

Supervisor and Co-Workers Relationship and Employee Engagement of Law Firms in Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

Quadri, Lukman Abimbola

Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt – Nigeria.

Email: lukman_quadri@uniport.edu.ng

Abstract: *This study examines the relationship between supervisor and co-workers relationship and employee engagement of law firms in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. Methodologically, the study used the survey research design. And the population of the study comprises of 50 employees randomly selected from 10 law firms in Port Harcourt. Data was collected for the study using questionnaire and the data collected was analysed using Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient. The result of the study showed that there is a relationship between supervisor relationship as well as co-workers relationship in relation to employee engagement of law firms. Based on the findings of the study, the study concluded that enhancement of the level of supervisor and co-workers relationship will further enhance the level of employee engagement in organizations and therefore recommended that law firms should provide an environment that is not only focused on infrastructure but freedom to make work more exciting and do away with monotonous work and free to have supervisor and coworker relationship in order to improve the level of employee engagement.*

Keywords: Coworkers Relationship, Supervisor Relationship, Engagement, Organizational Support, Performance, Productivity.

Introduction

As a result of the increased competitiveness of the corporate environment, there has been a steady growth in the number of studies and researches into employee engagement in the Nigerian workplace for more than a decade. This is because businesses have realized that employee engagement is critical to improving business outcomes and activities. Employee engagement is well known for increasing productivity, profitability, loyalty, and customer-focused services. According to a Gallup (2010) survey, companies with world-class, company-wide engagement grow their earnings per share at 3.9 times the rate of companies with weaker engagement in the same industry.

Employee engagement is critical for most service firms since human capital is their most valuable resource. As a result, it is critical for businesses to promote employee engagement, which may assist reduce costs while also increasing productivity, competitiveness, and ensuring that the best employees stay with the company. Employee engagement has been identified as one of the most important concepts in management since most firms find it difficult and difficult to actively involve their staff (Crawford, Bruce, Brooke, and Jenny, 2013). Employee engagement has been proposed and supported by various scholars as one of the most important aspects for assisting in the achievement of corporate goals without jeopardizing the competitive edge over competitors in the same industry.

According to Mohamed and Ali (2016), employee engagement is the level of commitment and involvement of an employee towards their organization and the values of the organization. They further stated that employees who are engaged would go beyond the call of duty to perform their role excellently. In engagement, people employ and expresses themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally in the course of performance their roles in an organization. (Mohamed and Ali, 2015)

In any firm, however, the level of employee work engagement is determined by the interaction between supervisors and coworkers. Employee relationships with coworkers and managers, according to May, Gilson, and Harter (2004), have an impact on psychological circumstances and employee engagement in the workplace. They went on to say that the relationship will enhance a sense of belonging and friendship in the workplace, which will lead to increased employee engagement. Coworkers and supervisors who are able to encourage and respect one another will build confidence and improve the psychological state of a secure and strong work engagement. Relationships in the workplace are vital for organizational life because they exist between persons in the workplace. Employee engagement is a psychological condition that helps people succeed at work (Macey & Schneider, 2008) and demonstrates how employees feel about their jobs and organizations.

In the literature, the importance of relationships with bosses and coworkers has been extensively discussed. The success of performance, personal aspirations, and examples or valuing models are all influenced by interpersonal relationships. Coworkers can establish behavioral norms that serve as both positive and negative role models. Employee engagement is a hot issue among researchers and practitioners since it is linked to a slew of beneficial outcomes for businesses. Employee engagement is important not only for the organization's results, but also for the employees' psychological well-being.

Statement of the Problem

The high rate of employee turnover in law firms across the country has piqued the interest of researchers and concerned citizens alike. Poor welfare packages, low levels of interaction between employees and supervisors, low levels of employee engagement, and poor leadership styles are just a few of the reasons for the high rate of employee turnover.

According to Maumeister and Leary (1995), when there is high level of relationship among co-workers, there is immense benefits from such relationship to the workers. Similarly sharing goals and knowledge probably makes workplace more satisfying and therefore, more enjoyable. These types of interactions keep employees engaged by facilitating communication and networking opportunities (Gene, Lyons & Tartaglia, 2010).

Several studies have been conducted in relation to employee engagement using other variables such as intention to stay, employee retention, team and co-worker relationship (Makera, Nasidi, Kamaruddeen & Jemaku, 2019; Adebayo, 2004; Okoye & Raymond, 2013). However there is shortage of studies with regards supervisor and co-worker relationship as it relates to employee engagement. It is as a result of this knowledge that this study seeks to examine supervisor and co-worker relationship on employee engagement of law firms in Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

Aim and Objective of the Study

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between supervisor relations and employee engagement. The research will also look into the link between coworker relationships and employee performance in law firms in Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

Hypothesis

- There is a significant relationship between supervisor relations and employee engagement in law firms in Port Harcourt, Nigeria..
- There is a significant relationship between co-workers relations and employee engagement in law firms in Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

Literature Review

Several researchers have explained employee engagement using various theoretical frameworks, and each of these researchers explained employee engagement from their own unique perspective. There is no universally accepted theoretical framework for employee engagement, as a result. However, because the purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between supervisors and coworkers in terms of employee engagement, the Job Demands-Resources Model developed by Bakker et al (2003) and the Social Exchange Theory developed by Levinson was used (1965).

Model of Job Demands and Resources

According to the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model, different organizations face different working environments, but these environments can always be classified into two general categories: job demands and job resources, resulting in an overarching model that can be applied to various occupational settings, regardless of the specific demands and resources involved. Job demands are those characteristics of a job that involve persistent physical and/or psychological (cognitive and emotional) effort and, as a result, are connected with physiological and/or psychological expenses. High work pressure, role overload, poor environmental conditions, and reorganization issues are all examples. Job resources are physical, psychological, social, and organizational aspects of a job that are either/or: (1) functional in achieving work goals; (2) reduce job demands and associated physiological and psychological costs; (3) stimulate personal growth and development (Bakker et al., 2003). As a result, the JD-R model can explain why employees are more likely to engage with their work when they have access to job-related resources from their employer. Salminen et al., 2014; Salanova et al., 2005; Bakker et al., 2005; Hakanen et al., 2006; Schaufeli et al., 2009; Xanthopoulou et al., 2009; Crawford et al., 2010;

Theory of Social Exchange

The Social Exchange Theory is another powerful theoretical explanation for employee engagement (SET). According to Levinson (1965), employment is a transaction involving labor, loyalty, and actual interest, as well as social incentives. To some extent, the employee-employer relationship lends itself to reciprocity, in which a request for anything in return will benefit both parties, regardless of who receives preferential treatment. According to Masterson et al. (2000), one party expects a future return after contributing or delivering services to the other. At the same time, the person who receives something valuable will feel obligated to return it to the other party. Employees will aggressively give back to those who have benefited them in order to obtain additional rewards in the future. Many scholars used social exchange theory to examine the relationship between the organization and its members. Employees are loyal to their employers and work hard in exchange for financial and social benefits, forming the employer-employee relationship. According to Eisenberger et al. (1986), high levels of perceived organizational support create obligations within individuals to repay the organization, resulting in a pro-organization attitude and behavior. According to Saks (2006), one

way for people to repay their organizations is through their level of engagement. To put it another way, employees will choose to engage to varying degrees in response to the resources provided by their employer.

Concept of Supervisor Relations

The strength of a positive relationship between an employee and his or her boss will inspire confidence in the boss. Employees assume that supervisors are a part of the organization. Generally speaking, it is expected of the supervisor to create a reliable relationship with his subordinate (Graen & Uhl-bien, 1995; Sluss & Ashforth, 2007).

Supervisors are examples to the subordinates and it is expected that they must live by example in order to achieve set targets. Supervisors are expected to teach and imbibe the values of the organization and transfer same to the subordinates and constantly talk about the organization in relation to the values and ethics of the organization. Supervisors represents the organization, it is therefore expected that a good relationship with the employees will translate into a good and harmonious relationship between the employees and the company which automatically result in employee engagement.

In comparison to the relationship between and employee and co-workers, the relationship with the supervisor is more profitable and beneficial to the employee, the supervisor and the organization in general (Raabe & Beehr, 2003). Supervisor is more likely associated formally with co-workers and gives appreciation to employees because supervisors involved in the assessment in the employee performance. A close relationship between an employee and his or her supervisor will reduce staff turnover and contribute to employee dedication and consistency in achieving organizational goals. Employees see the organization as a living entity because of the organization's responsibility to act as an agent, develop policies, norms, values, and make provisions for the sustainability of those values and the role of behavior, and expressed satisfaction with individual employees through the agent, i.e. the supervisor, according to Shanock and Eisenberger (2006).

Employees' relationships with their supervisors are significant in defining how they define workplace assistance, according to previous study (Sluss & Ashforth, 2007; Flynn, 2005). Employees provide effort and attention to the organization through the leader or supervisor and receive acknowledgment from the organization through the leader or supervisor in the social exchange strategy (Eisenberger et al., 1986). The supervisor, as an agent of the company, plays a larger responsibility in delivering feedback on performance and compensation decision (Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006). Employees believe that having a good relationship with his boss and receiving supervisor assistance is a type of organizational support. Such assistance can help to minimize workplace stress and boost productivity.

According to Pati and Kumar (2010), the supervisor's actions are an indicative of the organization's aims. The supervisor aids in the employee personification of the organization. Supervisors, on the whole, have a tight relationship with their employees and are able to communicate the organization's goals directly to them. Employees also consider supervisory assistance to be an extension of the company. Job involvement, work engagement, and organizational engagement are all linked to high organizational support (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Organizational support will instill a sense of obligation to contribute to the organization and assist it in achieving its goals. This support will also increase affective commitment to the organization to be engaged by the organization and encourage individuals to become organizational members, and have social identity as an organizational member. In addition, this support will encourage good individual psychological conditions which include psychological meaningfulness (Stinglhamber & Vandenberghe, 2003).

Harmonious employee relations have significant role in increasing the performance of employees in the organization. Employee relations make subordinates to be more responsible and enthusiastic in their works which eventually increase their job performance in the workstation (Ramayah, Lo, Amri, & Noor, 2011). Moreover, the employees having positive work relations and psychological work environment are more productive and have contribution in fulfilling the expected goal of the organization (O'Neill, & Arendt, 2008; Brown, & Leigh, 1996; Kahn, 1990).

Muhammad and Hamdy (2005) proposed that the direct interaction that occurs in the workplace between employee and supervisor has an effect on employee engagement, and that a supportive supervisory relationship will improve employee engagement. Employees are similarly inspired to put out their best efforts in their work when their superiors maintain positive relationships with their coworkers (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin, & Cardy, 2001). According to the study, efficient communication between managers and their subordinates has an important influence in obtaining outputs from workers. Similarly, Ivancevich (2001) claimed that a greater understanding between employee and employer should be an inherent aspect of a company culture in order to ensure increased employee productivity. Furthermore, Brown and Leigh (1996) demonstrated that supportive management relations contribute to the achievement of an organization's objectives through improved employee performance, as employee relations motivate people to take on demanding job.

Employee-employer relationships are inextricably linked to higher levels of employee engagement. Employee relations focuses on how involved employees are with their work in the company (Simon, Bakker, Gruman, Macey, & Saks, 2015). Positive attitudes and perceptions of superiors toward subordinates result in outstanding employee relations and high employee engagement (Joshi & Sodhi) (2011). Furthermore, according to Fleck and Inceoglu (2010)'s proposed model, job support and relationships are a crucial motivator in keeping employees engaged in their jobs. Furthermore, pleasant employee relations stem from job autonomy, which has been found to be crucial in maintaining employee engagement (Albrecht, 2010; Gagne, & Bhave, 2011). Employee engagement is linked to the exchange of ideas and increased management support (Richman, 2006).

Some other research (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001) claimed that supervisors' support and relationships have a favorable impact on employee engagement levels in the organization. May et al. (2004) went on to say that both helpful colleagues and supervisory relationships have a favorable impact on employees' engagement and psychological safety. According to Kahn (1990), employees' psychological safety improves their degree of involvement as a result of their interpersonal relationship with their supervisor.

Several studies (Macey, & Schneider, 2008; Arakawa, & Greenberg, 2007; Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002; Harter, Schmidt & Keyes, 2003) show that employees' positive relationships with their reporting supervisor help them to be involved with their work at the workplace. When employees feel at ease doing their jobs, they develop a good psychological attitude toward the company, which is necessary for increasing employee engagement. In a similar line, only a few empirical research (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Van Rhenen, 2009; Bakker, Emmerik, & Euwema, 2006; Schaufeli, & Bakker, 2004) have found a strong link between employee relations and employee engagement. In addition, some early research (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001) found that supervisors' supportive relationships with employees make them more involved with their work in the organization.

Concept of Co-Workers Relations

The success of any role is not solely determined by an employee's abilities, nor is it solely determined by the relationship with the supervisor; it is also determined by the relationship between coworkers in the workplace. Coworker relationships are critical because they give support and have a favorable impact on employee happiness (Madlock & Booth-Butterfield, 2012). The formation of relationships between employees and coworkers will lead to workplace friendship, which will benefit the employee's mental and physical health. The feeling of security and self-confidence of individuals, as well as the urge to have friendship in the workplace, are what lead to coworker relationships and friendship.

There is a substantial difference between coworker and supervisor relationships, according to Basford and Offerman (2012). In an organization's hierarchy of authority, the relationship with the supervisor is based on position, whereas the relationship with coworkers has no official authority. Coworker relationships are an important component of employees' everyday lives at work, and the results of these relationships can be evident both physically and emotionally in the workplace.

One of the most important qualities of employee-coworker relationships is that there is minimal or no power imbalance (Tan & Lim, 2009). Trust in coworkers and employees has a good effect on an organization's confidence level, which leads to greater and enhanced performance. Employees in organizations are more likely than official channels such as the supervisor to convey their ideas and work-related issues to their coworkers, according to Prusak and Cohen (2001), because confidence in coworkers can result in significant social capital.

Coworker relationships have an impact on an employee's decision to leave or resign from their job. This is due to the lack of communication in the workplace as a result of the regulations and formal policies in place. Because of social or structural factors, secession or resignation may occur. Interpersonal connection demands may not be addressed due to a lack of communication. Employees will appreciate and feel positive relationships with coworkers when coworker support is high, and they will feel engaged in the organization. Humans in general have a strong need to form and maintain lasting and meaningful interpersonal relationships (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). The majority of these relationships have an impact on one's ability to achieve the goal. The connection allowed him to make ends meet and helped define him (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Individual relationships are a work in progress, not a finished product. Communication is required to build, sustain, or end the relationship.

Concept of Employee Engagement

Employee engagement is not a new topic in literature; nonetheless, it has acquired traction in recent years as a result of its importance to the success of any firm. According to Robinson, Perryman, and Hayday (2004), employee engagement is defined as an employee's positive attitude toward an organization and its ideals. Employees that are engaged are aware of the business's context and recognize the need of collaborating with coworkers to improve job performance for the benefit of the organization as a whole. Khan is credited as being the first scholar to use the concept of workplace engagement (1990). In two separate contexts: a summer camp and an architecture business, he presented a grounded theory in relation to personal engagement and disengagement at work. He investigated

the state of being engaged and disengaged at work. He defined personal engagement as the simultaneous employment and expression of a person's preferred self in task behaviors that promote connections to work and to others' personal presence in terms of affective, cognitive, and emotional components, as well as active full role performance, based on his findings.

Company-based models, according to Robertson Smith and Markwick (2009), see engagement as a result. They claimed that engaged employees are loyal, show commitment, put forth discretionary effort, maximize their talents within the organization, and are enthusiastic supporters of the company's values and goals. According to them, engagement is a step above satisfaction and motivation. Kahn (1990) defined employee engagement as the act of harnessing of organisation members selves to their work roles; in engagement, employee expresses themselves totally in terms of cognitive, emotion and physically when performing their role. In the words of Kahn (1990), an engaged employee needs to be psychologically and physically present when performing or occupying a particular present when performing or occupying a particular organisational role.

Some scholars such as Richman (2006) and Shaw (2005), viewed employee engagement as emotional and intellectual commitment of employees towards their company or establishments. On the other hand Frank, Finnegan and Taylor (2004) viewed employee engagement as the amount of discretionary ability shown by employees in course of their work.

Andre, Lindos and Fares (2013) reported that engagement of an employee is the level of commitment of an employee towards the organisation and its values. They stated that an engaged employee in the work place complete the work with team members in order to increase the performance and the wholistic aims of the company. Kahn (1990) is of the idea that engaged people within the establishment, carry out their tasks physically, cognitively and emotionally. Shuck and Wollard (2010) offered their own idea regarding employee engagement by postulating that employee engagement involves the cognitive, emotional and behavioural energy that person focuses towards obtaining a desirable outcome in company.

Saks (2006) asserted that employees who are wholistically engaged in their work are more likely to be productive than employees who are not engaged or have a low level of engagement. Furthermore, according to Harter, Schmidt, Asplund, Willham, and Agrawa (2010), engaged employees are more likely to stay with their current employer for the rest of their lives or for a very long time. Furthermore, when employees are engaged in their jobs, they interact with customers in a more positive way. Crawford (2010), reported that there is a strong relationship between employee engagement and their performance in the organisation. He further asserted that engagement is more predicted and influence performance more than intrinsic motivation, job involvement and employee satisfaction. Engagement is related to workers who are very innovative, highly passionate, talented, effectively performance and curious regarding their future work. But the non-engaged employee concentrates on tasks rather than goals and outcomes. These workers do not communicate with their coworkers in a constructive manner.

According to Andree et al (2013), employee engagement is a critical factor in ensuring the firm's long-term success. Engaged employees enjoy their work and feel a strong connection to their coworkers, whereas disengaged employees exhibit characteristics that are detrimental to the organization. Some of these characteristics include wasting time at work, weakening group cohesion through their actions, and increasing the rate of group conflict.

According to Schaufeli and Bakkar (2010), engagement is a positive, fulfilling, and work-related state of mind marked by vigour, dedication, and absorption. However, employee engagement can simply be seen as the extent to which workers value, appreciate and get committed wholistically to what they do. Buttressing on this construct, Robinson, Perryman and Hayday (2004) asserted that engagement is the right attitude which is uphold by workers towards the organisation and its core values. An engaged employee seek for the success of the firm and do extra work to ensure that the firm goals are realised within stipulated time. Erewali (2015) opined that engaged employee who is bounded with the organisation intellectually and emotionally, feels a high passionate about the goals of the organisation and fully committed to the organisation. It is worthy to note that all employees have talent and skills which are needful by the organisation. But such skills cannot be used maximally if their wholistic beings are not given to the organisation. Engagement further encompasses creating opportunities for employees to have a link with co-workers, managers and the entire organisation.

Cartwright (2014) asserted that employee engagement is associated with higher degree of productivity, reduces staff turnover and fewer workplace accidents but on the other hand, low engagement of employee or total disengagement increase stress. Employee engagement has an opposite feature of burnout. According to Bakker and Denierouti (2007), employee engagement is characterised by involvement, energy and efficacy engagement of employee is void of cynicism and exhaustion but characterised with professional efficacy (Bakkar, Tims and Derks 2012). (Bakkar, Tims and Derks 2012).

Westhuizen (2014) for his part, said that employee engagement is a pleasant, gratifying job related frame of mind which has the traits of energy, absorption and dedication. He also asserted that employee engagement which has the traits of absorption, determination and enthusiasm are important and significant organisational assets. Employees who are engaged are completely

immersed and active in their work. They find it tough to disconnect from their task even when it is over. Despite the high demands of their profession, which could otherwise lead to irritation and tiredness, engaged employees have a higher level of vitality and self-efficacy (Westhuizen, 2014).

Employee engagement, according to Mone and London (2010), is "a state in which an employee feels interested, dedicated, enthusiastic, and empowered, and exhibits those feelings in work behavior." As a result, it refers to an employee's level of devotion and involvement with their company and its principles. The company must work to foster and grow employee engagement, which necessitates a two-way connection between the employer and the employee. As a result, employee engagement is a metric that measures a person's connection to the company.

Drivers of Employee Engagement

Given that employee engagement is a level higher than commitment, it's important to understand what motivates employees to engage in the first place. According to Dehinson, Perryman, and Hayday (2004), the drivers of engagement are employee involvement in decision making, which creates intimacy with the organization, and whether or not the employee's ideas are accepted and valued by management, which influences their engagement. Employees will become more engaged in order to come up with strategies to improve the organization's value if they believe their contribution is valued by the organization. Thirdly, the employees opportunity available to develop their jobs will also drive their commitment and engagement in the workplace. Fourthly Debinson, Perryman and Hayday (2004) discovered that the rate at which the employer or organisation demonstrates care regarding employees health and wellness, influences their engagement with the organisation. Furthermore, employee perceptions of job importance, employee clarity of job performance, career advancement and improvement opportunity, regular feedback and dialogue with superiors, quality of working relationships with peers, superiors and subordinates, perceptions of the ethos and values of the organisation and effective internal employee communication can help drive engagement to the maximum. According to Cook's (2008), there are four basic components which drives engagement. These are; wellbeing, this component means how worker feels in and about their organisation and how the employers or organisation handle/treats them. The two sides to wellbeing are the external components such as the corporate responsibility and employer branding (Cheallaign 2015). (Cheallaign 2015). Secondly, Cook (2008) noted that information is the second component that drives engagement. Workers are more likely to be engaged if they understand what they are doing, what the company is doing, and what is expected of them, according to him. He meant that when employees are constantly informed about the organization's goals, they will become more engaged in order to achieve them; third, fairness will help drive and boost engagement. Employees become more engaged when they perceive fairness in the workplace. Finally, according to Cook (2008), involving employees in all areas or aspects in which they can function is the best strategy for achieving an optimal level of employee engagement in an organization.

Methodology

This study adopted the survey research design. The study was conducted on employees of Law Firms in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. The population of the study comprises the employees of law firms in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. The study utilized the simple random sampling technique to randomly select 50 employees drawn from the law firms in Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

The study instrument was a structured questionnaire which was validated experts in the field of management. The structured questionnaire was distributed to respondents in order to solicit their responses to the questions raised.

The instrument was designed for the individual level as the unit of analysis. Each of the respondents in this study was asked to complete the three measurement of supervisor relations, co-workers relations and employee engagement. The scales were measured by 5-point likert scale beginning from 1 to 5. The Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the reliability of instruments at 0.05 level of significance. The reliability coefficient of 0.7 and above was used for the reliability of the instrument.

Test of Hypothesis

H_{01} : There is no significant relationship between supervisor relationship and employee engagement in law firms in Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

Decision Rule:

Where $P < 0.05$ = Reject the null hypotheses

Where $P > 0.05$ = Accept the null hypotheses

Table 1: Correlation between Supervisor Relationship and Employee Engagement in Law Firms in Port Harcourt

Correlations

			Supervisor Relationship	Employee Engagement
Spearman's rho	Supervisor Relationship	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.480**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	204	204
	Employee Engagement	Correlation Coefficient	.480**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	204	204

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Survey Data, 2021

The Relationship between supervisor relationship and employee engagement: the result of the data analysis shows that the relationship between supervisor relationship and employee engagement significant level is less than 0.05 where $\rho = .480$. It is therefore based on the result obtained that the researcher rejects the null hypotheses and affirmed that there is indeed a significant relationship between supervisor relationship and employee engagement.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between co-workers relationship and employee engagement in law firms in Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

Table 2: Correlation between Co-Workers Relationship and Employee Engagement in Law Firms in Port Harcourt

Correlations

			Co-Workers Relationship	Employee Engagement
Spearman's rho	Co-Workers Relationship	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.301**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	140	140
	Employee Engagement	Correlation Coefficient	.301**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	140	140

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Survey Data, 2021

Co-Workers Relationship and Employee Engagement: The result of the data analysis shows a significant level $p < 0.05$ ($0.000 < 0.05$). The $\rho = 0.301$, showing positive correlation between the variables. The findings reveal a positive relationship between the variables. Hence the null hypothesis is hereby rejected and the alternate hypothesis accepted.

Discussion of findings**Supervisor Relationship and Employee Engagement**

The result of the data analysis shows that the relationship between supervisor relationship and employee engagement significant level is less than 0.05 where $\rho = .480$. This finding is in agreement with the study of Pati and Kumar (2010), who observed that the supervisor's action is an indicator of the intentions of the organization. The result is also supported by the study of Stinglhamber and Vandenberghe (2003) who is of the view that the level of supervisor relation will boost the level of affective commitment of employees to the organization and give organizational members social identity as a members of the organization. They further argued that the support will increase the psychological conditions of individuals in the organization. Also the study of Ramayah, Lo, Amri, and Noor (2011) agrees with the findings of the study who confirmed that harmonious supervisor relations have significant role in increasing the performance of employees in the organization. Supervisor relations make subordinates to be more responsible and enthusiastic in their works which eventually increase their job performance in the organization. In the same vein, Muhammad and

Hamdy (2005) posited that the direct relationship that exists between employee and supervisor in the workplace has an effect on the engagement of such employees, therefore a supportive supervisory relationship will increase the level of employee engagement.

Co-Workers Relationship and Employee Engagement

The result of the data analysis shows a significant level $p < 0.05$ ($0.000 < 0.05$). The $\rho = 0.301$, showing positive correlation between the variables. The findings reveal a positive relationship between the variables. The result is in agreement with the study of Madlock and Booth-Butterfield (2012) who opined that the relationship between employee and co-workers will bring about friendship in the workplace and the end result will both the mental and physical engagement of the employees. Also, Basford and Offerman (2012), revealed that there is a distinctive difference between co-workers relations and supervisor relations. They argued that while, relationship with the supervisor is position-based in the hierarchy of authority in an organization, the relationship with co-workers are without any form of formal authority. Co-workers relations is an indispensable part of the daily life of employees in the workplace and the result of such relationship is seen both physically and emotionally in the workplace.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Flowing from the findings of the study on supervisor relationship, co-workers relationship and employee engagement, it can be deduced that high levels of relationship with supervisor and co-workers in the workplace will lead to improved employee engagement which will result in higher level of productivity in organizations as a result of the creation of a motivated workforce, that will work together to achieve the common goals of the organization. The study also revealed that the acquisition of skilled workforce is not enough in today's changing organizational environment; instead a lot needs to be done to retain, involve and make them engaged and remain so to the organization and its goals. Thus, engagement is a state where an employee is not only intellectually committed but has great emotional attachment with his/her job that goes above and beyond the call of duty so as to further the interest of the company. Therefore, an enhancement in the level of supervisor and coworkers relationship will enhance the level of employee engagement and therefore improve the overall organizational performance. As a way of recommendation, this study recommends that law firms should not only provide employees with great infrastructure and other physical facilities but also freedom to make their work exciting and also providing an environment wherein they can say good-bye to a monotonous work and free to have supervisor and co-worker relationship and working in a safe and cooperative environment that adds to the engagement level of employees.

References

- Adebayo, A. (2004). *Principles and Practice of Public Administration in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- Albrecht, S. L. (2010). *Handbook of Employee Engagement: Perspectives, Issues, Research, and Practice*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Northampton, MA.
- Arakawa, D. & Greenberg, M. (2007). Optimistic managers and the influence on productivity and employee engagement in a technology organization: implications for coaching psychologists. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 2(1), 78-89.
- Bakker, A. B., Emmerik, I. H., & Euwema, M. C. (2006). Crossover of burnout and engagement in work teams. *Work and Occupations*, 33(4), 464-489.
- Baru, P. A. (2019). Correlation between Team and Co-worker Relationship and Employee Engagement.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological bulletin*, 117(3), 497.
- Brown, S. & Leigh, T. (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 358-68.
- Fleck, S. & Inceoglu, I. (2010). A comprehensive framework for understanding and predicting engagement, In Albrecht, S.L. (Ed.), *Handbook of Employee Engagement: Perspectives, Issues, Research, and Practice*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, 31-61.
- Gagne', M. & Bhave, D. (2011). Autonomy in the workplace: an essential ingredient to employee engagement and well-being in every culture, In Chirkov, V. I., Ryan, R. M. & Sheldon, K. M. (Eds.), *Human Autonomy in Cross-cultural Context: Perspectives on the Psychology of Agency, Freedom, and Well-being*. Springer, New York, NY, pp. 163-187.

Gene, A., Lyons, J.B., & Tartaglia, F. (2010). Understanding predictors of engagement within the military. *Military Psychology*, 22(3), 301.

Gomez-Mejia, L. R., Balkin, D. B. & Cardy, R. L. (2001). *Managing Human Resources*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L. & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-79.

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2003). Wellbeing the workplace and its relationship to business outcomes: a review of the Gallup studies, In Keyes, C. L. & Haidt, J. (Eds.), *Flourishing: The Positive Person and the Good Life*, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, pp. 205-24.

Ivancevich, J. M. (2001). *International Human Resource Management*, 8th ed., McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York, NY.

Joshi, R. J. & Sodhi, J. S. (2011). Drivers of employee engagement in Indian organizations. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 47(1), 162-182.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.

Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 3-30.

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.

May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(1), 11-37.

Mone, Edward M., & London, M. (2010). Employee engagement: Through effective performance management. *A practical guide for managers*. Routledge Press. NY.

Muhammad, A. H. & Hamdy, H. I. (2005). Burnout, supervisory support, and work outcomes: A study from an Arabic cultural perspective. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 15(3/4), 230 – 243.

O'Neill, B. S., & Arendt, L. A. (2008). Psychological climate and work attitudes: the importance of telling the right story. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 14, 353-70.

Okoye, P. V. C., & Raymond A. E. (2013). The effect of human resources development on organizational productivity. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(10), 250.

Ramayah, T., Lo, M., Amri, A. Y. & Noor, N. (2011). An Analysis of career advancement among engineers in manufacturing organizations. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 21(2), 143-157.

Richman, A. (2006). Everyone wants an engaged workforce how can you create it? *Workspan*, 49, 36-39.

Schaufeli, W. B. & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293-315.

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Van Rhenen, W. (2009). How changes in job demands and resources predict burnout, work engagement, and sickness absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(7), 893-917.

Simon, L. A., Bakker, A. B., Gruman, J. A., Macey, W. H., & Saks, A. M. (2015). Employee engagement, human resource management practices and competitive advantage: An integrated approach. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 2(1), 7-35.

Storey, J., Welbourne, T., Wright, P. & Ulrich, D. (2008). *Employee engagement*. 10.4324/9780203889015.ch18.

Wahyuariani, D. (2015). Relationship with Supervisor and Co-Workers, Psychological Condition and Employee Engagement in the Workplace. *Journal of Business and Management*, 4. 34-47.