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Abstract
This study was necessitated by the inefficiency that has trailed the performance of employees in the Civil Service in Anambra state. The objective of this study is to ascertain the extent to which employee involvement correlates with goal achievement in Anambra State Civil Service. The study employed correlational survey research design, with a population of 684 employees, and a sample size of 252 was determined with the use of Taro Yamane formula of finite population, the questionnaire allocation was determined using Bowley’s proportion allocation formula. The study obtained information from the data using mean and standard deviation. The hypothesis was tested using Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Co-efficient on SPSS version 20, which establishes the extent of the relationship between the variables under consideration. The findings showed that employee involvement has a significant positive relationship with goal achievement in the selected ministries. The researcher recommended that the Civil Service should engage in induction training to specify work roles to each employee, encourage involvement of employees in decision making and feedback should be given on their performance with commensurate reward.
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1. Introduction
The notion of employee engagement has sparked widespread interest over the last decade. Engaged employees are those who give full discretionary effort at work and are highly vigorous and dedicated to their jobs, while disengaged employees are those who are motivationally disconnected from work, who do not have the energy to work hard and who are not enthusiastic at work (Bakker, 2008; Towers &
Perrin, 2003). The continuance of employee engagement goes beyond the traditional notions of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job involvement. Engagement involves the active use of emotional, cognitive and behavioural energies at workplace while working in coherence with the organizations objectives and strategies (Andrew & Sofian, 2012). Engaged employees experience greater attachment to their work and their organization, they are more likely to do things that augment organizational effectiveness (Saks, 2008). For instance, engaged employees are optimistic and spontaneous, they tend to exhibit positive attitudes and proactive behaviours at workplace.

The civil service is an important institution of a state, it affect the citizen’s daily life. It aims at ensuring that the goals of the state government are achieved. It is also essential to modern life in the state because of the role it plays; As a result of these, the quality of the civil service in the state is important to the quality of modern life in the said state. Anambra State (the study area) was created in 1976 when East Central State was broken into Anambra and Imo States. Then, it comprised of the present Anambra State and Enugu State Including the Abakaliki part of Ebonyi State, with Enugu as its capital. During States creation in August 1991, Enugu State with Abakaliki was excised, leaving Anambra State as presently constituted with Awka as its capital.

The creation of the present Anambra State resulted mainly from the desire to spread the gains of economic development and arrest the national problem of North South Geopolitical dichotomy evident in the former Anambra State, there was agitation that the indigenes of the present Anambra State because of their highly developed manpower, dominated the public services, while on the other hand, there was some measure of concentration of infrastructural base and government industrial development in the region that is now Enugu State. The creation of this State in 1991 led to the set up of the Anambra State Civil Service. Employing the tenets of traditional public administration, the State Civil Service is an instrument of the government authorities as well as an impartial interpreter and implementer of the policies and Programmes of the State Government. With the emergence of the modern state, the Civil service was established, not only to formulate policies but also to effectively implement them. In this regard, the Civil Service is an institution saddled with the responsibility of designing, formulating and implementing public policy, and discharging government functions and development programmes in an effective and efficient way (Salisu, 2011).

Improved performance is usually attained when civil servants are not only satisfied with their job, but are also well engaged in tasks within the organization. Managers unequivocally agree that this century demands more efficiency and productivity than other times in history, in this century the heads of service of every state is striving to increase their performance, and be the best they can be by delivering top services to their citizens so that they can be at the helm of affairs and help the executive arm of the state achieve their goal. Thanks to technology, nowadays there are new and more advanced techniques of operation that make achieving results easier and faster. As sophistication of technologies continues to evolve, they pose more challenges for managers because organizations will need more number of employees with increased technical and professional skills. These knowledge workers cannot be
managed with old styles of totalitarian management. They expect operational autonomy, job satisfaction and status. It is because of these facts that the attention of managers is shifting towards employees’ side of organizations. From last quarter of twentieth century onwards, concepts like employee commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) started to appear on the ground that efficiency and productivity lie within the employees’ ability and commitment. Managers are now focused on how to keep employees engaged on their job. Employers now realize that by focusing on employee engagement, they can create more efficient and productive workforce.

Since the Civil Service plays a huge role in the development of a state, it is important for civil servants to not only be well motivated (financially and non-financially), equipped with current skills, knowledge and abilities, given duties and tasks to carry out, but also to continually be involved in the affairs in the organization. Unfortunately, despite the fact that much is expected of this very organ of government, the lackadaisical attitude with which the civil service performs has generated a lot of heat for both past and successive administrations. Inefficiency has almost become a household word used to describe the civil service, not just Anambra State in particular but the nation as a whole. The Anambra State Civil Service is generally criticized for still maintaining conducts derived from the colonial based civil service which was designed just to make law and order. Further to this, inadequate co-ordination, communication gap, over centralization of decision making, has marred the efficiency and effectiveness of the Civil Service in Anambra State. Decision making is over centralized, and as such, employees are not allowed to participate when decisions are being made, even when employees are allowed to air their views, it is not being put into consideration, neither are their suggested ideas being considered for implementation. The bureaucratic way of management in the civil service is now a norm, and as a result of these, employees feel as though their inputs are not welcomed and appreciated, and they just have to stick to the status quo, and do everything by the book. These have led to laxities in employee behaviour ranging from unreasonable absenteeism, lateness, idleness and poor workmanship. The performance of the civil service in the state has been affected by all these, and the development of the state (which is the goal of the civil service) is being affected as well. It is these problems that prompted this research work. With regards to the problem stated above, the main objective of the study is:

To identify the extent of relationship that exists between employee engagement and organizational performance in selected ministries in Anambra State Civil Service. However, the specific objective is:

To determine the extent to which employee involvement correlates with goal achievement in selected ministries in Anambra State Civil Service.

**Research Question**

To what extent does employee involvement correlate with goal achievement in selected ministries in Anambra State Civil Service?

**Hypothesis**

\[H_0\]: There is a significant positive correlation between employee involvement and goal achievement in selected ministries in Anambra State Civil service.
2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Conceptual Review

2.1.1 Employee Engagement

One of the earliest writers to consider engagement (Kahn, 1990), regarded it as a psychological state experienced by employees in relation to their work together with associated behaviours. Kahn, in his first and foremost qualitative study on engagement states, “Engaged employees drive personal energies (physical, cognitive and emotional) into their work roles”. In this connection, psychological experiences were identified as significant and necessary for an employee to invest his/her personal energies into their work role performance. Three psychological conditions were also articulated as a result of this notion:

a) Meaningfulness (identification with one’s work/creative and challenging work, autonomy).

b) Safety (elements of social systems).

c) Availability (sense of having physical and psychological resources).

In this context, engagement was presumed as having positive outcomes for both individual as well as organizations. The fulgent beginning of engagement literature with the works of Kahn (1990) has drifted considerable attention and inclination of researchers in recent times. Hence, numerous definitions on engagement have been produced thereafter:

Perrin’s Global Workforce Study (2003) uses the definition “employees’ willingness and ability to help their company succeed, largely by providing discretionary effort on a sustainable basis”. According to the study, engagement is affected by many factors which involve both emotional and rational factors relating to work and the overall work experience. Gallup organization defines employee engagement as the involvement with and enthusiasm for work. Gallup as cited by Dernovsek (2008) likens employee engagement to a positive employees’ emotional attachment and employees’ commitment. Macey (2009) produced the following working definition, “Engagement is an individual’s purpose and focused energy, evident to others in the display of personal initiative, adaptability, effort and persistence directed towards organisational goal”.

Robinson, Perryman and Hayday (2004) define employee engagement as “a positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its value”. Employee Involvement (EI) is the process of developing “a feeling of psychological ownership among organizational members’ and has been implemented via the participation of employees in information processing, decision-making and/or problem solving” (Kearney, 1997).

2.1.2 Employee Involvement

The Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD, 2006) defines employee involvement as a range of processes designed to engage the support, understanding and optimum contribution of all employees in an organization and their commitment to its objectives. Employee involvement is creating an environment in which people have an impact on decisions and actions that affect their jobs. It is not the goal nor is it a tool, as practiced in many organizations. It is rather a management and leadership
philosophy about how people are most enabled to contribute to continuous improvement and the ongoing success of their work organization. The non-involvement of lower level management in decision-making also means that vital input from employees is often not factored into decisions made. This gives rise to the problems that are experienced in organizations when it comes to the acceptance of these decisions and its implementation because employees feel slighted and of no importance because their views were not sought. They also do not feel as being part of the decision process but rather decisions are taken and “pushed down their throats”. This leads to resistance to compliance or a lackadaisical attitude to implementation.

Employee involvement is a process of empowering employees to participate in managerial decision-making and improvement activities appropriate to their levels in the organization. A modern and forward looking organization will not keep employees in the dark about vital decisions. It trusts them and involves them in decision making at all levels “command and control” is no longer an adequate model. A more open and collaborative framework will exploit the talent of all employees (Hewit, 2012). Employees must be involved if they are to understand the need for creativity and if they are to be committed to changing their behaviour at work in new and improved ways (Singh, 2009; Kinghir & Mseci, 2007).

Kazmi (2002) posits that goals means what an organization hopes to accomplish in a future period of time. They represent a future state or an outcome of the effort put in now. The goal of an organization addresses broadly both financial and non-financial issues. Organizational goals are those ends that an organization seeks to achieve by its existence and operations. Goals are predetermined future results toward which present efforts are directed. It is fruitless for an organization to be in existence without achieving its goals. In the achievement of organizational goals, employees’ contribution is obviously an important ingredient. They act as a compliment to the superiors/heads of any organization. If there is no cooperation between the two, goals and objectives may not be adequately realized.

2.1.3 Drivers of Employee Engagement

According to Penna research report (2007) meaning at work has the potential to be a valuable way of bringing employers and employees closer together to the benefit of both. Wherever employees experience a sense of community, the space to be themselves and the opportunity to make a contribution, they find meaning. Employees want to work in the organizations in which they find meaning at work. Penna (2007) researchers have also come up with a new model they called “Hierarchy of engagement” which resembles Maslow’s need hierarchy model.
In the bottom line there are basic needs of pay and benefits. Once an employee satisfied these needs, then the employee looks to development opportunities, the possibility for promotion and then leadership style will be introduced to the mix in the model. Finally, when all the above cited lower level aspirations have been satisfied the employee looks to an alignment of value-meaning, which is displayed by a true sense of connection, a common purpose and a shared sense of meaning at work.

Development Dimensions International (DDI, 2005) states that a manager must do five things to create a highly engaged workforce. They are:

- Align efforts with strategy;
- Empower;
- Promote and encourage teamwork and collaboration;
- Help people grow and develop;
- Provide support and recognition where appropriate.

2.1.4 Employee Engagement and Performance

Studies have found positive relationship between employee engagement and organizational performance outcomes: employee retention, productivity, profitability, customer loyalty and safety. Researches also indicate that the more engaged employees are, the more likely their employer is to exceed average in its revenue growth. Research also indicates that engagement is positively related to customer satisfaction (Coffman, 2002; Ellis & Sorensen, 2007; Hewitt Associates, 2012; Heintzman & Marson, 2005).

Engaged employee consistently demonstrates three general behaviours which improve organizational performance:

- Say-the employee advocates for the organization to co-workers, and refers potential employees and customers;
- Stay-the employee has an intense desire to be a member of the organization despite opportunities to work elsewhere;
• Strive—the employee exerts extra time, effort and initiative to contribute to the success of the organisation (Baumruk & Gorman, 2004).

2.2 Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on Social Exchange Theory (SET). Social exchange theory was introduced in 1958 by the sociologist George Homans with the publication of his work “Social Behaviour as Exchange”. He defined social exchange as the exchange of activity, tangible or intangible, and more or less rewarding or costly, between at least two persons. Homans summarizes the system in three propositions: success, stimulus, and deprivation-satiation proposition:

1) Success proposition: When one finds they are rewarded for their actions, they tend to repeat the action.
2) Stimulus proposition: The more often a particular stimulus has resulted in a reward in the past, the more likely it is that a person will respond to it.
3) Deprivation-satiation proposition: The more often in the recent past a person has received a particular reward, the less valuable any further unit of that reward becomes.

Social exchange theory argues that obligations are generated through a series of interactions between parties who are in a state of reciprocal interdependence. A basic tenet of social exchange theory is that relationships evolve over time into trusting, loyal and mutual commitments as long as the parties abide by certain “rules” of exchange. These usually involve reciprocity or repayment rules such that the actions of one party lead to a response or actions by the other party (Saks, 2006). An exchange starts with one party giving a benefit to another. If the recipient reciprocates, and consequently a series of beneficial exchanges occurs, feelings of mutual obligation between the parties are created (Coyle-Shapiro & Shore, 2007). A broad notion of reciprocity encompasses a feeling of an obligation to repay favourable treatment. Aselage and Eisenberger (2009) defined employees’ obligation feeling as “a prescriptive belief regarding whether one should care about the organization’s well-being and should help the organization reach its goals”. According to Aselage and Eisenberger (2009), the exchange, or reciprocation, in social relationships becomes stronger when both partners are willing to provide resources valuable to the other. Whereas employees value beneficial treatment, employers seek loyalty and dedication (Coyle-Shapiro & Shore, 2007). But which of the two parties starts first? Research discusses mostly organizations as initiators. Positive actions directed at employees by the organization are argued to contribute to the establishment of high-quality exchange relationships (Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 2007). Basically, this theory is related to the present study in that once management tries to establish a close relationship with employees with the application of employee engagement tactics, the employees in turn reciprocate by being committed to their jobs and the organization.

2.3 Empirical Review

Prior studies on employee engagement among scholars presented varied perspectives and findings. Ali and Iklas (2014) carried out a research on “Employee engagement and organizational commitment: Evidence from Jordan”. The population of the study consisted of all frontline employees within the banking sector in Jordan which totaled 2393. The study utilized a non probability sampling method.
namely; quota and convenience sampling. The sample size was 336 employee participants. The result of the study revealed that employee engagement is significantly related to the two measures of organizational commitment namely: affective commitment and normative commitment, but are not significantly related to continuance commitment.

Brenda, Esther and Agnes (2015) carried out a research on the effect of employee engagement on organization performance in Kenya’s horticultural sector. The study was carried out in flower farms in Kenya. The population of the study was all flower farms on Kenya which were 14. The study employed cross sectional survey design. The study administered questionnaires as the instrument for data collection. They distributed 2460 questionnaires and got 1888 respondents. The result of the correlation analysis shows that employee engagement is statistically significant with a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.533 at a level of significance 0.000. The study concluded that employee engagement is a major determinant of organization performance in the horticultural sector in Kenya. The study recommended that organization should emphasize on induction training as it will help clarify the roles of employees, thus improving organizational performance.

James (2012) carried out a meta-analysis on “the relationship between engagement at work and organizational outcomes”. The study applied hunter-Schmidt meta-analysis methods to 263 research studies across 192 organizations in 49 industries and 34 countries. In total they studied 49,928 business/work units including 1,390,941 employees. They studied nine outcomes: customer loyalty, profitability, productivity, turnover, safety incidents, shrinkage, absenteeism, patient safety incidents, and quality (defects). The result from the research shows that employee engagement is related to each of the nine performance outcomes studied and they concluded that the relationship between engagement and performance at business/work unit level is substantially and highly generalizable across organizations.

Phylis, Chrispen and Florence (2014) carried out a research on “the influence of organizational employee engagement strategies on organizational citizenship behaviour within retail banking; a case of Amatole district Municipality”. The study utilized a quantitative research design and a sample size of 180. The researcher concluded that employees cannot display organizational citizenship behaviour if they are not exposed to employee engagement strategies. Alan (2005) carried out a research on Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. A survey was completed by 102 employees working in a variety of organizations. The survey included measures of job and organization engagement as well as the antecedents and consequences of engagement. Results indicated that there is a meaningful difference between job and organization engagement and that perceived organizational support predicts both job and organization engagement, job characteristics predict job engagement, and procedural justice predicts organization engagement. In addition, job and organization engagement mediated the relationships between antecedents and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intentions to quit, and organizational citizenship behaviour.

Harminder (2013) carried out a research on determinants and outcomes of employee engagement: A
comparative study in information technology sector. On the basis of secondary research, five determinants, job role, organizational support, rewards and recognition, training and development and leadership and planning, and three outcomes—organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour and employee satisfaction have been taken as variables of employee engagement in the study. 200 Employees (100 each) from two companies were administered a structured questionnaire on determinants and outcomes of employee engagement, and data was analyzed using SPSS package. Findings indicate that job role, rewards and recognition and leadership and planning are strong determinants of employee engagement and further employee engagement results in organizational citizenship behaviour, employee commitment and employee satisfaction.

Anita (2014) carried out a research on the determinants of employee engagement and their impact on organization performance in Nigeria. A survey questionnaire was developed and validated using a pilot data (α=0.975). Simple random sampling was used to select the employees from middle and lower managerial levels from small scale organizations. A total of 700 questionnaires were distributed and 383 valid responses collected. It was found that all the identified factors were predictors of employee engagement; however the variables that had major impact were working environment and team and co-worker relationship. Employee engagement had significant impact on.

Raida (2013) carried out a research on “Understanding Factors Influencing Employee engagement: a study of the financial sector in Malaysia”. To achieve this objective, this study adopted a mixed-method approach. The first method, a qualitative study of 41 interviews with employees in the financial sector, was designed to explore the most salient factors in the employees’ levels of engagement. The second method, a quantitative survey of 278 employees, was designed to investigate the associations between the studied variables. The key findings of this study suggest that both macro- and micro-institutions have pertinent roles in stimulating employee engagement. Organizations and managers need to understand the changing role of leaders, the introduction of high performance work practice and the practice of religious belief in the workplace as sources which enhance engagement.

Micheal (2010) carried out a research on “Employee engagement: an examination of antecedent and outcome variables”. The study examined the relation between job fit, affective commitment, psychological climate, discretionary effort, intention to turnover, and employee engagement. An internet-based self-report survey battery of six scales were administered to a heterogeneous sampling of organizations from the fields of service, technology, healthcare, retail, banking, nonprofit, and hospitality. Hypotheses were tested through correlation and hierarchical regression analytic procedures 283 respondents participated in the research. The findings from the study revealed that employees who experience a high degree of job fit, affective commitment were more likely to be engaged. It also revealed that employees who reported working in positive psychological climate were more likely to be engaged, and that employees who reported higher levels of employee engagement were more likely to put in more discretionary effort. Employees who reported higher levels of employee engagement were less likely intending to turnover. He recommends that organizations looking to increase performance
could focus on developing employee engagement as an organizational strategic leverage point. Peter, Taruona and Farai (2014) researched on “Employee engagement and organizational performance in a public sector organization in Zimbabwe”. The sample size was 50 participants. The data used in their research work was gathered using a combination of unstructured interviews, self administered questionnaires and a content analysis of a range of secondary data sources in the organization. The central argument in the research work was that employee engagement is very critical in determining employee, organizational performance. The findings reveal that low levels of employee engagement consequently result in a below standard performance amongst majority of the employees. Patrick (2015) carried out a research on employee engagement and workplace harmony in Rivers state civil service. His study attempts to examine the extent to which employee engagement as a nonfinancial incentive can significantly influence the degree of workplace harmony in the Nigeria civil service. Samples of 400 employees were randomly drawn from 10 ministries in the Rivers State Civil Service, Nigeria. He administered structured questionnaire and data gathered were tested using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation statistics. Results revealed a significant relationship and influence of the variables of employee engagement on workplace harmony in the studied sector. He concluded that employee engagement is a critical non financial incentive that has significant relationship on workplace harmony, and recommended that institutional collaboration between management and employees, employee career enhancement as well leadership cooperation should be encouraged to attract workforce loyalty to the vision and mission of the state civil service.

3. Methods
The study employed correlation survey research design since the research involves the determination of the extent of relationship between two variables. In this study, attention was paid to the variables of study which are Employee engagement (independent variable) measured with organization performance. The population of the study consists of civil servants of four ministries in Anambra State Civil Service they are: Ministry of Education, ministry of Housing and Urban Development, Ministry of Economic Planning and Budget, and Ministry of Transportation, the total number of civil servants under these ministries are 684. The researcher adopted convenience sampling approach in selecting 4 ministries from the 18 ministries in Anambra State Civil Service. The sample size was determined using Taro Yamane’s formula, and 252 questionnaires were distributed. The proportion of the questionnaire to be administered to each ministry will be determined using the Bowley’s proportionate allocation formula. The major source of data for the study is the primary source. The primary source made use of questionnaire to collect information regarding employee engagement, employee involvement as variable tools for organization performance. However, overt attempts were made to compliment the primary data with the secondary information gotten through literature review. The questionnaire developed for this study was subjected to content validity. The questionnaire was designed in a very simple language to avoid ambiguity, misinterpretation or misunderstanding of the
questions or statements. The Spearman-Brown Formula Split-Half Reliability Likert Tests was measured by using the Cronbach’s alpha test. In order for measurements to be acceptable, the minimum acceptable level of the Cronbach’s alpha score should be equal to or more than 0.70 (alpha≥0.70), as suggested by Sekaran (2003). The Cronbach’s alpha score for the item is 0.964 indicating an excellent internal consistency.

4. Test of Hypothesis

Hₐ: There is a significant positive correlation between employee involvement and goal achievement in Anambra State Civil Service.

Table 1. Correlation Result of Responses on Employee Involvement and Goals Achievement in Selected Ministries in Anambra State Civil Service

| Pearson Correlation | Employee Involvement | Goal Achievement |
|---------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| **Employee Involvement** | 1 | .768** |
| sig. (2 tailed) | | .000 |
| N | 240 | 240 |
| **Goal Achievement** | .768** | 1 |
| Sig. (2 Tailed) | .000 | |
| N | 240 | 240 |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: SPSS Analysis, 2016.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics Results on Questions Relating to Employee Involvement and Goals Achievement in Selected Ministries in Anambra State Civil Service

| N | SUM | MEAN | Standard Deviation |
|---|-----|------|--------------------|
| QUE01 | 240 | 918.00 | 3.825 | .57469 |
| QUE02 | 240 | 925.00 | 3.854 | 1.0645 |
| QUE03 | 240 | 870.00 | 3.625 | .84462 |
| QUE04 | 240 | 934.00 | 3.891 | 1.0990 |
| QUE05 | 240 | 858.00 | 3.575 | .91555 |
| QUE06 | 240 | 879.00 | 3.663 | .17270 |
| QUE07 | 240 | 702.00 | 2.925 | .92676 |
| QUE08 | 240 | 825.00 | 3.437 | .20131 |
| QUE09 | 240 | 921.00 | 3.837 | 1.2930 |
| QUE10 | 240 | 858.00 | 3.575 | .75438 |

Valid N (listwise)

Source: Field Survey, 2016.
5. Discussion of Findings and Conclusion

After analysis of collected data, the following was discovered. The result from the Pearson’s product moment correlation using SPSS shows positive (0.768), this means that there is a significant relationship between employee involvement and organizational performance in Anambra State Civil Service.

The study discovered that there is a significant relationship between employee involvement and goal achievement in Anambra State Civil Service. The study found that the lower level employees in the civil service are in serious need of employee engagement, as this would enable the organization to tap into their potential. Eisenberger (2001) in support of the above posit that positive actions directed at employees by the organization contributes to the establishment of high quality exchange relationship, whereby both parties get the best from each other. Thus when employee engagement is well utilized in an organization, employees are most likely to put in their best. Low employee involvement in decision-making would not lead to a high employee turnover but rather to low employee commitment. Involving employees in decision making would contribute effectively to the implementation of decisions. Involvement of employees in decision making may be low when knowledge skills and abilities on specific matters are needed to arrive at a decision. When employees lack these needed skills, involving them would make the decision making process rather long and cumbersome leading to delays.

There is a positive relationship between employee involvement and goal achievement in Anambra State Civil Service, as shown by the positive result of 0.7. The system and process of the organization should be made clear to employees as this would enable employees perform better. Employee engagement would boost employees morale and performance generally, most especially the type that takes motivational aspects like feedback on performance, and recognition for success.

6. Recommendations

In light of these findings, the following are recommended:

1) Employees should be continuously briefed on all issues which affect the organization and its workers. Information must be communicated in such a way that all employees no matter the level is aware of what is going on in the organization at any particular point in time. This can be achieved by holding regular meetings at the departmental level to discuss issues and at that level every employee should given an opportunity to air their views and make suggestions on how to make their work procedures efficient and effective.

2) That employee should also be given responsibility to own their outcomes both positive and negative and they should be allowed to make decisions appropriate at their level of authority without checking everything out with their bosses. They should be coached to plan and manage their time well and encouraged to see their fellow workers as team members and resources for help.
3) Employees should be involved by asking them to input ideas to appreciate the respective roles they play in decision implementation. It is important that they should have the requisite knowledge, skills and ability to play their roles effectively and so training should form an integral part of their working life in the organization. They should be made to understand that their contributions to decision-making process comes in various and different ways and not necessarily through sitting in on meetings.

4) The views of employees should be sought on matters that affect their lives and work in the organization as this would lead to an increase in productivity and would create an atmosphere of harmony and belongingness. When this happens, employees would be willing to give off their best in all situations to see to the progress of the organization.
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Appendix A

Questionnaire on Employee Engagement and Goal Achievement

Instruction: Agree=A, Strongly Agree=SA, Disagree=D, Strongly Disagree=SD. Please tick (√) as it represents your view.

| S/N | QUESTIONS                                                                 | SA | A | UN | D | SD |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|----|---|----|
| 1   | Employee Involvement<br>My performance would improve if I am given more control over their job |    |    |    |    |    |
| 2   | A reasonable level of involvement in decisions that are being Made by superiors would increase my performance |    |    |    |    |    |
| 3   | Belonging to an autonomous work group would help me express themselves better |    |    |    |    |    |
| 4   | Regular feedback on my performance would motivate me                       |    |    |    |    |    |
| 5   | Effective communication with my superiors would give me a clear sense of direction |    |    |    |    |    |
| 6   | Goal achievement<br>Clear goals will facilitate my attainment of results and predetermined objectives |    |    |    |    |    |
| 7   | The organization system and work process enhances my task accomplishment |    |    |    |    |    |
| 8   | My job schedule is such that can make me meet deadline                      |    |    |    |    |    |
| 9   | Having enough time to complete a task enhances my performance               |    |    |    |    |    |
| 10  | Assigning challenging and interesting assignments to employees increases my sense of responsibility |    |    |    |    |    |

Appendix B

Sample Size Determination and Reliability Test

The sample size was determined using Taro Yamane’s formula as follows:

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} \]

Where \( n \)=sample size, \( N \)=total population, \( e \)=error margin.

Substituting in the formula, we have

\[ n = \frac{684}{1 + 684(0.05)^2} \]

\[ n = \frac{684}{2.71} \]

Published by SCHOLINK INC.
n=252.

**Reliability of Instrument**

Workings for Coefficient Alpha Also Known As Cronbach’s Alpha Using Spearman-Brown Formula Split-Half Reliability Likert Tests.

\[
\Gamma_{SB} = \frac{2r_{hh}}{1 + r_{hh}}
\]

Where \( r_{hh} \) = Pearson correlation of scores in the two half tests.

The Pearson correlation of scores in the two half tests is 0.931

Applying:

\[
\Gamma_{SB} = \frac{2 \times 0.93}{1 + 0.931} = 1.862 \\
\Gamma_{SB} = 0.964
\]

**Appendix C**

**Analysis of Research Question**

**QUE00001**

|       | frequency | percent | Valid percent | Cumulative percent |
|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| SA    | 109       | 46      | 46            | 46                 |
| A     | 85        | 36      | 36            | 81.8               |
| D     | 20        | 8.3     | 8.3           | 90.3               |
| valid | SD        | 23      | 9.7           | 9.7                |
| Total | 240       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

*Source: Field Survey, 2016.*

**QUE00002**

|       | frequency | percent  | Valid percent | Cumulative percent |
|-------|-----------|----------|---------------|--------------------|
| SA    | 121       | 52       | 52            | 52                 |
| A     | 58        | 24.9     | 24.9          | 76.8               |
| D     | 20        | 8.5      | 8.5           | 85.4               |
| valid | SD        | 34       | 14.6          | 14.6               |
| Total | 240       | 100.0    | 100.0         |                    |

*Source: Field Survey, 2016.*
### QUE00003

|        | frequency | percent | Valid percent | Cumulative percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| SA     | 106       | 45.2    | 45.2          | 45.0               |
| A      | 60        | 25.7    | 25.7          | 70.3               |
| D      | 30        | 12.6    | 12.6          | 83.0               |
| valid  |           |         |               |                    |
| SD     | 40        | 16.8    | 16.8          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 240       | 100.0   | 100.0         | 100.0              |

*Source: Field Survey, 2016.*

### QUE00004

|        | frequency | percent | Valid percent | Cumulative percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| SA     | 122       | 52.8    | 52.8          | 52.8               |
| A      | 65        | 28.1    | 28.1          | 80.9               |
| D      | 24        | 10.4    | 10.4          | 91.3               |
| valid  |           |         |               |                    |
| SD     | 20        | 8.7     | 8.7           | 100.0              |
| Total  | 240       | 100.0   | 100.0         | 100.0              |

*Source: Field Survey, 2016.*

### QUE00005

|        | frequency | percent | Valid percent | Cumulative percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| SA     | 125       | 53.6    | 53.6          | 53.6               |
| A      | 52        | 22.4    | 22.4          | 75.7               |
| D      | 32        | 13.7    | 13.7          | 89.6               |
| valid  |           |         |               |                    |
| SD     | 24        | 10.3    | 10.3          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 240       | 100.0   | 100.0         | 100.0              |

*Source: Field Survey, 2016.*

### QUE00006

|        | frequency | percent | Valid percent | Cumulative percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| SA     | 119       | 52.2    | 52.2          | 52.2               |
| A      | 53        | 23.2    | 23.2          | 75.4               |
| D      | 27        | 11.9    | 11.9          | 87.2               |
| valid  |           |         |               |                    |
| SD     | 29        | 12.7    | 12.7          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 240       | 100.0   | 100.0         | 100.0              |

*Source: Field Survey, 2016.*
### QUE00007

|   | frequency | percent | Valid percent | Cumulative percent |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| SA | 40        | 17.4    | 17.4          | 17.4               |
| A  | 20        | 8.7     | 8.7           | 26.0               |
| D  | 50        | 21.7    | 21.7          | 47.8               |
| valid |          |         |               |                    |
| SD | 120       | 52.2    | 52.2          | 100.0              |
| Total | 240      | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

*Source: Field Survey, 2016.*

### QUE00008

|   | frequency | percent | Valid percent | Cumulative percent |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| SA | 63        | 26.5    | 26.5          | 26.5               |
| A  | 101       | 42.5    | 42.5          | 69.2               |
| D  | 40        | 17      | 17            | 86.1               |
| valid |          |         |               |                    |
| SD | 33        | 14      | 14            | 100.0              |
| Total | 240      | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

*Source: Field Survey, 2016.*

### QUE00009

|   | frequency | percent | Valid percent | Cumulative percent |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| SA | 125       | 53.7    | 53.7          | 53.7               |
| A  | 52        | 22.3    | 22.3          | 75.9               |
| D  | 24        | 10.5    | 10.3          | 86.2               |
| Valid |          |         |               |                    |
| SD | 32        | 13.7    | 13.7          | 100.0              |
| Total | 240      | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

*Source: Field Survey, 2016.*

### QUE00010

|   | frequency | percent | Valid percent | Cumulative percent |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| SA | 119       | 54.1    | 54.1          | 54.1               |
| A  | 44        | 20      | 20            | 74.0               |
| D  | 27        | 12.27   | 12.27         | 86.3               |
| Valid |          |         |               |                    |
| SD | 30        | 13.63   | 13.68         | 100.0              |
| Total | 240      | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

*Source: Field Survey, 2016.*