

Factors of Employee Engagement and Organizational Development: Are they Linked?

Ibrahim Mkheimer, Salameh A. Mjlae

Abstract: *The paper's objective is investigating the relationships between employee engagement factors and organisational development in industrial firms in Jordan. And it aims to address the main question of the study which is Do employee engagement factors influence on organizational development. The study proposed a model that suggests that a significant employee engagement correlated with organizational development. The study used quantitative method approach and survey questionnaire to achieve its goals. The study used regression analysis to analyse the suggested conceptual framework due to the effective use of this method to test the hypotheses of the study. The study's sample was around 250 industrial firms employees represent different private firms operating in industrial zone in Sahab city (Jordan) with a response rate of 88.4 % (221 employees) Pearson correlation and linear regression as well (Confirmatory Factor Analysis) CFA was also used to test the relationships among the variables of the study. The results revealed that the factors of engagement implemented in the organizations had achieved level of development. The findings also found that there were great relationships between employee engagement factors and organisational development. This findings have important implications for management in order to enhance its development, specifically in connection to human resource development and employee's motivation. The study contributes to the academic studies that examined a model consisted of the factors of employee engagement and outcomes.*

Keywords: *Employee Engagement; Organizational Development; CFA; Industrial Firms.*

I. INTRODUCTION

In current dynamic competitive business complicated context, the employees encountered modern and new challenges. Therefore, the changes and not stability of workplace looks to be a usual. Most practitioners were agreed that successful organization adapt with these changes better than unsuccessful organizations. Employee engagement in the past years have transformed into committed employees rather satisfied employees (Avery et al, 2007) who become the main inducements in the success of their organizations and act as the force behind organizational development. The challenges that encounter all organizations were creating engaged employees. However, employee engagement may impact the organizational performance and productivity. (Pauken, 2008)

Revised Manuscript Received on January 15, 2020.

Ibrahim Mkheimer, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Terengganu Malaysia. Email: amkhiemer97@gmail.com

Salameh A. Mjlae *, Prince Abdullah bin Ghazi faculty of IT, Al-Balqa Applied University Al-Salt, Jordan. Email: Dr.s-mjlae@bau.edu.jo

demonstrated the main side of the problem was to discover the circumstances which engage the employees, as well these circumstances make the employees to be disengaged. Scholar has connected employee engagement with organizational culture, and the organizations are interested in understanding if the employee's conditions show different levels of engagement (Corace, 2007). Employee engagement is counted as a main field of concern in industry sector.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Employee Engagement

To review the literature of the research, the self-determination theory SDT is the background to understand the importance of conducting new approaches. This theory was basically created in 19805 by Deci and Ryan to study the factors of employee engagement. They developed this theory which has been utilized a lot in academic contexts which also associated with the employee engagement. The theory is also related to normal tendencies to act in dynamic manner. Both human behaviour's and employee engagement are correlated directly to this theory and was the core of work engagement (Deci and Ryan, 1985). The engagement degree has emerged from the tendency of the staff to make a control of personal attitudes and wants. In this theory too both of disengagement and engagement are associated to the SDT in the employee's attitudes demonstrate a main driver and factor of innovation to state a professional behaviour. The engagement level of employees influences the corporate productivity as well and the motivation of employee is linked to job satisfaction (Deci and Ryan, 1985). When employees are not willing and don't want to show creative ideas and loyal attitudes, will be disengaged and providing not desired outcomes on organization's performance (Deci and Ryan, 1985).

The strategies effective implemented carried out through the business leaders might result a great high level of employee engagement (Blattner and Walter, 2015), customers satisfaction, loyalty and revenues (Bowen, 2016), and decreased rates of employee complaints and turnover (Barrick et al., 2015). Business leaders adopted the SDT to make their employees behave positively toward their business. Employee engagement is a critical issue for every organizations.

Deci and Ryan executed an influential research on employee engagement in 1985. They differentiate between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Efficiency and psychological needs motivate the employee to begin with a behaviour important for individual psychological health also if the satisfaction may lead to ultimate growth (Deci and Ryan, 1985). The major needs of satisfaction have been revealed directly related to employee's loyalty (Vandenabeele, 2014).

Shuck and Wollard (2010) defined the concept of employee engagement as a new term which draws positive relationships for employee towards the output either products or services of their organizations. The concept also described the willingness and ability of employees to employ their skills and competences in order to achieve organizational success (Markos and Sridevi, 2010). Employee engagement as well characterized a circumstance which the employee's works, thoughts and behaviours were consistent with their employer (Shuck and Wollard, 2009). It also represents a situation which fulfilment the organizational objectives and effectiveness may contribute in feelings of personal achievement (Maslach et al., 2001). Employee engagement has been connected to improve the corporate performance (Caplan, 2013). A study conducted in Middle East region proved that engaged employees not only showed greater performance, but also directly tried to strength the organization in crisis and critical cycle life (Singh et al., 2012). Employers now encounter challenges and difficulties in stating the definition of employee engagement, as there were variety of literature in this topic (Saks and Gruman, 2014).

Engagement is a feeling related to level of staffs' satisfaction with commitment with his/her job and organization. It is a great relationship which the employee has with his/her work. It is also a level which the employees commit to the job in their organization and indicates to how long they can stay and work in the organization as an outcome of this commitment (Council, 2004). Engagement can be measured by the degree which employees have a great level of satisfaction and emotional connection towards organization development and success. It also helps in creating an improvement, increases performance and support directly or indirectly in retaining employees and less turnover (Taylor, 2011). Employee engagement is not only characterized in positive attitudes and feelings during work, but also be stated as "organization citizenship attitude, commitment and high involvement work practices." It is used as an approach to make the staff work actively and creatively to achieve organizational objectives. (Purcell, 2010) classified the engagement practice in three types: (1) Intellectual aspect which refers to the degree that employees are melt in their jobs and think they can achieve it in effective and better manners (2) Affective Engagement which indicates to the people who feel positive and commitment about their job and organization; and (3) Social side states the point at which staffs talk about their job experiences positively and progress and development they made in work socially. the "engaged employee" can be described as the person who is deeply involved and so excited about his/her work and behave as much as the best they have in ways that enhance their

organization's goals.

B. Employee Engagement Drivers

Different major motivations which lead to make engagement and commitment for employees which were also familiar in business organisations. These motivations, therefore, depend on the type of business and organization, size of them and their industries also socioeconomic dimensions. In can summarized in some points; (1) Organisational justice concept is worded in 1964 by Wendell French and implemented by the psychologists to indicate the justice and equity which the companies adopt in their daily operations, It is also depend on fairness expectations come from workforce (Cropanzano, 1993). The employees automatically will exchange if they feel the organisation treat fairly all employee without any discrimination or bias and will do their works honestly which reflect on increasing their engagement (Saks, 2006). Organizational justice is connected with how the employees evaluate their organizations while treat them, are they feel fairly in their jobs and how these ways affect other work-related factors (Moorman, 1991). It impacts employees' behaviours consequently their productivity and the organisation's development (Moorman, 1991). (2) Compensation and Benefit are another unavoidable antecedent related to employee engagement.

They contain both financial and non-financial benefits like rewards and remuneration and other incentives such as good healthcare, social security subscription, housing loans and extra holidays. These benefits which the employee receive from their organizations make them more effective and do their works effectively and use the ways that save money and effort due to their high satisfaction and commitment (Anitha, 2014).

According to Social Exchange Theory (SET), good rewards and remunerations make employees feel forced to act with higher level of engagement, and high performance also the staff want to be remunerated and appreciated for the eminent work they achieve specifically when the salary and other incentives are related to productivity (Andrew and Sofian, 2011). A study revealed that the financial rewards, appreciation and compliment were considered important factors of work environment and a strong driver of engagement especially when implement a policy related to performance prevails at work (Koyuncu et al., 2006). On the contrary, lack of enough and appropriate remuneration package may induce the employees to appear careless and less creativity as well turnover and looking for a new job can fulfil their needs and maybe it will be a competitor for former organization (Koyuncu et al., 2006). (3) Training and Development is another influential factor has an effect of engagement. This factor has line with the job scope resource as suggested in Job Demands-Resources framework (Bakker et al., 2004). It brings bilateral importance to talent employees. This kind of driver can be classified as a genuine stimulus which that supports employees' development and build individual development through achieving major human needs like needs for self-management,

skills and qualifications (Deci et al., 1999). It provides several tools and methods for employees like knowledge and competencies, due to this benefits this factor stated as real motivator, these tools used in the job and are necessary for employees' achievements and career development (Leiter and Bakker, 2010).

C. Organizational Development

Since a long time, all organizations spend a lot of money in order to recruit qualified staffs and reduce their turnover. The shortage of talented and skilled employees importantly causes damage the organization. Additionally, organizations often do not provide enough effort and policies which aim to retain their employees. The concept of organization development is a process that implements a wide range of behaviors and practices to support in building organizations capacity to achieve greater performance and get high business outcomes like customer satisfaction (Cummings and Worley 2014). In the past decades, organizational development has witnessed different progress from a limited aspect and practice to a comprehensive and world approach to organisational development (Glassman and Cummings, 1991). Various factors and subsequent internationally have contributed in developing this term for example the increasing number in businesses which invade the global markets (Peterson, 1997) the need to apply approaches to achieve organizational development like quick growth and transformation of organizations in order to adapt with changes (Pettigrew et al., 2001) the increase in number of size and complicating of industrial economies as well technological interventions and wide prevalence of knowledge make all organizations to engage and to be aware for global changes so they need to design plans to overcome and adapt with these unavoidable changes (Cummings and Worley, 2014). According to (Blair et al., 2002), dealing and controlling of dramatic changes has demanded to adopt organizational development interventions that have major roles in dealing these changes that have turbulence and damage characteristics. However, the values and cultures might cause a conflict with these values in some societies. Therefore, the effectiveness of organizational development and the gap between the theory and practice in different cultures are major interests for practitioners (Blair et al., 2002).

D. Employee Engagement and Organization Development

Several studies discussed and analyzed the importance of having engaged employee and the impact on organization development and performance. All large and medium corporates in the world have started to pay more attention to employee engagement due to multiple reasons and benefits for this (Kane-Frieder et al., 2014). In competitive and productive environment, Marvin Weisbord said, "The quickest way to increase dignity, meaning, and community in a workplace is to involve people in the redesigning of their own work". He considered this the shortest way to reduce cost, increase quality, and get more satisfied customers (Weisbord, 2004). Although the benefits of having an engaged employee are obvious, the challenge is how to create and retain these engaged employees. The top management for organizations and some practitioners in organizational development are interested in this issue and they would like to make the engagement process easier like plug workforce into

this process and directly turn them into engaged and more productive people. Others conceived that the employee engagement was not like a plug activity. Making engaged people requires a long-term process and systemic strategies and policies and follow up the results and modify the plans in the light of these outcomes. It also requires designing appropriate work duties consistent with qualification and competences of the employees as well looking at daily connections between the top management and leaders and the employee who manage them (MacLeod and Clarke, 2009).

A research conducted by North-western University revealed that organizations with high rate of engaged employee has customer who repeats purchased and use more again their services and brands, this increasing in usage the products of the organization may lead to higher level of customers satisfaction (Cozzani and Oakley). The study showed that the organizations have engaged employees are 52% more profitable than organizations that have disengaged employee. Effective and successful organizations demonstrated in a global research that cooperation, partnership between leaders and employees and the concept of employee engagement are become key effective factors. This stream in this kind of studies has brought more attention of leaders who are really looking for the ways to develop their corporates. The idea of employee engagement often used to state the degree of commitment in organization's mission with the employees as described by behaviors to work environment (Poisat, 2006) and reaching the level of employees' commitment either emotional or personal to get addition progress in work (Lockwood, 2007). There was a modify trial of employee satisfaction (Kreitner et al., 1999) that is, "...an effective/emotional response towards various facets of one's job..." basically, employee engagement influences favorably on employee attitudes and lead to organizational development, as measured factor like productivity, profitability, customer satisfaction and corporate image, organization commitment, high rate of retention especially in volatile markets (Mathis and Jackson, 2011; Lockwood, 2007).

Furthermore, it is critical for any organization to make fertile environment to create employee engagement in order to prosper if they develop their perceptions and human capital assets. Macey and Schneider (2008) demonstrated that organizations should design positive circumstance for engagement and the employees come to work and want to be engaged. Although engaged employees linked to each other, the multidimensional impacts of collaboration lead to collective works that affects organizational development. Miller (2008) conducted a study aimed to assess the employee engagement. The data was collected data from manufacturing company employees on employee engagement, and the study instrument was a survey developed by Gallup organization to measure the level of employee engagement and its effect on organization performance. The study found that employee engagement was the major stimulus for organizational development. High involvement of engagement retains highly skilled and talent employee as well foster customer satisfaction, and develop organizational performance were also result of the study.

Factors of Employee Engagement and Organizational Development: Are they Linked?

Engagement was affected via various dimensions such as organization culture, communication ways, managerial approaches, trust and treatment (Lockwood, 2007). The purpose of this study is to evaluate how extent employee's engagement levels can effect on their commitments and if the engaged employee has an impact on development of organization of industrial firms in Jordan.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Theoretical Framework

A survey questionnaire was created to collect the data from targeted sample and study the impact made by the intended variables on organizational development. Hence the study instrument measured organizational development and organizational development. Organizational development was also measured to state the effect of employee engagement on organizational development. The participants were asked to indicate their response of each item on a seven-point Likert scale, rating from strongly agree to strongly disagree with respect to the different items which measured the concepts. The study instrument was validated using pilot study from many respondents. Reliability of these different factors through the instrument was presented to be statistically significant.

First step of the data analysis was reliability analysis to assess the internal consistency of the results and instrument used for data collection. At the second step the correlation analysis was conducted to test the correlation between the variables. The process of test the hypotheses suggested in the proposed model developing a questionnaire to a convenience sample of industrial firms' employees in AIE, evaluating the reliability of the scales, and carried out the regression test to investigate the relationship of between employee engagement and organization development. A total of 250 industrial firms' employees were included from several firms operating in AIE. After excluding 29 incomplete questionnaires 221 valid resulting a great rate of response about 88.4%. Some of the respondents prefer to answer the questionnaires online after providing them the link of the questionnaire during explaining the study's objectives. The researcher assured that the participation was anonymity and voluntary.

The theoretical framework of this study is illustrated in Figure 1. There are four factors of employee engagement: (1) Organization Justice (2) Leadership (3) Compensation and Benefits (4) Training and Development.




Figure 1 Theoretical Framework

From Figure 1 the purpose of the paper is to examine if there is a relationship between employee engagement factors and organizational development. The employee engagement indicators used in this study are organization justice, training & development, compensation and benefit. The conceptual

model also suggests that each type of employee engagement dimensions could be related to the organization development.

B. Hypotheses Development

In the study model the premise is that the variable of employee engagement with its dimensions was important indicators of organizations development. So, the following hypotheses were developed.

H1. There is a significant correlation between organization justice and organizational development.

H2. There is a significant correlation between compensation and benefits and organizational development.

H3. There is a significant correlation between training and development and organizational development.

C. Study Design

The population of this study is the employee of industrial firms working in Abdullah second Ibn Al-Hussein Industrial complex which was established in 1980s, it is located 12 Km south-east of Amman, comprises from more than (358) medium and small industries, hiring 13042 people with total investment volume of JD 1009.85 million, which is the largest industrial complex. The industry in Jordan is a major player and contributor to local economy, contributing around 22.5% of Gross Domestic Product GDP, about 90% of national export and hiring and 15% of the country's labor force. Jordan's industrial sector is consisting of basically mining, quarrying and manufacturing. The mining and quarrying primarily includes potash and phosphate contributed around 3.3% of GDP, whereas the manufacturing sector contributed 19.2% of GDP. This sector had a wide range of activities www.jordan.gov.jo. Sampling technique used in this study was convenient sampling. This method relies on data collection from the sample who are conveniently selected to participate in this research. In other words, this method means getting respondents wherever the researcher can find them and mainly wherever is convenient. No inclusion criteria in this type of sampling should be identified before to the selection of entities. Every population are asked to participate in the study. The rationales of using this type of sampling are its easiness to use and the data can be generated in less period as well it is the cheapest to implement. The sample represents the subjects of the population, sample size was 250 participants. Secondary data approach was used in the study diversified from research papers, articles and reports from the various sources which focus on the relevant variables of the study. The instrument to collect the data collection in this study was the survey questionnaire which commonly used as a tool in collection data on a seven-point Likert Scale from (1=Strongly Disagree to 7=Strongly Agree). Employee engagement was consisted of several criteria to measure the factors and items were linked with organizational development. Questionnaire is self-administered by employing a research assistant and collected from the respondents. Data analysis was conducted by using Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS 21).

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data were analysed by using SPSS software. Descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation and frequencies were conducted, Pearson correlation and analysis of variance (ANOVA) as well conducted in the data analysis.

The reliability test for the employee engagement ranks from 0.89 to 0.91. The Cronbach alpha coefficient for organization justice, compensation and benefits and training and development were 0.91, 0.89 and 0.90, respectively. The coefficient for organizational development was 0.80. These findings indicate good level of internal consistency in the responses due to Nunnally (1994) who indicated a 0.7 as cut-off of reliability coefficient to be acceptable. The descriptive statistics of the age of respondents ranged between 22 to above 50 years with mean 2.08 and standard deviation 0.940. Compared with female employee, male employee was the majority of this study 65.6%; the reason behind this result was the nature of working in industrial firms which require hard works like dealing with machines, so the employer prefer to hire male than female. 46.2% of the sample hold a diploma degree and less, 44.3% hold a bachelor's degree, and only 9.5% received higher degrees. The majority of employees 50.7% worked in lower managerial positions, 29.4% worked in non-management positions, 14% worked in middle management jobs and only 5.9% have senior managerial jobs. The experience variable was ranged between 1 and above 10 years with the mean and standard deviation of 2.07 and 0.800 accordingly. The characteristics of the sample indicated a combination of demographic characters represented in this study.

Table 1 Pearson Correlation Coefficients

Hypotheses	Independent Variables	Dependent Variable	Pearson Correlation Coefficients	Sig. (2-tailed)
H1	Organizational justice OJ	Organizational development	0.894**	0.000
H2	Compensation and benefits CB	Organizational development	0.941**	0.000
H3	Training and development TD	Organizational development	0.884**	0.000

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

A. Organizational Justice and Organizational Development

According to the theoretical framework, the first variable discussed in this study is the organizational justice prevalence in the surveyed firms which refers to how the employees evaluate the organization's behaviour toward their employees. The justice also refers to the idea that the decision is ethically appropriated and socially accepted which may be characterized based on ethics of society or norms like religion or law regulations. According to the responses of the sample, they believe that fair treatment of the firms to their employees will help in developing these firms and any discriminant attitudes toward them or distinguish between the employee based on their religion, race or geographic background or any consideration surly damage their reputation and may be deteriorate in the total performance. The sample expressed that the feeling with justice will increase the level of

engagement for employee also will make them involve more in the work and be loyal which surely enhance the organizations and achieve their strategic goals. Analysis of correlation matrix has revealed that the value of organization justice and organizational development is estimated to be 0.89 at significance level of 0.01. Finding showed that there was a significant correlation between these variables which means that the increasing in justice inside the organization will increase in the level of developing the organizations. In order to define the degree of the intensity of relationships between the two variables a value of R² which is 0.79 (0.89*0.89) revealed that there was a high variation of independent variable on dependent variable which means the amount of variance in the dependent variable is explained by independent variable. Results also have explained that 79% of variance caused by organizational justice, the reason behind this result is the applying the justice in daily operations in organizations is playing towards organizational development.

B. Compensation and Benefits and Organizational Development

Compensation and benefits don't include only tangible rewards like monetary form but also intangible rewards like acknowledgment and promotion. The forms of benefits offered by the companies to employees can be included pay day-off, medical insurance and allow them to participate in investment or saving funds. The analysis showed that the compensation and benefits provided to the employee have a positive relationship with organizational development. Compensation and benefits provided by the companies can create a highly involvement and make as an engine to push the employee towards more achievement and commitment which consequently lead to high rate of engagement which also effect of organization development. The responses demonstrated that the enough of benefits and compensations rendered make the employee feel satisfied also with job security and make as a motivator to achieve more. Analysis of correlation matrix has revealed also that the value of compensation and benefits and organizational development is estimated to be 0.94 at the significance level of 0.01.

This result showed that there was a strong correlation between these variables which means that the increasing compensation and benefits will increase in the level of developing the organizations. In order to define the degree of the intensity of relationship between the two variables a value of R² which is 0.88 (0.94*0.94) revealed that there was a high variation of independent variable on dependent variable which means the amount of variance obtained in the dependent construct which explained by independent variable. So, the results have explained that 88% of variance caused by compensation and benefits, the reason behind this result is the enough grants and incentives either financial or non-financial have effect in organizational development.

C. Training and Development and Organizational Development

Training and development indicate to daily activities done by the employee and develop their abilities and skills in order to do their current jobs effectively and the development idea is related to get ready employees for future tasks.

Factors of Employee Engagement and Organizational Development: Are they Linked?

It is a strategy has implemented by many of organization that aims to achieve their goals,

It is also identified in the light of organizations' needs and the previous gaps in the past which make these organization to deteriorate and lose market positioning or shares due to the lack or weak of training and development plans conducting by the companies. The sample expressed about this dimension and its importance in developing the employees' skills and make them more engaged also increase in organization development. Analysis of correlation matrix revealed that the value of training and development and organizational development is estimated to be 0.88 at the significance level of 0.01.

This result evidenced that there was a significant correlation between these variables which interprets that the increasing training and development plans will develop the organization. In order to determine the relationship between the two variables a value of R² which is 0.77 (0.88*0.88) manifested that there was a high variation of independent variable on dependent variable which explains the amount of variance in the dependent variable is explained by independent variable. The study can summarize that this finding with the training and development provided to develop the employee in all positions will develop an effective managerial context to accomplish organizations' goals.

D. Linear Regression Analysis

The purpose of linear regression analysis is used to test the nature of relationships among two variables. The purpose of using this test in this study is to analyze the influence of employee engagement dimensions on organizational development. This type of analysis also used to estimate the between the variables of the study positive or negative. Entering all variables at once to run the linear regression by using method enter which is the standard method of where all independent variables at the same time enter into the equation. This is an appropriate method when examine a small set of predictors and the researcher doesn't know which of these independent variables will explain the best prediction on dependent variable (Cohen, 1983).

Table 2: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.948a	0.899	.898	.15511

a. Predictors: organization justice OJ; compensation and benefits CB; and training and development TD

One of the important statistical outputs any researcher needs to conduct it is the Model Summary which describes the goodness of fit as well standard error of estimate. These outputs give us the extent of correlation of the independent variables with dependent variable. The table 2 above provide us the explanation of variance between dependant and independent variables. Findings have illustrated that the value of R² (90%) of variance in the dependent variable (organizational development) is interpreted by the independent variable which means that the all independent variables and dependant variable are correlated and have a significant relationship. Standard error of estimates explains the dispersion of the regression line. This table also shows a low result of standard error of estimate (0.15) which means that the real data is only 15% dispersed from the line of

regression. The coefficient for any variable indicates that the percentage of the change in the dependent variable would be explained from the change in certain independent variables.

Table 3: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	46.685	3	15.562	646.780	0.000
	Residual	5.221	217	.024		
	Total	51.906	220			

a. Dependent Variable: organizational development
b. Predictors: organization justice OJ; compensation and benefits CB; and training and development TD

ANOVA is stand for the Analysis of Variance, which used to prove if the results of the study are significant. In other words, they enable the scholars to decide if reject the null hypothesis or accept the alternate hypothesis also can compare between two or more means. It is also used to measure the significance level of a study. In the table 3 above shows the sum of squares demonstrates the total effect of employee engagement dimensions on organizational development; whereas the mean square of the model illustrates the average effect.

The sum of square of residual represents unsystematic errors in the data. Within the output given in ANOVA table the main interest of the researcher is to concentrate on the value of significance. This result represents that how probable the F-value of the size have appeared; in this study the significance is 0.000 which tell us that the chances appearance is less than 0.1%. If the P-value result in this output is less than the critical value i.e. 0.05 stated by the researcher than the effect is known to be significant and conversely if the P-value higher than the critical value will explains insignificant result. Our P-value as shown in table 3 has shown less than 0.05 meaning that the relationship between the variables is significant. So, the conclusion showed that there is a strong effect of organization justice; compensation and benefits; and training and development on organizational development. The direction of relationship can be concluded from the value of sum of squares which is 46.68 larger sum of square of errors which is 5.22. It proves that there is a significant positive relationship among the study's variables.

Table 4: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error			
1	(Constant)	0.708	0.132		5.357	0.000
	OJ	0.090	0.052	.100	1.733	0.085
	CB	0.599	0.057	.655	10.475	0.000
	TD	0.199	0.043	.219	4.590	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: organizational development

Regression also demonstrates the effect of one variable on other and shows how the dimensions of employee engagement impact on organizational development. From the coefficients table above which demonstrate that if the value of organizational justice JO is increased by 1 unit the increase in dependent variable organizational development will increase by 0.100 units. This displays that there is an insignificant effect of organizational justice on organizational development. The results are insignificant because the P-value in the table is 0.085 that is greater than the significant level (0.05). The reason of this non-significant result might be due to the smaller sample size as compared to the studies which found a significant relationship which the valid response for this study is only 221 as well as this research was conducted in one economic sector. Regression shows that there is a positive effect of compensation and benefits CB on organizational development.

This represents that if compensation and benefits is increasing by 1 unit then the organizational development is going to increase by 0.655 units. The results are highly significant because more compensation and benefits rendered means more engaged employee which also result in developing the organization. Training and development TD cause a positive impact on organizational development. Regression analysis shows that with the increase in 1 unit of independent variable (training and development TD) is going to be increased by 0.219 units. The p-value estimates for this variable is 0.000 which is less than 0.05 the level of significance and represents that the results are statistically significant. The reason behind this significant result is the employee are enthusiastic in training plans carried out by the organization and the level of development result from these plans which also enhance the organization.

E. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

As a preliminary step towards CFA and further as well sophisticated statistical analysis in this study; Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted in order to extract the factors related to latent variable and group them into a particular construct. It is a statistical method determines the correlation between the variables in the data. This part of analysis provides a factor structure which group the variables based on strong correlations among them. With using 0.6 as cut-off of factor loadings to make sure a strong correlation for factors, the study has got a good output of these factors with their components as show in table 5 below which present the three dimensions emerged and their respective items resulted from EFA procedure. The factor loading for all item is higher than 0.6. So, no item should be excluded since they got the acceptable ranges for factor loading of 0.6 (Awang, 2015). All items are useable to measure their latent constructs.


	Component		
	1	2	3
CB1	.808		
CB3	.800		
CB2	.776		
CB4	.771		
OJ1		.797	
OJ2		.787	

OJ4		.745	
OJ5		.715	
OJ3		.705	
TD1			.845
TD2			.839
TD3			.744
TD4			.661

Table 6 represents the value of KMO value which based on statisticians it shouldn't be less than 0.6 which indicate that the sampling is not adequate enough and that remedial process should be conducted (Cerny and Kaiser, 1977). Moreover, the KMO is a measure of sampling adequacy by is meritorious, since it exceeded the rule of thumb of 0.6. These results of this test were greater than 0.6 and indicates that the data is adequate to proceed further with the data reduction procedure.

Table 6: KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.878
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2450.44
	df	3
	Sig.	78
		0.000

In the process of development, a complicated scale, the CFA is an essential method to assess the structure of a questionnaire. It is often carried out after EFA to confirm the number of underlying latent constructs (components) and the type of observed variable and factor relationships (Brown, 2014).



A measurement model in the figure 2 above is executed with CFA and the items don't achieve the recommended threshold value (≥ 0.50) as recommended by Hair et al. (2006) should be deleted regardless pooled measurement model by removing first the lowest factor loading. The measurement model is fit if each fitness indexes achieved the acceptance level, for example for ($GFI \geq 0.90$, $RMSEA \leq 0.08$, and $CFI \geq 0.90$) (Hair et al. ,2006). The measurement model evidenced good model fitness. As suggested by (Bentler, 1990) and (Kline, 2015): $CMIN/DF < 3$; $CFI \geq 0.90$; $RMSEA \geq 0.08$ are considered fit. The measurement model finalized with a good model fit where ($CMIN/df = 1.399$, $P\text{-value} = 0.003$, $CFI = 0.981$, $RMSEA = 0.043$, $IFI = 0.981$, $GFI = 0.924$, $TLI = 0.977$ and $NFI = 0.937$). Therefore, the model fit indices have revealed to be achieving their outstanding criteria's.

CFA is designed to evaluate the validity of the constructs as well it is a type of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) procedure to examine the feasibility of measurement model prior integrate them into a complete SEM analysis.

V. CONCLUSION

This study has examined employee engagement factors namely; organizational justice; compensation and benefits; and training and development as potential factors of organizational development on a sample of employees of Jordanian industrial firms in industrial assembly in Sahab city. Industry sector play a major role in Jordan's economy system, and surely help in the growth of the local economy. The results revealed that there is a strong relationship between employee engagement factors and organisational development. This findings have important implications for management in order to enhance its development, specifically in connection to human resource development and

employee's motivation. We can conclude as a result in this study there is an increasing the importance of human capital in this complicated and competitive business environment, the employee engagement concept in all sectors has also protrude as a concern issue to be highlighted by scholars. In addition, the contribution in this work based on the lack of attempts which examined and measured employee engagement dimensions on organizational development in the Jordanian industry sector. Therefore, the research has been carried out to define how the factors of employee engagement correlate with the organizational development.

Two dimensions (training and development & compensation and benefits) of employee engagement were revealed to have positively explained organizational development, whereas only one of the employee engagements dimensions (organizational justice) insignificantly predicted organizational development. EFA results also showed a proper value for all statistical methods used in this study like KMO which greater than threshold of (0.6) based on experts mentioned in the text. CFA findings as well showed that all factors are important contributed based on the regression weights in the model to gauge the organizational development; the factors examined in the proposed model were significant at $P \text{ value} \leq 0.05$; the compensation and benefits as well training and employee development have a prime motivation in employee engagement, and the model possessed a satisfactory fit and was appropriate to measure organizational development. The model was developed to measure organizational development from in-depth literature review that primarily discussed a group of employee engagement factors and their measurement indicators.

Those factors and measurement indicators and the data were validated and tested for their reliability. The model also was tested by using several of statistical techniques, resulting in four constructs. These constructs have been subjected to CFA to assure that they are pertinent and define their relative importance into the framework. Additionally, the model fitness was specified by using common fitness indices like CFI, GFI and RMSEA. The model showed a satisfactory fit, determining that it might be used as measurement by management and scholars to gauge the organizational development.

Employee Engagement is a positive important attitude attributed by the staff towards their organizations and its objectives. It has rapid importance and prevalence among workplace settings and influence organizations success in different ways. Overall, the organization should hence focus on their employees more than any assess, as powerful engines to achieve high level of competitive against their competitors in the market. Primarily, the engaged employees can support their organizations also to fulfill their values and mission and implement effectively its strategy and generate great business positions. Therefore, engage the employees must be a continuous process of evaluation, support, measurement and validity. This work provides some noticeable implications for both scholars and practitioners. There is an obvious need for further studies to advance the current management understanding of the psychological attitudes supporting engagement, the comprehensive perception and status of the engagement variable.

REFERENCES

1. Andrew, O.C. and Sofian, S., (2011). Engaging people who drive execution and organizational performance. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 3(3), p.569.
2. Anitha, J., (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International journal of productivity and performance management*, 63(3), p.308.
3. Avery, D.R., McKay, P.F. and Wilson, D.C., (2007). Engaging the aging workforce: The relationship between perceived age similarity, satisfaction with co-worker's, and employee engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), p.1542.
4. Awang, Z., (2015). Validating the measurement model: CFA. A Handbook on SEM. 2nd edition ed: Kuala Lumpur: Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, pp.54-73.
5. Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E. and Verbeke, W., (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan and in alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management*, 43(1), pp.83-104.
6. Barrick, M.R., Thurgood, G.R., Smith, T.A. and Courtright, S.H., (2015). Collective organizational engagement: Linking motivational antecedents, strategic implementation, and firm performance. *Academy of Management journal*, 58(1), pp.111-135.
7. Bentler, P.M., (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological bulletin*, 107(2), p.238.
8. Blair, M., Sorensen, P., & Yaeger, T. (2002). OD Practitioner. *Journal of the Organization Development Network*, 34(1), <http://www.odnetwork.org/odponline>.
9. Blattner, J. and Walter, T.J., (2015). Creating and sustaining a highly engaged company culture in a multigenerational workplace. *Strategic HR Review*, 14(4), pp.124-130.
10. Bowen, D.E., (2016). The changing role of employees in service theory and practice: An interdisciplinary view. *Human Resource Management Review*, 26(1), pp.4-13.
11. Brown, T.A., (2014). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. Guilford Publications.
12. Caplan, J., 2013. *Strategic talent development: Develop and engage all your people for business success*. Kogan Page Publishers.
13. Cerny, B.A. and Kaiser, H.F., (1977). A study of a measure of sampling adequacy for factor-analytic correlation matrices. *Multivariate behavioral research*, 12(1), pp.43-47.
14. Cohen, J. (1983). The cost of dichotomization. *Applied psychological measurement*, 7(3), 249-253. Corace, C.J., (2007). *Engagement--Enrolling the Quiet Majority*. *Organization Development Journal*, 25(2).
15. Council, C.L., (2004). *Driving performance and retention through employee engagement*. Washington, DC: Corporate Executive Board, 32.
16. Cozzani, C.A. and Oakley, J.L., *Forum for People Performance and Measurement. Executive Summary. Incentive Performance Center. www.incentivecentral.org/pdf/employee_engagement_study.pdf* (accessed August, 2018).
17. Cropanzano, R.(Ed.), (1993). *Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management*. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.
18. Cummings, T.G. and Worley, C.G., (2014). *Organization development and change*. Cengage learning.
19. Deci, E. and Ryan, R.M., (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer Science & Business Media.
20. Deci, E.L., Koestner, R. and Ryan, R.M., (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological bulletin*, 125(6), p.627.
21. Glassman, A.M. and Cummings, T.G. eds., (1991). *Cases in organizational development*. Irwin Professional Publishing.
22. Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E. and Tatham, R.L., (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (Vol. 6).
23. Kane-Frieder, R. E., Hochwarter, W. A., & Ferris, G. R. (2014). Terms of engagement: Political boundaries of work engagement-work outcomes relationships. *Human Relations*, 67(3), 357-382.
24. Kline, R.B., (2015). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. Guilford publications.
25. Kompaso, S.M. and Sridevi, M.S., (2010). Employee engagement: The key to improving performance. *International journal of business and management*, 5(12), p.89.
26. Koyuncu, M., Burke, R.J. and Fiksenbaum, L., (2006). Work engagement among women managers and professionals in a Turkish bank: Potential antecedents and consequences. *Equal Opportunities International*, 25(4), pp.299-310.
27. Kreitner, R., Kinichi and Bluelens, (1999). *Organisational behaviour*.
28. Leiter, M.P. and Bakker, A.B., (2010). *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*. Psychology press.
29. Lockwood, N.R., (2007). *Leveraging employee engagement for a competitive advantage*, SHRM Research Quarterly. Alexandria, VA: SHRM Foundation.
30. Macey, W.H. and Schneider, B., (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and organizational Psychology*, 1(1), pp.3-30.
31. MacLeod, D. and Clarke, N., (2009). *Engaging for success: enhancing performance through employee engagement: a report to government*. London: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. www.berr.gov.uk/file52215.pdf (accessed August, 2018).
32. Markos, S., & Sridevi, M. S. (2010). Employee engagement: The key to improving performance. *International journal of business and management*, 5(12), 89.
33. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B. and Leiter, M.P., (2001). Job burnout. *Annual review of psychology*, 52(1), pp.397-422.
34. Mathis, R.L. and Jackson, J.H., (2011). *Human resource management: Essential perspectives*. Cengage Learning.
35. McKinsey and Company. (2010). *What Successful Transformations Share: McKinsey Global Survey Results*. McKinsey Quarterly, March.
36. Miller, S.L., (2008). *An Employee Engagement Assessment of XYZ Manufacturing Company*. Published thesis, The Graduate School University of Wisconsin-Stout.
37. Moorman, R.H., (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship?. *Journal of applied psychology*, 76(6), p.845.
38. Moreland, J. (2013, May 1). *The costs of ignoring employee engagement*. Fast Company. Retrieved from <http://www.fastcompany.com/3009012/the-costs-of-ignoring-employee-engagement>. Nunnally, J., (1994). *Psychometric theory*, 2.

Factors of Employee Engagement and Organizational Development: Are they Linked?

39. Pauken, P. D. (2008). A perfect match: decoding employee engagement–Part I: Engaging cultures and leaders. Industrial and commercial training.
40. Peterson, L.A., (1997). International HRD: What we know and don't know. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 8(1), pp.63-79.
41. Pettigrew, A.M., Woodman, R.W. and Cameron, K.S., (2001). Studying organizational change and development: Challenges for future research. Academy of management journal, 44(4), pp.697-713.
42. Poisat, P., (2006). A critical analysis of organisational strategies for employee engagement (Doctoral dissertation, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University).
43. Purcell, J., (2010). Building employee engagement. Acas.
44. Saks, A.M., (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Journal of managerial psychology, 21(7), pp.600-619.
45. Saks, A.M. and Gruman, J.A., (2014). What do we really know about employee engagement?. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 25(2), pp.155-182.
46. Sanford, B., (2002). The high cost of disengaged employees. Gallup Management Journal.
47. Shuck, B. and Wollard, K., (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. Human Resource Development Review, 9(1), pp.89-110.
48. Singh, R.K., Murty, H.R., Gupta, S.K. and Dikshit, A.K., (2012). An overview of sustainability assessment methodologies. Ecological indicators, 15(1), pp.281-299.
49. Taylor, R. (2011). Diversity and Engagement Go Hand in Hand.
50. Vandenaabee, W., (2014). Explaining public service motivation: The role of leadership and basic needs satisfaction. Review of Public Personnel Administration, 34(2), pp.153-173.
51. Weisbord, M.R., (2004). Productive workplaces revisited: Dignity, meaning, and community in the 21st century. John Wiley & Sons.
52. www.jordan.gov.jo

AUTHORS PROFILE



Ibrahim M. Mkheimer. is a Ph.D. holder from Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin (UNISZA) Malaysia. His academic interests include marketing and strategic management. He has around 9 years of experience in the field of public relations in the government sector in Jordan.



Salameh A. Mjlae. received his Ph.D. degree in Informatics and Computing from UniSZA | Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Malaysia. in 2019. he is currently a Professor at Balqa Applied University, Jordan. His research interests include Cloud Computing, Information Security, e-government and MIS.