RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPERVISOR SUPPORT AND WORK ENGAGEMENT

Noorisha Muzafar[1*], Humaira Saddique[2], Rubina Jabeen[3]

Abstract

Aim: The aim of the study was to assess the relationship between supervisor support and work engagement.

Methodology: A descriptive correlation research study design was conducted to assess the relationship between supervisor support and work engagement. An adopted version of questionnaire was used to collect the data from the participants. The population was targeted by the convenient sampling technique. The study population was staff nurses of tertiary hospital, Lahore and 200 population size was used which was deliberated from **Slovin's Formula.** The data were analyzed through the statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) version-21.

Result: The overall result of the study shown that supervisor support has positive relationship with work engagement. The Cronbach alpha, Bartlett's, KMO and Kolmogorov Smirnov test, Correlation, Data Normality and Regression test values have been checked to ensure the validity and reliability in our context. The values show positive and significant results and tools were considered as reliable and valid for performing statistical analysis.

Conclusion: The supervisor support should have positive relationship with work because if the supervisor will support the worker, it will get more motivation and courage from the supervisor then definitely it will work more effectively and efficiently then the organizational goals will met and the organization will get benefit from it. Therefore, supervisor support is an important predictor of work engagement for nurses.

Key words: Supervisor Support **(SS)**, Work Engagement **(WE).**

[1*]BSN(Generic) Student, The Superior University Department of Nursing
[2]Faculty, The Superior University Department of Nursing

*Corresponding Author: Noorisha Muzafar
*BSN(Generic) Student, The Superior University Department of Nursing
Email: noorishamuzafar998@gmail.com

Introduction:

Work engagement is one of the most important factors in a healthcare setting, because it is directly related to the health and wellbeing of the patients(1).

Support from a supervisor is described as how much that person values and cares about the work that their employees do. A competent supervisor with strong supervisor support is one who gives workers a sense of being heard, valued, and cared for(2). Although it may seem straightforward, making the switch from employee to supervisor is one of the most difficult changes to make. Consider your approach to this challenge if you are a manager or supervisor(3).

Consequently, why is supervisor assistance so crucial for productive work performance? Considering that it is one of the major behaviors that affect employees and their best effort is given(4). In Organizational research has identified a wide range of positive outcomes linked to high supervisor support(5), including: Enhanced job satisfaction, Stronger person-organization fit (degree to which personality, beliefs, and values align with organizational culture), and Enhanced organizational citizenship behaviours (OCB), performance in roles and outside of roles, connections with supervisor, and employee views of the organization's support have all improved. Decreased workplace strain, work-family conflict, and turnover (a secondary effect)(6).

A competitive advantage at work can be ensured through effective supervision. The impact of higher authority and working hours are seen to be crucial for enhancing employees' performance(7).
According to the positive affectivity hypothesis, employees who have a positive outlook are more liked and supported by their managers because they are more outgoing and likeable(8).

Workplace spirituality also played a role in explaining the link between effective supervisory practices and work engagement(9). The association between positive supervisor behaviors and employee performance was mediated by work engagement, while the relationship between positive supervisor behaviors and work engagement was mediated by workplace spirituality, confirming the serial mediation(10).

Since positive supervisor behaviors and employee performance are related, workplace spirituality and engagement are crucial links in the chain that helps to explain it(11). These contradictions suggest that further theoretical work is required because the negative feedback reduces performance goals and objectives as well as individuals' personal effort(12).

Supervisor support was found as one of the main criteria identified as a fundamental factor to inform employee engagement(13). Effective supervisor support is a higher-order, multi-dimensional construct comprising self-awareness, balanced processing of information, relational transparency, and internalized moral standards. Research studies show that engagement occurs naturally when supervisors are inspiring(14).

Supervisors are responsible for communicating that the employees" efforts play a major role in overall organization success(15). When employees work is considered important and meaningful, it leads obviously to their interest and engagement. Authentic and supportive supervisor is theorized to impact employee engagement of followers in the sense of increasing their involvement, satisfaction and enthusiasm for work(16).

Kahn (1990) found that supportive and trusting interpersonal relationships, as well as a supportive supervisor, promote employee engagement(17). An open and supportive environment is essential for employees to feel safe in the workplace and engage totally with their responsibility(18). Supportive environments allow members to experiment and to try new things and even fail without fear of the consequences(19).

Another researcher found that relationships in the workplace had a significant impact and as one of the components of employees" engagements(20).

Research Methodology

A descriptive cross-relational research study design was conducted to assess the relationship between supervisor support and work engagement. The study setting was Jinnah Hospital Lahore. The study took approximately nine months. The study targeted population was Staff Nurses of Jinnah Hospital Lahore. The study sample was calculated by using Slovin's formula. Convenient sampling technique was used to gather information. All Nurses of Jinnah hospital was included in the study. Student nurses, Head nurses, Nurses who are on leave, Administrative nurses were excluded from the study.

Table no: 01

Table no: 01 shows that who responded in the study from the total population. Those with the age group from 20-25 were 65(32.5%), those with the age

group from 25-35 were 94(47.0%), those with the age group 35-45 were 36(18.0%), similarly those with the age group above 45 were 5(2.5%). female were 187(93.5%), male were 13(6.5%). Married were 126(63.0%), Unmarried were 68(34.0%), Divorce were 6(3.0%). according to qualification General Nursing were 98(49.0%), BSN Generic were 89(44.5%), Masters in nursing 4 (2.0%), LHV were 9(4.5%). those who are experienced less than 1 year 8(4.0%), 1 year-3 year 59(29.5%), 4 year-6 year 37(18.5%), above 6 years 96(48.%). working in departments in OT were 18(9.0%), in ICU were 72(36.0%),, in ward were 91(45.5%), in emergency were 19 (9.5%).

	Frequency (%)	Cumulative Percentage (%)
Age		
20-25	65(32.5)	32.5
25-35	94(47.0)	79.5
35-45	36(18.0)	97.5
Above.45	5(2.5)	100.0
Gender		
Female	187(93.5)	63.0
Male	13(6.5)	100.0
Marital. Status		
Married	126(63.0)	63.0
Unmarried	68(34.0)	97.0
Divorce	6(3.0)	100.0
Qualification		
General. Nursing	98(49.0)	49.0
BSN Generic	89(44.5)	93.5
Masters In Nursing	4(2.0)	95.5
LHV	9(4.5)	100.0
Experience		
Less than 1 year	8(4.0)	4.0
1year-3year	59(29.5)	33.5
4year-6year	37(18.5)	52.0
Above 6 years	96(48.0)	100.0
Department		
OT	18(9.0)	9.0
ICU	72(36.0)	45.0
Wards	91(45.5)	90.5
Emergency	19(9.5)	100.0

Table no:02

Table no:02 shows that From total participants who responded about the question "My supervisor is supportive when I have a work problem", those who responded disagree were 24(12.0%), neutral were 54(27.0%), agree were 68(34.0%), and strongly agree were 54 (27.0%).Participants who responded about the question " My supervisor is fair and does not show favoritism in responding to employees personal or families", those who responded disagree were 66(33.0%), neutral were 47(23.5%), agree were 56(28.0%), strongly agree were 31(15.5%). Participants who responded about the question "My supervisor accommodates me when I have family or personal business to take care of those who responded strongly disagree were 15(7.5%), disagree were 33(16.5%), neutral were 54(27.0%), agree were 82(41.0%), strongly agree were 16(8.0%).Participants who responded about the question "My supervisor is understanding when I talk about personal or family issues with my supervisor", those who responded strongly disagree were 24(12.0%), disagree were 18(9.0%), neutral were 69(34.5%), agree were 62(31.0%), strongly agree were 27(13.5%).

	Frequency (%)	Cumulative percentage
My supervisor is supportive when I have a work problem?		
Disagree	24(12.0)	12.0
Neutral	54(27.0)	39.0
Agree	68(34.0)	73.0
Strongly agree	54(27.0)	100.0

My supervisor is fair and does not show favoritism in responding to employees personal or families.		
Disagree	66(33.0)	33.0
Neutral	47(23.5)	56.5
Agree	56(28.0)	84.5
Strongly Agree	31(15.5)	100.0
My supervisor accommodates mw when I have personal or family business to take care of e.g. medical appointments, meeting with child teacher etc.		
Strongly disagree	15(7.5)	7.5
Disagree	33(16.5)	24.0
Neutral	54(27.0)	51.0
Agree	82(41.0)	92.0
Strongly Agree	16(8.0)	100.0
My supervisor is supportive when I talk about personal or family issues.		
Strongly Disagree	24(12.0)	12.0
Disagree	18(9.0)	21.0
Neutral	69(34.5)	55.5
Agree	62(31.0)	86.5
Strongly Agree	27(13.5)	100.0
I feel comfortable bringing up personal or family issues with my supervisor.		
Strongly Disagree	42(21.0)	21.0
Disagree	55(27.5)	48.5
Neutral	50(25.0)	73.5
Agree	35(17.5	91.0
Strongly Agree	18(9.0)	100.0

Table no: 03

Table no: 03 shows that from total participants who responded about the question "at my work I feel bursting with energy'', those who responded disagree were 21(10.5%), neutral were 50(25.0%), agree were 73(36.5%), strongly agree were 56(28.0%).Participants who responded about the question "I find the work that is full of meaning and purpose'' who responded disagree were 64(32.0%) neutral were 42(21.0%), agree were 59(29.5%), strongly agree were 35(17.5%).Participants who responded about the question "time flies when I am working'', those who responded strongly disagree were 12(6.0%), disagree were 32(16.0%), neutral were 58(29.0%), agree were 81(40.5%), strongly agree were 17(8.5%). Participants who responded about the question "at my job, I feel strong and vigorous'', those who responded strongly disagree were 23(11.5%), disagree were 16(8.0%), neutral were 71(35.5%), agree were 59(29.5%), and strongly agree were 31 (15.5%). Participants who responded about the question "I am enthusiastic about my job'', those who responded strongly disagree were 39(19.5%), disagree were 48(24.0%), neutral were 52(26.0%), agree were 40(20.0%), strongly agree were 21(10.5%).

At my work I feel bursting with energy.		
Disagree	21(10.5)	10.5
Neutral	50(25.0)	35.5
Agree	73(36.5)	72.0
Strongly Agree	56(28.0)	100.0
I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose.		
Disagree	64(32.0)	32.0
Neutral	42(21.0)	53.0
Agree	59(29.5)	82.5
Strongly Agree	35(17.5)	100.0
Time flies when I am working.		
Strongly Disagree	12(6.0)	6.0
Disagree	32(16.0)	22.0
Neutral	58(29.0)	51.0
Agree	81(40.5)	91.5
Strongly Agree	17(8.5)	100.0

At my job I feel strong and vigorous.		
Strongly disagree	23(11.5)	11.5
Disagree	16(8.0)	19.5
Neutral	71(35.5)	55.0
Agree	59(29.5)	84.5
Strongly Agree	31(15.5)	100.0
I am enthusiastic about my job.		
Strongly disagree	39(19.5)	19.5
Disagree	48(24.0)	43.5
Neutral	52(26.0)	69.5
Agree	40(20.0)	89.5
Strongly agree	21(10.5)	100.0

Correlation

Correlations

		SS	WE
Ss	Pearson Correlation	1	.251[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	200	200
We	Pearson Correlation	.251[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	200	200

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

This table shows that the relationship between supervisor support and work involvements is .251 which shows positive correlation and the P value is .000 which is less than .05 and considered as significant

Regression

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.251[a]	.063	.058	.74666

a. Predictors: (Constant), WE

As indicated in the table, we can see that R-square value is 0.58, which means that our independent variable which is WE causes 5.8% change in the dependent variable which is SS.

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	7.449	1	7.449	13.361	.000[b]
	Residual	110.384	198	.557		
	Total	117.833	199			

a. Dependent Variable: SS
b. Predictors: (Constant), WE

Anova results shows that p-value is 0.000 which is less than 0.05, hence graph shows that there is a significant relationship between our independent variable i.e. WE and the dependent variable i.e. SS.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.864	.353		5.284	.000
	We	.397	.109	.251	3.655	.000

a. Dependent Variable: SS

The table show the coefficients results. As indicated that the beta value is .251, which means that the change in independent variable WE by one unit will bring about the change in the dependent variable i.e. SS by .251.

Furthermore, the beta value is positive, which indicates the positive relationship between dependent variable SS and independent variable WE.

Discussion of result findings:

The descriptive co relational research study design was examining the relationship between supervisor support and work engagement. The study results show that the total respondents who respond to the study majority were female and majority were General Nursing and BSN Nursing and working in both (Private, Government) setting. The tool used for ''The relationship between supervisor support and work engagement,, was adopted. The overall result of this study is shown that supervisor support has positive relationship with work engagement. The Cronbach alpha, Bartlett's, KMO and Kolmogorov Smirnov test, Correlation, Data Normality and Regression test values have been checked to ensure the validity and reliability in our context. The values shows positive and significant results and tools were considered as reliable and valid for performing statistical analysis.

Conclusion

The study result shows that supervisor support directly relates to work engagement. So with the increase in supervisor support work engagement will also increase. The policy makers in an organization or organizational head will consider this issue that if they face any troublesome in work engagement, or their workers are not doing their best, the first priority of the organizational head is to ensure that how their supervisor are supporting them. If the workers are not getting support or not getting motivated or encourage for the work they do, definitely the worker will not do the work the organization demands. So the proper training of the supervisor is very necessary for effective work and better results. Therefore, supervisor support is an important predictor of work engagement for nurses.

Limitations:

1. Sample size is small which is 200 staff nurses of Jinnah hospital Lahore.
2. Due to shortage of time I gathered data only from the Jinnah hospital Lahore.

3. Because of their busy schedule and so much work load nurses were not interested in giving data.

Recommendations:

1. I use convenient sampling technique future researcher can use other methods too.
2. Future researcher would also compare and check supervisor support and its relationship from other departments of different hospitals.
3. The study recommends that SS has positive relationship with WE so, increase supervisor support for effective work and good result
4. This study also recommends that some workers does not thinks positive about supervisor so, change their perception about supervisor.

REFERENCES:

1. Van Bogaert P, Peremans L, Van Heusden D, Verspuy M, Kureckova V, Van de Cruys Z, et al. Predictors of burnout, work engagement and nurse reported job outcomes and quality of care: a mixed method study. BMC nursing. 2017;16(1):1-14.
2. Franzosa E, Tsui EK, Baron S. "Who's caring for us?": Understanding and addressing the effects of emotional labor on home health aides' well-being. The Gerontologist. 2019;59(6):1055-64.
3. Lee A. How can we develop supervisors for the modern doctorate? Studies in Higher Education. 2018;43(5):878-90.
4. Kim YJ, Kim WG, Choi H-M, Phetvaroon K. The effect of green human resource management on hotel employees' eco-friendly behavior and environmental performance. International Journal of Hospitality Management. 2019;76:83-93.
5. Bailey C, Madden A, Alfes K, Fletcher L. The meaning, antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. International journal of management reviews. 2017;19(1):31-53.
6. Asghar M, Gull N, Bashir M, Akbar M. The impact of work-family conflict on turnover intentions: the moderating role of perceived family supportive supervisor behavior. Journal of Hotel and Business Management. 2018;7(1):2169-0286.
7. Berberoglu A. Impact of organizational climate on organizational commitment and perceived organizational performance: empirical evidence from public hospitals. BMC health services research. 2018;18(1):1-9.

8. Jolly PM, Kong DT, Kim KY. Social support at work: An integrative review. Journal of Organizational Behavior. 2021;42(2):229-51.

9. Arokiasamy A, Tat H. Exploring the influence of transformational leadership on work engagement and workplace spirituality of academic employees in the private higher education institutions in Malaysia. Management Science Letters. 2020;10(4):855-64.

10. De Carlo A, Dal Corso L, Carluccio F, Colledani D, Falco A. Positive supervisor behaviors and employee performance: The serial mediation of workplace spirituality and work engagement. Frontiers in Psychology. 2020;11:1834.

11. Bayighomog SW, Araslı H. Workplace spirituality–customer engagement Nexus: the mediated role of spiritual leadership on customer–oriented boundary–spanning behaviors. The Service Industries Journal. 2019;39(7-8):637-61.

12. Mekler ED, Brühlmann F, Tuch AN, Opwis K. Towards understanding the effects of individual gamification elements on intrinsic motivation and performance. Computers in Human Behavior. 2017;71:525-34.

13. Lemon LL, Palenchar MJ. Public relations and zones of engagement: Employees' lived experiences and the fundamental nature of employee engagement. Public Relations Review. 2018;44(1):142-55.

14. Kanat-Maymon Y, Elimelech M, Roth G. Work motivations as antecedents and outcomes of leadership: Integrating self-determination theory and the full range leadership theory. European Management Journal. 2020;38(4):555-64.

15. ErajesvariePillay DS. The impact of employee engagement on organisational performance â€"A case of an insurance brokerage company in Gauteng. IOSR Journal of Business and Management. 2018;20(6):66-76.

16. Vila-Vázquez G, Castro-Casal C, Álvarez-Pérez D, del Río-Araújo L. Promoting the sustainability of organizations: Contribution of transformational leadership to job engagement. Sustainability. 2018;10(11):4109.

17. Bulińska-Stangrecka H, Iddagoda YA. The relationship between inter-organizational trust and employee engagement and performance. 2020.

18. Chamberlin M, Newton DW, Lepine JA. A meta-analysis of voice and its promotive and prohibitive forms: Identification of key associations, distinctions, and future research directions. Personnel Psychology. 2017;70(1):11-71.

19. Pihkala P. ECO-ANXIETY, TRAGEDY, AND HOPE: PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SPIRITUAL DIMENSIONS OF CLIMATE CHANGE: with Karl E. Peters,"Living with the Wicked Problem of Climate Change"; Paul H. Carr,"What Is Climate Change Doing to Us and for Us?"; James Clement van Pelt,"Climate Change in Context: Stress, Shock, and the Crucible of Livingkind"; Robert S. Pickart,"Climate Change at High Latitudes: An Illuminating Example"; Emily E. Austin,"Soil Carbon Transformations"; David A. Larrabee,"Climate Change and Conflicting Future Visions"; Panu Pihkala,"Eco-Anxiety, Tragedy, and Hope: Psychological and Spiritual Dimensions of Climate Change"; Carol Wayne White,"Re-Envisioning Hope: Anthropogenic Climate Change, Learned Ignorance, and Religious Naturalism"; Matthew Fox,"Climate Change, Laudato Si', Creation Spirituality, and the Nobility of the Scientist's Vocation"; Christopher Volpe,"Art and Climate Change: Contemporary Artists Respond to Global Crisis"; Jim Rubens,"The Wicked Problem of Our Failing Social Compact"; and Peter L. Kelley,"Crossing the Divide: Lessons from Developing Wind Energy in Post-Fact America.". Zygon®. 2018;53(2):545-69.

20. Knight C, Patterson M, Dawson J. Work engagement interventions can be effective: a systematic review. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology. 2019;28(3):348-72.