THE MEASUREMENT OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT IN GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS

N Martins*, O Ledimo*

*Department of Industrial and Organisational Psychology, University of South Africa

Abstract

Employee engagement has consistently been rated as one of the top issues on chief executive officers' lists of priorities and is a main focus of attention of both academics and human resources practitioners. A number of studies focus on employee engagement in the private sector, however there are relatively fewer studies that focus on employee engagement in government institutions. The aim of this study was twofold: Firstly, the validity and reliability of the employee engagement instrument for government institutions were determined. Secondly, it was determined if any significant differences could be detected between the employee engagement levels of the various biographical groups that participated in the survey. A quantitative research study was conducted using a database of a research company. The database in question is made up of 285 000 business people from various industries and sizes of business and who occupy different roles, reflecting the profile of the South African working population. A total of 4 099 employees, of which 427 represented government institutions, completed the employee engagement questionnaire. The results confirmed the validity and reliability of the questionnaire for government institutions, but with a slightly different structure. Some biographical groupings indicated that they experience employee engagement in a significantly different way. The results indicate that the younger employees together with top and senior management experience the highest levels of engagement in government institutions. The significance of these results is that not all biographical groups' engagement levels can be managed equally.

Keywords: Employee Engagement Assessment, Government Institutions, Millennials, Job Grades, Reliability, Validity

1. INTRODUCTION

Numerous research articles are frequently published on employee engagement, work engagement and engagement (Barnes & Collier, 2013; Gruman & Saks, 2011; Saks 2006; Schaufeli & Salavanova, 2008; van Rooy, Whitman Hart Caleo, 2011) . These authors and researchers highlight the importance and value of an engaged workforce. Researchers (Attridge, 2009; Barnes & Collier, 2013; Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002; Truss, Shantz, Soane, Alfes & Delbridge, 2013) attribute a number of positive outcomes to an engaged workforce. These outcomes include improved productivity, job satisfaction, work wellbeing, low absenteeism, strong and authentic values, mutual respect, improved or successful performance, talent management, growth and stakeholder return, more satisfied and loyal customers, better quality products or services and greater growth potential. Researchers moreover indicate that an engaged workforce ultimately affects bottom-line results (Maclead & Clarke, 2009; Nelson & Cooper, 2012; Werner, 2014). It is thus important that organisations should continuously aspire to improve the engagement levels of their employees.

A number of definitions are used in the literature, depending on the research scope and the constructs measured to define engagement. The definitions focus on constructs such as a set of positive attitudes and behaviours that enable high job performance of a kind that is in tune with an organisation's mission (Storey, Wright & Ulrich, 2008), and the creation of opportunities for employees to connect with their colleagues, managers and the wider organisation, creating an environment in which employees are motivated to connect with their work and to really care about doing a good job, (Gatenby, Rees, Soane & Truss,2009). The three authors added " It is a concept that places flexibility, change and continuous improvement at the heart of what it means to be an employee and an employer in a twenty-first century workplace" Viljoen (2015) from an African context positions engagement as the output of human energy in the system to perform - the system results is the interplay between individual potential, the group potential and the organisational potential within the context of a specific industry or a national culture. Imandin, Bisschoff and Botha (2014:521) came to the following conclusion after investing a number of employee engagement definitions: "Drawing on the various definitions of employee engagement discussed above, it is apparent that an important thread runs through all the definitions described above, this being the extent of employee discretionary effort to his/her work".

According to Maclead and Clarke (2009), "despite there being some debate about the precise

meaning of employee engagement there are three things we know about it: it is measurable; it can be correlated with performance; and it varies from poor to great. Most importantly employers can do a great deal to impact on people's level of engagement. That is what makes it so important, as a tool for business success." Rich, Lepine and Crawford (2010) found in their research that engagement was a better predictor of performance than job involvement, job satisfaction and intrinsic motivation.

Consequently, the most appropriate description/definition of employee engagement for purposes of this research is the following definition by Nienaber and Martins (2015:5): "Employee engagement refers to 'engaged employees' at both the individual and organisational level, who are fully absorbed by and enthusiastic about their work, and so take positive action to further the organisation's reputation and interests". This definition moreover reflects the constructs measured in the employee engagement survey used in this research.

This study thus focuses on employee engagement as measured by the South African employee engagement measure and specifically the validation of the instrument in respect of government institutions. Secondly, the focus is to determine if any significant differences could be detected between the various biographical groups that participated in the survey.

1.2. Employee engagement in government

Current research on engagement in South Africa mostly focuses on engagement in the private sector; minimal research on this topic is conducted in government institutions. This disparity might be related to cost, as it is expensive to conduct employee engagement surveys. Moreover, government officials might not yet see the value of engaged employees and there might be a lack of specific measuring instruments to measure the construct in government institutions. According to Mafini and Dlodlo (2014), the South African public service has been characterised by inefficiency and ineffectiveness in terms of meeting its mandate of ensuring quality service delivery. This is in contrast to the private sector, which is renowned for its world-class service. In the United Kingdom's public sector there is a growing understanding of the importance of engagement as a medium of driving the performance and wellbeing of public servants. This is reflected in the decision of the Civil Service to carry out its first service-wide survey of employee engagement in 2009, covering some 500 000 civil servants (Maclead and Clarke, 2009).

Eldor and Vigoda-Gadot (2013:10-11) ask the important question of why engagement is so important in the public sector. They come to the following conclusion: "More than ever before, public service managers would agree that employees have a critical impact on an organization's effectiveness. At a time when public service organizations are expected to provide effective and high-quality service in an economy of constant budget cutting, they must be lean and learn to achieve more with less. Thus, they need engaged employees who are proactive and take responsibility in order to achieve the desired performance standards". Taylor (2012) is of the opinion that literature written on

Generation Y in Australia indicates that they are different from previous generations to the point that they require new recruitment, management and retention strategies. She further concludes that members of Generation Y who have a high public service motivation are more likely to work in the public sector and the non-profit sector than in the private sector. It appears from the mentioned international research that generational research in the context of employee engagement can benefit the public sector in terms of organisational effectiveness and employee wellbeing, if managers understand these employees' engagement levels.

Research by Olivier (2015) in the South African government shows that during the period 1 January to 3 April 2014 alone, 48 major service delivery protests were staged against local governments, occurring roughly at a rate of a protest every second day. Gauteng and the Eastern Cape were the most protest-ridden provinces in 2014, with the Eastern Cape slightly ahead as of the end of March 2014. According to Leibbrandt and Botha (2014) as cited by Olivier (2015), the inability to execute strategies is one of the main problems in local government in South Africa today. It is thus obvious that the majority of local governments in South Africa are underperforming, are deemed to be ineffective and are in crisis. The service delivery protests that have occurred at local government level in South Africa over the last few years are a clear indication that ordinary citizens are demanding that municipalities become more effective and start delivering on their constitutional mandate (Olivier, 2015).

Given the above situation, it appears that a focus on employee engagement can only improve service delivery and employee satisfaction in government institutions in public service in South Africa. As discussed earlier the South African public service has been characterised by inefficiency and ineffectiveness in terms of meeting its mandate of ensuring quality service delivery (Olivier, 2015). As noted by Maclead and Clarke (2009), engaged employees have a sense of personal attachment to their work and organisation; they are motivated and able to give of their best to help the organisation succeed - and from that flows a series of tangible benefits for the organisation and individuals alike. The contribution of this research will thus be to validate an employee engagement questionnaire that can be used with confidence in government institutions to assess employee engagement and to suggest strategies for the engagement of employees of the various biographical groups to improve inefficiency and ineffectiveness.

2. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD

A quantitative research was conducted to validate the engagement instrument for government institutions and to determine if there were any significant differences between the employee engagement levels of the different biographical groupings. A quantitative approach is applied in this research as the authors are concerned with the measurement and quantification of data using a structured questionnaire, descriptive and inferential statistics (Mouton, 2003) .

The aim of the quantitative research was thus to test the validity and reliability of the employee engagement instrument for government institutions. The second aim of the research was to determine if

there were any significant differences between the employee engagement levels of the different biographical groupings.

2.1. Population and sampling

The database of a research company was used in this study. The database in question consists of 285 000 business people from various industries - including government institutions and sizes of business and who occupy different roles, reflecting the profile of the South African working population. The database was permissioned, that is, everybody in the database gave permission to participate in online surveys. An electronic survey, administered by the iFeedback.co.za online data collection portal, was used by means of a mass e-mail invitation over a period of three weeks. Each potential participant received a personalised e-mail stating the purpose of the investigation and that the survey would take approximately 15 minutes to complete and inviting them to participate in the survey on a voluntary, confidential and anonymous basis (Martins, 2015). The respondents had to rate the items on a five-point Likert scale: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = unsure; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree. The results were reported on an aggregated level only, that is, no results could be tied down to any individual (Martins, 2015). A total of 427 completed questionnaires were received from government participants, i.e. participants not working in the private sector. The demographic profile of the participants is reflected in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic profile of participants

Item	Category	Frequency	%
Gender	Male	173	40.5
	Female	254	59.5
Years of service	0 to 1 year	20	4.7
	2 to 3 years	49	11.5
	4 to 5 years	34	8.0
	6 to 10 years	112	26.2
	10 years and longer	212	49.6
Qualification	Grade 12 and below	39	9.1
	Certificate	36	8.4
	Diploma	99	23.2
	First degree	72	16.9
	Post-graduate qualification	181	42.4
Race group	African	90	21.1
	Coloured/Indian	64	15.0
	White	260	60.9
	Other	3	0.7
	Prefer not to say	10	2.3
Year born	Born between 1978 and 2000	165	38.6
	Born between 1965 and 1977	174	40.7
	Born between 1946 and 1964	88	20.7
Job grade	Top management	82	19.2
	Senior management	116	27.2
	Manager	125	29.3
	Supervisor	37	8.7
	Employee	66	15.5
	Prefer not to say	1	0.1

Source: Author's compilation based on survey results

The demographic profile indicates that 59.5% of the respondents were female, 49.6% had completed a minimum of 10 years' service, most (40.7%) were born between 1965 and 1977 and most (60.9%) were white. Most (59.3%) of the respondents indicated that they had a first degree or a post-school qualification indicating that most respondents are well qualified.

2.2. Research questionnaire

A quantitative research approach was followed in this study. The Employee Engagement Instrument (EEI) was developed by Nienaber and Martins (2014). They reported on the validity and reliability of the instrument in the second phase of the research (Nienaber & Martins 2015:16-17). In the third phase of the research, they conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to confirm the validity of the instrument and compiled a base structural equation model, consisting of the sectors with sufficient responses. Thereafter they determined the goodness-of-fit indices across the sectors, which was followed by sector model comparisons and testing for invariance across the sectors. The results of the analysis indicated that multi-group invariance could not be assumed for all the sectors. The subsequent results then indicated that two sectors, namely, manufacturing and government institutions, needed to be excluded from the invariance testing to obtain factorial invariance. The validity and reliability of the employee engagement questionnaire pertaining to manufacturing and government institutions need to be determined separately (Martins, 2015). This has led to the aim of this research, namely, to test the validity and reliability of the instrument for government institutions and to determine if there were any significant differences between the employee engagement levels of the various biographical groups.

2.3. Statistical analysis

The survey results were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23. Firstly, the validity and reliability were determined and, secondly, the significant differences, if any, between the various biographical groups were determined.

2.4. Factor and reliability analyses

Preliminary distribution analyses indicated that the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity had not been violated. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value obtained was 0,963, well above the recommended minimum value of 0.6 (Ismail & Yusof 2010:7). Values of the KMO statistic that fall between 0.7 and 0.8 are good, values between 0.8 and 0.9 are great and values above 0.9 are superb (Hutchenson & Sofroniou 1999:218-219). Bartlett's test of sphericity was also calculated. Bartlett's test of sphericity reached high statistical significance, namely, $p < .001$, indicating that the correlations within the R-matrix were sufficiently different from zero to warrant factor analysis (Martins, 2015). The communalities indicated values between 0.50 and 0.842. Communality values represent the amount of variance accounted by the factor solution for each variable. Variables with high values are well-represented in the common factor

space, while variables with low values are not well-represented. All the communality values were above 0.50 and sufficiently high to proceed with the rotation of the factor matrix. To further enhance understanding of the diversity concept within government institutions, a factor analysis (extraction method: principal component analysis; rotation method: oblimin with Kaiser normalisation) was employed to uncover the basic structure underlying employee engagement within a government context. The total variance explained by the eigenvalues was 69.5%. This percentage is above the criterion stated by Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson (2010), namely, that a solution in the social sciences should account for 60% of the variance (or even less) as satisfactory. Principal component factor analysis was preferred due to unconfirmed theoretical perspectives on the concept of employee engagement within a government environment. During factor extraction, the shared variance of a variable is partitioned from its unique variance and error variance to reveal the underlying factor structure where only shared variance appeared in the solution. Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum and Strahan (1999:277) argue that if data are relatively normally distributed, maximum likelihood is the best choice because "it allows for the computation of a wide range of indexes of the goodness of fit of the model [and] permits statistical significance testing of factor loadings and correlations among factors and the computation of confidence intervals". If the assumption of multivariate normality is violated, as is the case with the present data, they recommend principal axis factors. Two factor solutions were extracted - one with six factors and one with seven factors. After the two factor structures had been investigated, the structure which most closely reflected the original factor structure was the seven factor structure. One of the factors was only represented by two statements and was thus rejected. The six factor model, in comparison to the original factor structure, is portrayed below in Table 2.

Table 2. Reliability statistics for the six extracted components

	Original questionnaire structure		Government structure	
Description	*Number of items*	*Cronbach's alpha*	*Number of items*	*Cronbach's alpha*
Team	11	0.933	11	0.936
Organisational satisfaction	9	0.942	9	0.946
Immediate manager	7	0.934	7	0.938
Organisational commitment	12	0.932	9	0.931
Strategy and implementation	7	0.904	7	0.909
Customer service	4	0.813	5	0.816

Source: Calculated from research results

The above results portray a very similar factor and reliability structure, but with some important changes. The main differences are in respect of the dimensions of organisational commitment and customer service. The two statements that did not load on the two factors are:
– Our organisation has the systems and procedures to support me in providing good customer service (previously grouped under customer service)
– In my team we will finalise a task even if we experience difficulties (previously grouped under team)

Another difference that was noted was that seven statements moved between dimensions. This movement mainly took place between organisational commitment, and strategy and implementation, with four statements that are now grouped under organisational commitment, from the dimension of strategy and implementation. The dimension of organisational commitment was subsequently renamed vision and mission. Most of the statements now focus on aspects in relation to the vision, mission and values, for example:
– I am excited by our vision and mission
– The organisation's vision for the future is inspiring
– My personal values are in line with the organisational values
– Our top management communicates the vision and mission to us

The dimension of strategy and implementation was renamed employee encouragement to reflect the current contents:
– Initiative is encouraged in this organisation
– Risk-taking is encouraged in this organisation

– In our organisation, employees are encouraged to develop ideas to improve work procedures and methods
– The way we do things around here encourages high performance

All the other dimension labels were kept the same, as they measure the original constructs.

The results of the dimensions show that the dimension of team is overall the most positive (Table 3). This is also reflected in the analysis of the results of government in respect of the six highest ranked individual questions:
– In my team we usually do more than is expected of us (mean of 4.25)
– In my team we adapt to changes (mean of 4.19)
– In my team we do what is expected of us; we are dependable (mean of 4.18)
– In my team we will finalise a task even if we experience difficulties (mean of 4.16)
– My job is meaningful to me (mean of 4.15)
– In my team we do what we promise to do (mean of 4.15)

Five of the most positive statements are from the dimension of team.

An analysis of the six lowest ranked statements for government reflects the following:
– My immediate manager does a good job of 'managing the work', that is, making appropriate work assignments, scheduling the work, setting priorities, etc for me and my team (mean of 3.37)
– My immediate manager gives me regular feedback that helps me to improve my performance (mean of 3.37)
– I am satisfied with the way that my work performance is evaluated (mean of 3.23)
– The organisational leadership gives employees a clear picture of the direction in which the organisation is headed (mean of 3.37)

– The way we do things around here encourages high performance (mean of 3.35)

– Risk-taking is encouraged in the organisation (mean of 2.86)

The first three statements refer to the dimension of manager and the last three to employee encouragement. These two dimensions are also the lowest ranked dimensions (Table 3) for the overall results and for government. Further, two of the lowest ranked statements refer to dissatisfaction with work performance evaluation and performance feedback.

Table 3. Comparison of the overall engagement survey scores with the government institutions results

Dimensions	*Overall survey results N=4099*		*Government institutions results N=429*	
	Mean	*% Agree*	*Mean*	*% Agree*
Team	4.05	83.9	4.06	83.5
Organisational satisfaction	3.80	73.1	3.81	72.5
Customer service	3.72	68.4	3.69	66.7
Organisational commitment/vision and mission	3.73	67.3	3.75	67.5
Immediate manager	3.58	61.3	3.53	59.5
Strategy and implementation/ employee encouragement	3.40	56.7	3.41	56.9
Overall	3.73	69.4	3.73	69.0

2.5. Biographical differences

The second aim was to determine if any significant differences pertaining to engagement levels could be detected between the various biographical groups.

The results indicate that only two biographical groups, namely, job grade and year born, portray significant differences between the various biographical groups. It is important to note that although whites with more than 10 years of service and with qualifications represent most of the respondents, no overall significant differences were detected in respect of these groups. Overall, the respondents who were born between 1978 and 2000 (Millennials) are significantly more positive than the Baby Boomers (born between 1946 and 1964). The most positive job grade is top management - they are significantly more positive than all the other job grades. On the whole top management is significantly more positive than all the other job grades. Supervisors and employees reflect the lowest levels of engagement overall. A more in-depth analysis of the results indicates the following:

– All job levels experience the dimensions of customer service, immediate manager, organisational commitment/vision and mission, and strategy and implementation/employee encouragement significantly more negatively than top management do.

– Top management experience the dimension of team significantly more positively than employees do.

– The Millennials experience the dimension of organisational satisfaction significantly more positively than the other two generations do.

– The Millennials experience organisational commitment/vision and mission and team significantly more positively than the Baby Boomers do and strategy and implementation significantly

more positively than the members of Generation Y do.

– The post-graduate qualification group experience team significantly more positively than the diploma group do.

Table 4. Overall significant differences

Item	*Category*	*Mean*	*F*	*Sig*
Gender	Male	3.66	1.164	0.281
	Female	3.74		
Years of service	0 to 1 year	4.00	1.292	0.272
	2 to 3 years	3.80		
	4 to 5 years	3.69		
	6 to 10 years	3.64		
	10 years and longer	3.70		
Qualification	Grade 12 and below	4.05	2.936	0.020
	Certificate	3.60		
	Diploma	3.53		
	First degree	3.72		
	Post-graduate qualification	3.79		
Race group	African	3.55	1.427	0.224
	Coloured/Indian	3.73		
	White	4.08		
	Other	3.84		
	Prefer not to say	3.68		
Year born	Born between 1978 and 2000 (Millennials)	3.85**	5.378	0.005
	Born between 1965 and 1977 (Generation X)	3.63*		
	Born between 1946 and 1964 (Baby Boomers)	3.61*		
Job grade	Top management	4.11**	12.186	0.000
	Senior management	3.76*		
	Manager	3.63*		
	Supervisor	3.42*		
	Employee	3.43*		
Overall results		3.71		

*Note:** indicates significantly more positive than ***
Source: Author's compilation based on survey results

3. DISCUSSION

The first aim of the quantitative research, that is, to test the validity and reliability of the instrument for government institutions, was accomplished by means of factor and reliability analyses. The results of these analyses confirmed the validity and reliability of the employee engagement questionnaire for government institutions. Although the factor structure is very similar, the new structure focuses more on organisational commitment and less on strategy and implementation. The dimension of organisational commitment was renamed vision, mission and values, and the dimension of strategy and implementation was renamed employee encouragement. These labels are more accurate reflections of the constructs. The construct of organisational commitment also fits in better with private business than with government. In government, it appears as if the alignment is more towards setting visions, missions and values than towards individual commitment to the government institution. According to Olivier (2015:193), if a metropolitan municipality achieves its goals in keeping with its vision and mission and provides the

services that it is supposed to provide, leading to customer satisfaction, that municipality's achievement of its goals will affect the degree of organisational effectiveness attributed to it. Given the government environment, it is understandable that strategy and implementation is more a function of the central and local governments than of management teams. Employee encouragement, or encouraging employee involvement in specific local government activities, seems to align more with the government environment. Olivier (2015) summarises the objectives of local government as follows:

– providing democratic and accountable government of local communities

– ensuring the provision of services to communities in a sustainable manner

– promoting social and economic development

– promoting a safe and healthy environment

– encouraging the involvement of communities and community organisations in the matters of local government

Two of the core concepts in the dimension of employee encouragement, namely, accountability and encouragement are reflected in the objectives above. It also appears from the overall results and the results of the individual statements that team work is already a core element of employee engagement in government institutions. The dimensions and statements that need to be developed are employee encouragement and immediate manager.

The second aim of the research was to determine if there were any significant differences between the engagement levels of the different biographical groupings. This aim was accomplished by the ANOVA analysis. A number of interesting results were noted, for example, the significantly more positive overall results of top management, senior management and the Millennials. Top management experience the dimensions of customer service, immediate manager, vision and mission, strategy and employee encouragement significantly more positively than all the other job levels do. The results thus indicate that the younger employees together with top and senior management experience the highest levels of engagement in government institutions.

This finding is supported by research conducted in the United Kingdom (Maclead and Clarke, 2009) that indicates that many people, particularly younger employees, want more out of work than simply a wage packet at the end of the week. Towers Perrin, in their 2008 Global Workforce Study regarding employee views, found that the top driver of engagement was senior management demonstrating a sincere interest in employee wellbeing (Maclead and Clarke, 2009).

4. CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The results indicate that the adapted questionnaire, rather than the original, more generic questionnaire, can be used with confidence in government institutions. It is, however, proposed that the questionnaire be tested for validity and reliability again, using a bigger sample to ensure that the factor structure reflects the employee engagement constructs for government.

Government leaders need to take note of the results of this study. The results indicate a positive

perception regarding team work in government institutions. On the other hand, it appears as if employee encouragement and the immediate manager are experienced as developmental issues. An important aspect to take note of is the lower levels of engagement of employees in government institutions. The British Association of Communicators in Business emphasises the importance of the chief executive and the senior management team seeing this issue (that is, employee engagement) as "an integral part of higher-level strategic activity rather than something they are supposed to do, but that is not a core function (Maclead & Clarke, 2009). In relation to government institutions, it is important that South African government leaders recognise the importance and value of employee engagement for their service delivery. Government leaders need to embark on specific actions to improve the engagement levels of their employees.

With regards to the results of the biographical groups, significantly more positive overall results for top management, senior management and the Millennials were founded. Top management experience the dimensions of customer service, immediate manager, vision and mission, strategy and employee encouragement significantly more positively than all the other job grades. The results also indicated that the younger employees together with top and senior management experience the highest levels of engagement in government institutions.

Maclead and Clarke (2009) made a number of important recommendations to the British government. Some of these recommendations on the micro level are, according to the authors, applicable to government institutions in South Africa as well, given the results of the employee engagement survey:

– More support should be devoted to the people skills that are vital to leadership and management and that lie at the heart of engagement. These softer skills include the ability to consult, to engage, to communicate effectively and to have difficult conversations, and interpersonal skills.

– The ability to visit workplaces that are achieving high levels of employee engagement should be improved.

– The ability to access evidence and emerging evidence of the drivers of employee engagement should be improved.

– Coaching should be encouraged.

– The ability to listen, possibly online, to line managers and leaders who have been through the journey of enhancing employee engagement should be improved.

– Specific and practical ideas for interventions and events that engage employees should be listened to.

– Networks should be created to pool experiences and to develop new ideas to enhance levels of engagement. This can especially be of value to the millennials and lower grades of employees who appear to experience the work environment differently to the other age groups and the senior job grades.

The above recommendations will improve, in particular, the dimensions of employee encouragement and the immediate manager, which appear to be the main problematic areas pertaining to employee engagement in government institutions.

On the macro level in South Africa, the following recommendations can be considered to improve employee engagement:

– Higher education institutions also have an important role to play in extending engagement. Business schools, in general, and specific universities, in particular, have made significant progress in developing people management and leadership (Maclead & Clarke, 2009), which can be further extended to focus more on engagement in government institutions.

– There should be a nationwide awareness raising campaign to expose the widest range of companies, businesses and organisations in the public (government institutions) and the private sectors to the potential benefits of employee engagement (Maclead & Clarke, 2009).

One of the limitations of the study is the small number of government employees who participated in the employee engagement survey. It is proposed that a follow-up survey that includes a broader selection of government institutions be carried out.

REFERENCES

1. Attridge, M. 2009. Measuring and managing employee work engagement: A review of the research and business *literature. Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health 24(4):383-398*
2. Barnes, DC, & Collier, JE. 2013. Investigating work engagement in the service environment. *Journal of Services Marketing* 27(6):485-499.
3. Eldor, L & Vigoda-Gadot, E. 2013. *Engaged to public service: strategies for enhancing employees' engagement in government agencies.* pmpc.haifa.ac.il/.../EE-Magazine-HRNews_Jan2013_Eldor-VigodaG (Accessed 30 October 2015).
4. Fabrigar, LR, Wegener, DT, MacCallum, RC, & Strahan, E. J. 1999. Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods* 4(3):272-299.
5. Gatenby, M, Rees, C, Soane, E & Truss, C. 2009. *Employee engagement in context.* London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
6. Harter, JK, Schimdt, FL & Hayes, TL. 2002. Business-level-unit relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87(2):268-279.
7. Saks, AM. 2011. Performance management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review* 21:123-136.
8. Hair JF Jr, Black, WC, Babin, BJ & Anderson, RE. 2010. *Multivariate data analysis: a global perspective.* 7th edition. New York, NY: Pearson.
9. Hutchenson, G & Sofroniou, N. 1999. *The multivariate social scientist: introductory statistics using generalized linear models.* London: Sage.
10. Imandin, L, Bisschoff, C & Botha, C. 2014. A model to measure employee engagement. *Problems and Perspectives in Management* 12(4):520-532.
11. Leibbrandt, JH & Botha, CJ. 2014. Leadership and management as an enabler for strategy execution in municipalities in South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 5(20):329-339.
12. Martins, N. 2015. Testing for measurement invariance for employee engagement across sectors in South Africa. *Journal of Contemporary Management* 12:757-774.
13. Maclead, D & Clarke, N. 2009. *Engaging for success: enhancing performance through employee engagement.* A report to Government. Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. Crown Copyright. BIS/Pub 8859/07/09NP. URN09/1075 - 39.
14. Mafini, C & Dlodlo, N. 2014. The relationship between extrinsic motivation, job satisfaction and life satisfaction amongst employees in a public organisation. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology/SA Tydskrif vir Bedryfsielkunde* 40(1):Art. #1166, 13 pages .http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ sajip.v40i1.1166.
15. Nelson, DL & Cooper, CL. 2012. *Positive organizational behavior: accentuating the positive at work.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
16. Nienaber, H & Martins, N. 2014. An employee engagement instrument and framework building on existing research. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 5(20):485-496.
17. Nienaber, N & Martins, N. 2015. Validating a scale measuring engagement in a South African context. *Journal of Contemporary Management* 12:401-425.
18. Ismail, MB & Yusof, ZM. 2010. The impact of individual factors on knowledge sharing quality. *Journal of Organizational Knowledge Management.* http://www.ibimapublishing.com/journals/JOKM/ jokm.html, Article ID 327569, 13 pages DOI: 10.5171/2010.327569 (Accessed 15 November, 2015).
19. Mouton, J. 2003. How to succeed in your Master's & Doctoral studies. A South African guide and resource book. Pretoria. Van Schaik Publishers.
20. Olivier, B. 2015. The development and validation of an assessment framework for measuring the organisational effectiveness of a metropolitan municipality in South Africa. PhD thesis, University of South Africa, Pretoria.
21. Rich, BL, Lepine, JA & Crawford, ER. 2010. Job engagement: antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal* 53(3):617-635.
22. Schaufeli, WB, & Salanova, M. 2011. Work engagement: On how to better catch a slippery concept. *European Journal of Work and Organization Psychology* 20(1):39-46.
23. Storey, J, Wright, PM & Ulrich, D (eds). 2008. *The Routledge companion to strategic human resource management.* New York: Routledge.
24. Taylor, J. 2012. "Public service motivation and work preferences of the millennials in Australia", in Ng, ES & Schweitzer, L (eds), Managing the new workforce: International perspectives on the Millennial generation. Chelthenham, UK: Edward Elgar: 20-41.
25. Truss, C, Shantz, A, Soane, Alfes, K & Delbridge, R. 2013. Employee engagement, organisational performance and individual well-being: exploring the evidence, developing the theory. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 24(14):2657-2669.
26. Van Rooy, DL, Whitman, DS, Hart, D & Caleo, S. 2011. Measuring employee engagement during a financial downturn: Business imperative or nuisance? *Journal of Business and Psychology* 26:147-152.
27. Viljoen, R. 2015. *Organisational change and development. An African perspective.* Randburg, South Africa: Knowres Publishing.
28. Werner, A. 2014. "Motivation", in Nel PS & Werner A (eds), Human resource management. 9th edition. Cape Town: Oxford University Press: 264-288.