engagement	12	0.729
Job Satisfaction	3	0.759

Given that the Cronbach alphas were greater than .07, as recommended by Amin (2005), the items measuring the variables were considered dependable for the data collection. Spearman rank correlation was used to determine relationships between variables because the variables were accompanied with an ordinal scale. The coefficient of determination was used to determine the effect of employee engagement on employee job satisfaction. The regression analysis technique was used to determine the effect of the dimensions of employee engagement, as a HRM practice on employee job satisfaction. Content analysis was used to analyse qualitative data where all the qualitative data collected through interviews and documentary records were categorised, interpreted and analysed under their respective themes. These were used to corroborate and triangulate findings obtained through quantitative data analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Using a questionnaire, twelve (12) items about employee engagement were presented to respondents at the UML. They were requested to respond to the items using a five response scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 = Disagree (D), 3 = Neither Disagree not Agree (NDA), 4 = Agree (A) and 5 = Strongly Agree (SA). The findings are presented in Table 4. The analysis and interpretation of findings follow the table.

Table 4: Findings about employee engagement

Items about employee engagement	SD	D	NDA	A	SA	Total
1. I do feel like “a member of the family” at this organization	5 (7%)	7 (9%)	10 (14%)	39 (52%)	13 (18%)	74 (100%)
2. I do feel a strong sense of belonging to this organization	4 (5%)	6 (8%)	11 (15%)	35 (48%)	18 (24%)	74 (100%)
3. I do feel “emotionally attached to this organization	3 (4%)	4 (5%)	14 (19%)	38 (52%)	15 (20%)	74 (100%)
4. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit job at this organization without having another one	9 (12%)	18 (24%)	18 (24%)	21 (29%)	8 (11%)	74 (100%)
5. It would not be too costly for me to leave my job at this institute in the near future	8 (11%)	17 (23%)	20 (27%)	24 (32%)	5 (7%)	74 (100%)

2. I am proud to work for my organization	1 (1%)	4 (5%)	7 (9%)	41 (57%)	21 (28%)	74 (100%)
3. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization	6 (8%)	18 (24%)	20 (27%)	21 (29%)	9 (12%)	74 (100%)
4. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice; another place may not match the overall benefits I have here	8 (11%)	20 (27%)	15 (20%)	24 (33%)	7 (9%)	74 (100%)
5. The best way for me to advance my career is to stay with my current organization	7 (9%)	24 (32%)	12 (16%)	23 (32%)	8 (11%)	74 (100%)
6. I think I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this institute	1 (1%)	10 (14%)	15 (20%)	41 (56%)	7 (9%)	74 (100%)
7. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this Institute	7 (9%)	24 (33%)	20 (27%)	20 (27%)	3 (4%)	74 (100%)
8. I frequently think about quitting my job and leaving this organization	9 (12%)	20 (27%)	19 (26%)	19 (26%)	7 (9%)	74 (100%)

Source: *Primary data*

The findings show that most of UMI staff concurred with five of the items in Table 4 (that is items 1, 2, 3, 6 and 10). The percentage of UMI staff that did not agree with these items ranged from 6% to 16% while the percentage of staff that concurred was 70% to 85%; the percentage that neither disagreed nor agreed ranged from 9% to 20%. This suggests that most UMI staff felt like “a member of the family” at the organisation, has a strong sense of belonging to the organisation and were emotionally attached to the organisation. Furthermore, most UMI staff was proud to work for the institute. Despite these positive feeling and the pride felt in the UMI, most staff felt that they could easily become as attached to another organisation as they were to the institute.

The findings from the interviews were supportive of the questionnaire findings. Asked whether the UMI engages its employees, the Head of Department X at the UMI responded, “Majority are fully engaged. The highest engagement is in teaching, finance, audit and registry departments but general administration is normal. The administrative officers who work extra are also paid for extra time” (Interview with the Head of Department X at the UMI, 7th September 2012). UMI Top Management Q stated: “People are highly engaged. We operate as a business because without this, we would not survive” (Interview with UMI Top Management Q, 7th September 2012). On employee engagement, UMI Top Management

X had this to say: *The tempo is very high and the expected output is very demanding. We are a small institute. Everybody is expected to do more than his normal share. Because we are few, everybody shoulders more workload than it would be in other circumstances. But engagement is part of the institute's culture (Interview with UMI Top Management X, 5th September 2012).* However, when asked why some staff was not satisfied with the way the UMI engages its employees, a former UMI staff member responded thus, *"The Chief Executive has employed his relatives without interviews and displaced a number of staff. The chairman board recruited his son in an irregular manner"* (Interview with former UMI staff R, 6th August 2012). Questioned as to whether there was concrete evidence for this claim, a former UMI staff member said: *"UMI has very clear recruitment systems that take about 7 levels. Save for the last one year in which over 17 staff were given appointments without any interview"* (Interview with former UMI staff L, 10th September 2012).

Apart from the issue of nepotism, sectarianism and favouritism in recruitment, politics in engagement with employees contributed to dissatisfaction as shown in the following response: *"Yes, there are some few cases of dissatisfaction especially among the teaching staff. This is due to foul cases. Some who are supposed to teach are left out and Associates are engaged due to simplistic internal politics"* (Interview with UMI Top Management X, 5th September 2012)". In response to the concern that some staff feels excluded from engagement the Head of Department X at UMI said: *"Most likely the supervisors have found them not much helpful and decided to minimize their workload"* (Interview with a Head of Department X at UMI, 7th September 2012). While there can be no justification for a supervisor not engaging with a staff member on the pretext that the staff is not helpful, staff is significantly supported by the staff development plan and almost all respondents maintained that staff performance has improved as a result of training. Furthermore, several interviewees confirmed that the institute recruits competent people by means of its normal recruitment procedures.

The findings also show no significant differences among UMI staff that opposed, neither disagreed nor agreed or concurred with seven items in Table 4 (that is, items 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12). The percentage of staff that opposed the items ranged from 32% to 42%, 31% to 43% concurred with these items and 16% to 27% neither disagreed nor agreed. This suggests that some UMI staff were afraid of what might happen if they quit their job without securing alternative employment, felt it would be too costly for them to leave in the near future and would be very happy to spend the rest of their career with the UMI. One of the major reasons why some UMI staff continue to work for the organisation was that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice; another organisation might not match the overall benefits offered by the institute. Finally, some staff indicated that they frequently thought about quitting their job.

4.6.2 Testing the third hypothesis

Having presented the findings on employee engagement and job satisfaction, the next stage was to establish how employee engagement affected job satisfaction. This was achieved by computing the Spearman correlation coefficient and coefficient of determination. The findings are presented in Table 5 below, followed by an analysis and interpretation.

Table 5: Correlation between employee engagement and job satisfaction

	Job satisfaction
Employee engagement	$\rho = .461$ $\rho^2 = .213$ $p = .000$ $n = 74$

Source: Primary data

The finding in Table 5 reveals that there was a moderate correlation ($\rho = .461$) between employee engagement and job satisfaction. The sign of the correlation was positive. Since the correlation does not indicate the percentage variance in the dependent variable caused by the independent variable, a coefficient of determination ($\rho^2 = .213$), which is a square of the correlation coefficient was computed. The coefficient of determination was expressed as a percentage to determine the effect of employee engagement on job satisfaction. This revealed that employee engagement accounted for 21.3% of variation in job satisfaction. These findings were subjected to a test of significance, which showed that the significance of the correlation coefficient ($p = .000$) was less than the critical significance at 0.05. This implied there was a moderate positive relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction. The moderate nature of the relationship meant that a moderate change in employee engagement was related to a moderate change in job satisfaction. The positive nature of the relationship implied that the change in the two variables was in the same direction, whereby better employee engagement was related to more job satisfaction and vice versa.

A further correlation analysis was conducted, focusing on each of the dimensions of engagement (emotional attachment, involvement, commitment and life insurance) in relation to job satisfaction. The findings are presented in tables 6 to 9. Table 6 presents the findings on emotional attachment and job satisfaction.

Table 6: Correlation between emotional attachment and job satisfaction

	Job satisfaction
Emotional attachment	$\rho = .470$ $\rho^2 = .221$ $p = .000$ $n = 74$

Source: Primary data

The finding in Table 6 reveals that there was a moderate correlation ($\rho = .470$) between emotional attachment and job satisfaction. The sign of the correlation was positive. Since the correlation does not indicate the percentage variance in the dependent variable caused by the independent variable, a coefficient of determination ($\rho^2 = .221$), which is a square of the correlation coefficient was computed. The coefficient of determination was expressed as a percentage to determine the effect of emotional attachment on job satisfaction. This

revealed that emotional attachment accounted for 22.1% of variation in job satisfaction. These findings were subjected to a test of significance, which showed that the significance of the correlation coefficient ($p = .000$) was less than the critical significance at 0.05. This implied there was a moderate positive relationship between emotional attachment and job satisfaction. The moderate nature of the relationship meant that a moderate change in emotional attachment was related to a moderate change in job satisfaction. The positive nature of the relationship implied that the change in the two variables was in the same direction, whereby more emotional attachment was related to more job satisfaction and vice versa. Table 7 presents the findings on involvement and job satisfaction.

Table 7: Correlation between involvement and job satisfaction

	Job satisfaction
Involvement	$rho = .099$ $rho^2 = .001$ $p = .404$ $n = 74$

Source: Primary data

The finding in Table 7 reveals that there was a very weak correlation ($rho = .099$) between involvement and job satisfaction. The sign of the correlation was positive. Since the correlation does not indicate the percentage variance in the dependent variable caused by the independent variable, a coefficient of determination ($rho^2 = .001$), which is a square of the correlation coefficient was computed. The coefficient of determination was expressed as a percentage to determine the effect of involvement on job satisfaction. This revealed that involvement accounted for 1% of variation in job satisfaction. These findings were subjected to a test of significance, which showed that the significance of the correlation coefficient ($p = .404$) was greater than the critical significance at 0.05. This implied that involvement did not significantly influence job satisfaction. Table 8 presents the findings on commitment and job satisfaction.

Table 8: Correlation between commitment and job satisfaction

	Job satisfaction
Commitment	$rho = .425$ $rho^2 = .181$ $p = .000$ $n = 74$

Source: Primary data

The finding in Table 8 reveals that there was a moderate correlation ($rho = .470$) between commitment and job satisfaction. The sign of the correlation was positive. Since the correlation does not indicate the percentage variance in the dependent variable caused by the independent variable, a coefficient of determination ($rho^2 = .181$), which is a square of the correlation coefficient was computed. The coefficient of determination was expressed as a percentage to determine the effect of commitment on job satisfaction. This revealed

that commitment accounted for 18.1% of variation in job satisfaction. These findings were subjected to a test of significance, which showed that the significance of the correlation coefficient ($p = .000$) was less than the critical significance at 0.05. This implied there was a moderate positive relationship between commitment and job satisfaction. The moderate nature of the relationship meant that a moderate change in commitment was related to a moderate change in job satisfaction. The positive nature of the relationship implied that the change in the two variables was in the same direction, whereby more commitment was related to more job satisfaction and vice versa. Table 9 presents the findings on life insurance and job satisfaction.

Table 9: Correlation between life insurance and job satisfaction

	Job satisfaction
Life insurance	$\rho = -.125$
	$\rho^2 = .002$
	$p = .288$
	$n = 74$

Source: Primary data

The finding in Table 9 reveals that there was a very weak correlation ($\rho = -.125$) between life insurance and job satisfaction. The sign of the correlation was negative. Since the correlation does not indicate the percentage variance in the dependent variable caused by the independent variable, a coefficient of determination ($\rho^2 = .002$), which is a square of the correlation coefficient was computed. The coefficient of determination was expressed as a percentage to determine the effect of life insurance on job satisfaction. This revealed that life insurance accounted for 2% of variation in job satisfaction. These findings were subjected to a test of significance, which showed that the significance of the correlation coefficient ($p = .288$) was greater than the critical significance at 0.05. This implied that life insurance did not significantly influence job satisfaction.

The interviews shed more light on the effect of employee engagement on job satisfaction. For example, asked how employee engagement at the UMI had affected job satisfaction, a former UMI staff said: *“There is internal friction caused by recruitment based on nepotism”* (Interview with former UMI staff, 6th August 2012). UMI Top Management X responded that: *“Those who feel left out are dissatisfied. This is clearly seen”* (Interview with UMI Top Management X, 5th September 2012). Similarly, the Head of Department P, at UMI said, *“People who are engaged feel satisfied at their work”* (Interview with a Head of Department P, at UMI, 7th September 2012).

A further analysis was conducted using a regression to determine the effect of the dimensions of employee engagement (emotional attachment, involvement, commitment and life insurance) on job satisfaction. The findings are presented in Table 10, followed by an analysis and interpretation.

Table 10: Effect of dimensions of employee engagement on job satisfaction

Regression Statistics					
Multiple R	0.53				
R Square	0.28				
Adjusted R Square	0.24				
Standard Error	2.30				
Observations	74				
ANOVA					
	SS	df	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	142.8	4	35.7	6.8	0.000
Residual	363.5	69	5.3		
Total	506.3	73			
	Coefficients	t Stat	P-value		
Emotional attachment	0.3	2.9	0.008		
Involvement	0.0	0.1	0.680		
Commitment	0.3	2.4	0.017		
Life Insurance	-0.1	-1.0	0.305		

Source: Primary data

The findings in Table 10 show a moderate linear relationship (Multiple R = 0.53) between dimensions of employee engagement (emotional attachment, involvement, commitment, and life insurance) and job satisfaction. Going by the adjusted R Square, it is shown that dimensions of employee engagement (emotional attachment, involvement, commitment, and life insurance) account for 24% of variance in job satisfaction. These findings were subjected to an ANOVA test, which showed that the significance (Sig F = .000) of the Fishers ratio (F = 6.8) was less than the critical significance at .05. Hence, the findings were accepted.

The coefficients findings show that emotional attachment most significantly affected job satisfaction because it had least significant p-value ($p = 0.008$), which was less than the critical significance at 0.05. Commitment was the second most significant dimension to affect job satisfaction, given that it had second least significant p-value ($p = 0.017$), which was less than the critical significance at 0.05. However, involvement and life insurance did not significantly affect job satisfaction, given that they had significant p-value ($p = 0.680$ and $p = 0.305$, respectively), which were greater than the critical significance at 0.05.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Employee engagement at the UMI should be improved to enhance job satisfaction. This can be achieved by communicating clear goals and expectations to employees; sharing information; encouraging open communication; encouraging employees to find a personal fit with UMI culture; encouraging employees to trust one another as well as their leadership; creating a strong team environment; providing constant and immediate feedback on positives; supporting employees in their work and growth; collaborating and sharing in problem-solving; delegating activities to employees; and matching incentives with accountability and results.

References

- Amin M. E. 2005. *Social science research: Conception, methodology and analysis*. Kampala: Makerere University Printery.
- Armstrong, M. 1987. *A Handbook of Human Resource Management*, London: Kogan Page.
- Best, M. E. & Thurston, N. E. 2004. *Measuring nurse job satisfaction*. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 34:283-290.
- Blyton, P. & Turnbull, P. 1992. *HRM: debates, dilemmas and repositorium*. [sdum.uminho.pt/bitstream/ 1822/3379/15/bibliografia.pdf](http://repositorio.sdum.uminho.pt/bitstream/1822/3379/15/bibliografia.pdf).
- Bratton, J. and Gold, J. 1999. *Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice*, London: Macmillan.
- Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C. and Stone, E. F. 1992. *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. Lexington Books: New York.
- Cumming, M. W. 1993. *The Theory and Practice of Personnel Management*, New York: Heinemann.
- Disch, J., Edwardson, S., and Adwan, J. 2004. *Nursing faculty satisfaction with individual, institutional, and leadership factors*. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 20:323-332.
- Fowler, A. 1987. 'When Chief Executives Discover HRM', *Personnel Management*, January 3.
- Gallup Organization, 2005. *Employee Engagement: The Employee side of the Human Sigma Equation*.
- Greenberg, J. and Baron, R. A. 1997. *Behaviour in organizations: Understanding and managing the Human side of work*, 6th ed., Prentice-Hall, New Jersey.
- Guest, D. 1987. 'HRM and Industrial Relations' *Journal of Management Studies* 24:5: 503-21.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L. and Hayes, T. L. 2002. *Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279.

Hendry, C. 1995. *Human Resource Management: A Strategic Approach to Employment*, Boston: Butterworth Heinemann.

Judge, T. A, Timothy, A. and Joyce, E. B. 2001. Relationship of core self-evaluation, self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability – with Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86:80-92.

Keenoy, T. 1990. 'HRM: A case of the Wolf in Sheep's Clothing'. *Personnel Review*, 19:2.

Kothari, C. R. 2004. *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*, New Age International, London.

Legge, K. 1995. *Human resource management: Rhetorics and Realities*, London, Macmillan.

Locke, E. A. 1976. The nature and causes of job satisfaction in Dunnette, M. D. (ed.) *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Melnyk, B. M. 2006. The latest evidence on factors impacting nurse retention and job satisfaction. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*, 3:201-204.

Redman T. and Wilkinson, A. 2001. *Contemporary Human Resource Management*, London: Prentice Hall. reformulation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 51 (4), 330 – 339.

Robinson, D., Perryman, S. and Hayday, S. 2004. *The Drivers of Employee Engagement*. Institute for Employment Studies. Retrieved 2006-11-07.

Scarlett, K. 2001. Quality Employee Engagement Measurement Pages 108-122 as featured in "The New HR Analytics" by Dr. Jac Fitz-enz.

Schmidt, S. W. 2007. The Relationship Between Satisfaction with Workplace Training and Overall Job Satisfaction. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, vol. 18, no. 4.

Sisson, K. 1990, "Introducing human resource management journal", *Human Resource*.

Spector, 1997, *Organizations have significant effects on the people who work for them as evidenced by how people feel about their work*.

Storey, J. 1992. 'Human Resource Management in the Public Sector' in Salaman, G. (ed.), *Human Resource Strategies*, London: Sage.

Strauss, A. L. 1999. *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Suzuki, E., Itomine, I., Kanoya, Y., Katsuki, T., Horii, S., and Sato, C. 2006. Factors affecting rapid turnover of novice nurses in university hospitals. *Journal of Occupational Health*, 48:49-61.

Torrington, D. 1989. 'HRM and the Personnel Function' in Storey, J. (ed.) *New Perspectives in Human Resource Management*, London: Routledge.

Odubuker Picho Epiphany, Benon C. Basheka and Mary Basaasa Muhenda Jayeola

Torrington, D., Hall, L. and Taylor, S. 2005. *Human Resource Management*, Essex: Pearson Educational Ltd.

Wellins and Concelman. 2004 *Creating the culture for employee engagement workforce performance solution*. Retrieved: August 1 2005 from www.WPSmag.com.