

## **Employee engagement in health organizations in relation to Maslow's and Herzberg theory – The Institute for Family Health as an example**

1. **Sarah Ahmad Majed Al-Aitan**, Family Medicine Doctor at The Institute for Family Health.
2. **Osama Suleiman Samawi**, Community Medicine Specialist, Technical director of The Institute for Family Health.
3. **Ibrahim Said Aqel**, Business Administration, General Director of The Institute for Family Health.
4. **Hussein Mohammad Al-Salem**, Psychosocial counsellor, Head sector of psychosocial unit.
5. **Hassan Mohammad Banat**, Curriculum Development, Research Consultant .

### **Abstract:**

Moving to the modern age, employee engagement in an organization has been defined as an important factor in achieving maximum productivity and performance. Employee engagement may vary with employee demography and other contributing factors. It is important to mention that most employee engagement models neglect employees' age, years of experience, and seniority. This study aimed to investigate the level of employee engagement in a health organization (The Institute for Family Health) and its relationship to different variables such as gender, age, and experience. In addition, this study used some theories as Maslow's law, and Herzberg's explain employee engagement. The number of study sample individuals who responded to the study scale was (221) of both sexes, divided into 161 females (72.9%) and 60 males (27.1%). The distribution according to age groups was as follows: (21-29) years 43.4%; (30-39) years 38.9%; (40-49) years 11.8%; (50-59) years 3.6%; (60 and above) years 2.3%. The instrument used was based on Gallup Q12 scale with modifications to reflect the researchers' interests. The results showed that the general level of employee engagement was high with an arithmetic mean of (3.62) and a standard deviation of (.718). Higher levels were in the Basic needs and Teamwork domains. The results show virtual differences between the means of males and females in favor of females. Also, there are virtual differences between the age range means in favor of the age group (50-59) years. Moreover, there are virtual differences between the means of experience levels in favor of (4-7 Yrs.) in the Total Scale, and (more than 10 Years) in the (Management Support) and (Growth) domains, and favor of (8-10 Years) in the (Basic Needs) and (Teamwork) domains.

**Keywords:** Employee engagement, Health organization, I.F.H., Maslow's law, Herzberg theory.

### **I. Introduction:**

Transforming into the digital age and modern world, talking about successful and efficient organizations becomes crucial by focusing on competition and proposition of values that do not involve only products and services those organizations provide, but also what lies within the organization itself as staff capacity and their relationship to the workplace. Leaders and entrepreneurs who can build strong relationships with their organization can build trust within the workplace and influence other employees' attitudes, beliefs, performance, and outcomes. Organizations with higher engagement levels tend to have lower rates of employee turnover, and higher productivity. (Baumruk, 2006).

Engaged individuals are defined by (Kahn, 1990) as those who "employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances. While those who "withdraw and defend themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances" are considered disengaged. Similar to Kahn's definition, Maslach, Schaufeli and Leiter (2001, p. 417) also refer to engagement as a psychological and emotional state, a 'persistent, positive affective-motivational state of fulfilment' and (Hallberg and Schaufeli, 2006) define it as 'being charged with energy and fully dedicated to one's work'.

A sense of attachment towards the workplace, investing oneself in the specific role and the organization as a whole, is a vitally essential characteristic of engaged employees. In addition, engaged employees are more likely to stay longer with the organization. According to Pareto principle can have on shoulder 80% of the work and act as advocates of the business, encouraging growth, involvement, and engagement.

Engagement can enhance bottom-line profit and enable organizational agility, and improve efficiency in driving change initiatives.

Demography and personality characteristic factors can affect employee engagement, as younger employees may be positive when they first join an organization but can quickly become disengaged, or older employees can sense more connection to their environment in the workplace. At the same time, it is easier for extrovert and adaptable individuals to engage, whereas introvert individuals find difficulty getting engaged. Engagement is also a choice connected to one's values and principles and depends on what the individual considers a priority and worth investing in. The levels of employee engagement can vary according to other contributing factors like seniority and occupation; the more senior an individual's role is, the greater the chance of being engaged. (Kahn, W. A. ,1990)

According to Gallup, engaged employees are committed, connected to, and enthusiastic about their work or workplace. Other definitions highlight emotional connection, positive attitude, and proactive energy as part of engaged employees' practices or expressions towards their work. Employee engagement levels can indicate a workplace's social environment, opportunities for professional growth, and productivity (Lailah Imandin, Christo Bisschoff, & Christoff Botha. ,2014). Employers and organizations measure employee engagement as a tool to gauge what improvements need to be made in their workplaces.

There are different tools to measure employee engagement. A popular way for organizations to assess employee engagement is through a survey. The types of surveys that some organizations or employers may use can ask employees to rate their engagement. This method of measuring engagement may not be fruitful for assessors because there is a possibility that the responses collected are misleading. In addition, there may be bias from respondents as there may be a fear of answering incorrectly(Fuller, 2014). Analyzing components such as relationships with colleagues and level of initiative in the workplace can provide employers and organizations with more empirical results.

The Gallup 12 Questionnaire is another model used to measure engagement. The questionnaire consists of twelve questions that assess employee engagement, thus predicting workplace performance. The questions range from assessing if employees have the essential materials to complete tasks to their emotional connection to their employment (Gallup, I. 2020). Thus, the questionnaire aims to identify if an employee meets the fundamental psychological requirements to be an engaged employee.

Maslow's hierarchy of needs is one of the theories shaping in a five-tier model that depicts the hierarchy of humans' fundamental basic physiological needs. Individuals must meet the needs at the bottom of the hierarchy before attaining the needs at the model's top. From the bottom to the top, the needs are physiological, safety, love and belonging, esteem, and self-actualization (McLeod, Saul, 2007) Maslow's hierarchy of needs can be applied to the workplace. Employees must meet their basic workplace needs before they can reach higher levels of self-actualization.

The questions in the Gallup 12 Questionnaire assess many of the points highlighted in Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Each of the twelve questions can be sorted into one of Maslow's hierarchy of needs levels. According to Maslow, physiological needs are the most basic needs. The equivalent to physiological needs in the workplace can include having the essential materials to complete one's work. Following physiological needs is the need for safety. In a workplace, this can take the form of having a supportive environment and staff. After safety, love, and belonging, needs can be met. These may include comradery in the workplace. Next is the need for esteem. Praise and acknowledgment in the workplace can fulfill this level in the hierarchy. The final level of the hierarchy is the need for self-actualization. An employee may meet this need when there are opportunities for him to grow in their workplace.

An example of this is receiving a promotion. Employees may feel more connected and enthusiastic about their work if their needs are met. Thus, employees can be engaged workers rather than workers that simply fulfill tasks.

Different variables such as age and gender can contribute to differences in employees' levels of engagement. Sudershana et al. found that age is a significant determinant of employees' engagement levels; with age, higher levels of engagement coincide. Sudershana et al. also found some differences in how employees of different genders express their engagement levels. For example, female employees demonstrate high levels of loyalty to their work, whereas male employees are high performers but have lower levels of loyalty. Although the literature supports that age and gender affect employee engagement, there is a lack of literature on how these differences are connected to Maslow's hierarchy of needs. It is unknown if employees of different ages or gender are at an advantage or disadvantage to reach basic employee needs. (Sudershana, Satpathy, & Patnaik., 2019)

## **II. Research questions:**

The research questions were as follows:

- What is the general level of employee engagement in the organization and different domains (basic needs, management support, teamwork, and growth)?
- What is the relation of employee engagement to the variables (age, gender, and experience in years)?

- How can Maslow hierarchy and Herzberg factors be reflected in the employee engagement

**III. Study variables:**

Independent variables, including:

- A. Sex and has the following categories: male or female.
- B. The age group and has the following categories: (21-29) years; (30-39) years; (40-49) years. (50-59) years; (60 and above)
- C. Years of Experience: (0-3) years; (4-7) years; (8-10) years; (above ten years).

**III. Literature review:**

Variables such as employees' age, gender, and years of experience can affect employee engagement. Different groups within each variable can experience different treatments in the workplace. This can lead to differences in engagement levels. Maslow's hierarchy of needs can serve as a framework to measure and analyze employee engagement. There is literature that demonstrates that the basic needs of employees must be met for them to have higher levels of employees engagement. Literature regarding the relationship between employee engagement, age, and gender offers different perspectives to contribute to I.F.H.'s research on this topic.

Maslow's hierarchy of needs is divided into low-level and high-level needs. Rasskazova et al. aimed to discover the impact of low-level and high-level needs on employee engagement. Four thousand seven hundred eight blue- and white-collar workers of a Russian energy company were given a survey that was marketed as a survey "aiming to improve organizational factors for better wellbeing and performance." The results of the survey demonstrated that low-level and high-level needs satisfaction has an impact on employee engagement. (Rasskazova, E., Ivanova, T., & Sheldon, K., 2016). The study also reveals that an increase in the satisfaction of an individuals' low-level needs can help them attain high-level satisfaction (Ruslan, binti Ibnu, Md., Islam, Aminul. & Mohd Noor 2014); this aligns with Maslow's model that suggests that basic needs must be met before meeting higher-level needs. Employees who meet their low-level and high-level needs can be more engaged in their workplace.

Job satisfaction contributes to employees' engagement levels. Maslow's hierarchy of needs can serve as a framework for determining what and how employees' needs are met. The study conducted by Rahimi et al. aimed to investigate the relationship between employees' needs and job satisfaction. The study surveyed 238 lifeguards who worked in Tehran swimming pools. The Needs Evaluation Questionnaire (N.E.Q.) and Job Descriptive Index (JDI) were used to measure employees' needs and satisfaction. The results demonstrated that women emphasized satisfying physiological needs, safety, esteem, and self-actualization needs. On the other side, men placed importance on satisfying social, esteem, and self-actualization needs. The study found that there was a strong correlation between meeting needs and job satisfaction. Employees who met most of their needs demonstrated higher levels of employee engagement (Rahimi et al., 2016). In conclusion, the needs explained by Maslow must be met for employees to feel satisfied with their jobs which can affect how engaged they are.

Sudarshana et. al; conducted a study to assess the impact of age and gender on employee engagement in the information and technology (I.T.) sector and the correlation between job satisfaction, age, and gender. It revealed that female employees are more loyal than male employees. However, male employees are high performers in the workplace. In the study conducted by Sudarshana et al., participants in Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India, were given a questionnaire to collect data about their motivation, learning and development, age, gender, and job satisfaction. Of the 240 employees surveyed, 36.73% were women, and 63.27% were men. The results demonstrated that gender does not significantly impact employee engagement in the I.T. sector. However, as for the relationship between employees' engagement and job satisfaction, the results demonstrated a significant relationship. Although this study does not pertain to employees in the health sector, it does offer some insight into the impacts of age, gender, and job satisfaction on employee engagement. (Sudarshana et.al, 2019)

Literature on the relationship between age and employee engagement reveals differences in mature-aged employees' engagement levels. Sudarshana et al.; found that literature reveals that older employees are more engaged and committed to their work, along with finding that gender does not impact employee engagement; Douglas and Roberts' research confirmed this statement. Data was collected by providing a survey to 181 employees in the private sector. Participants were ages 30 or older. The results of the survey demonstrated that employees over the age of 63 had a higher mean work engagement score than those between the ages of 30 to 50 and 51 to 62. Rahimi et al. also confirmed this through their survey of lifeguards at the Tehran swimming pools. Employees over the age of 30 expressed higher levels of job satisfaction. As previously stated, higher levels of job satisfaction correspond with higher levels of employee engagement. Thus, with more age comes higher levels of employee engagement. However, some literature suggests the opposite.

Kulik et al. demonstrated that different factors in the workplace could influence the engagement of mature-aged employees. (Kulik, C. T., Perera, S., & Cregan, C., 2016). Negative stereotyping and discrimination against older employees can impact engagement levels. The perception is that mature-aged workers have a negative attitude and are inflexible. Kulik et al. surveyed 666 mature-aged employees in Australia. In the three-yearly surveys, employees were asked to describe their workplace experiences. The results of the surveys demonstrate that employees who experience stereotyping reported lower levels of engagement. The decrease in engagement would occur over 11 to 12 months after the experiences. Employees who reported lower levels of discrimination or stereotyping were more engaged in the workplace. If there is an ageist stereotyping threat or discrimination in the workplace, employee engagement levels will be lower. However, it is also essential to acknowledge that an increase in age can come with higher levels of engagement.

#### **IV. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

##### **Research design:**

This research used a qualitative approach and adopted a cross-sectional research design to examine the level of employee engagement in health organizations (The Institute for Family Health as an example) and its relationship to different variables. An online survey was published on the organization's official site using Google forms. Although the researchers reached most employees working at I.F.H. with different posts to represent the research sample, the questionnaire was anonymous and did not request the name of the employee or his working site, which guaranteed privacy and unbiased answers.

##### **Characteristics of Participants:**

The inclusion criteria were people aged older than 21 years and currently work at I.F.H. The number of study sample individuals who responded to the study scale was (221) of both sexes, divided into 161 females (72.9%) and 60 males (27.1%). The distribution according to age groups was as follows: (21-29) years 43.4%; (30-39) years 38.9%; (40-49) years 11.8%; (50-59) years 3.6%; (60 and above) years 2.3%. Approval to conduct this research was obtained from the Research Ethical Committee at the Institute for Family Health.

##### **Instruments:**

The whole sample was investigated using a modified Gallup scale constituting 15 questions. Gallup is an ongoing employee survey that measures employee engagement developed initially by Gallup, a private company located in Washington, D.C. Gallup spent years conducting thousands of interviews across most industries in many countries. It was in the late 90s that scale was finalized, and since then, it's been administered to more than 25 million employees in 195 countries, as well as in 70 different languages,

The modified scale consists of 15 actionable workplace elements that offer proven links to performance outcomes categorized in 4 main domains. The four domains in the scale are basic needs, management support, teamwork, and growth. The survey uses a 5-point Likert response scale ranging from 1 (rarely) to 5 (permanently), and participants were asked to rank each item accordingly.

##### **Validity:**

The current study used The Arabic version of the Gallup survey, a cross-culturally valid instrument with very high validity and reliability. (Havenga, W., Brand, C., & Visagie, J., 2013).

The survey was presented to (5) specialists in the fields of (medicine & psychology) to verify the validity of the instrument and to denote their thoughts on the clarity and phrasing of the content and its appropriateness to measure engagement. The specialists' consensus approved a criterion of (.77)

The instrument's validity was verified by applying to a pilot sample of (30) individuals distinct from the sample. Furthermore, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to study each item's relationship to its hypothesized scale or domain. The item should have the highest correlation with its domain than with other domains. (Gerstman, 2008).

Correlation coefficients amidst the paragraphs with their domains were in the range of (0.414 – 0.897), and they are all statistically significant, and the correlation coefficients- amidst the paragraphs with the full scale ranged from (0.662 – 0.965), which are all statistically significant as well, indicating that the scale is characterized by a reasonable degree of validity.

##### **Reliability:**

The instrument's reliability was verified by the Test-Retest method on an exploratory sample distinct from the study sample of (30) individuals (pilot study). The period between testing and re-testing was two weeks. The correlation

coefficients and the reliability factor were calculated by the internal consistency method (Cronbach's Alpha) for the domains and the overall scale.

The Domains' values of the correlation coefficient and the overall scale value between testing and re-testing ranged between (0.376 - 0.913). Thus, it indicates a strong correlation between individuals' responses upon repeated application of the instrument. On the other hand, the value of the reliability coefficient of the tool was (0.844), and the consistency coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha) for scale was (0.927), a value indicating high reliability. Accordingly, the instrument was adopted for the current study.

**Procedures**

An approval to conduct this research was obtained from the Research Ethical Committee at the Institute for Family Health. The researchers ensured the instrument's reliability and validity using a pilot study sample. The data was collected via a web-based survey, and the confidentiality of the collected information was guaranteed without mentioning the names of participants.

**Data Collection**

Data were collected from June 21, 2021, until July 7, 2021, in the form of a web-based survey using (Google Forms), comprised of biometric information about participants and the modified 15 questions measuring different domains for employee engagement.

**Data Analysis**

All data were analyzed using the SPSS Statistics software. The Pearson correlation coefficient was used to measure Internal item consistency and Item discriminative validity, and Cronbach's alpha coefficients determined the whole scale.

The means and standard deviations were calculated to test the first and second research questions. The Single-Test Variation (ANOVA) test and Dimensional comparisons of Scheffe's equation were used to test the second question T-test variance. A level of  $p < 0.05$  was considered statistically significant.

**V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

1. What is the general level of employee engagement in the organization and different domains (basic needs, management support, teamwork, and growth)?

**Table (1): Descriptive Statistics of Gallup scale and its domains**

| <b>Domain</b>       | <b>N</b>   | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Std. Deviation</b> | <b>Level</b>   |
|---------------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Basic Needs         | 221        | 3.94        | .701                  | High           |
| Management Support  | 221        | 3.47        | .914                  | Average        |
| Teamwork            | 221        | 3.82        | .703                  | High           |
| Growth              | 221        | 3.29        | .949                  | Average        |
| <b>Gallup Scale</b> | <b>221</b> | <b>3.62</b> | <b>.718</b>           | <b>Average</b> |

Table (1) shows that the general level of employee engagement at I.F.H. using (Modified Gallup scale) which is (high) with a mean of (3.62) and standard deviation of (.718). The employee engagement showed (higher) levels in the (Basic Needs) and (Teamwork) domains, followed by the (Management Support) and (Growth) domains. The researchers attribute the high level of engagement to the organization's model and the management of human resources, which enhances collaboration between individuals at different positions. In addition, the organization uses an integrated approach of service delivery based on the world health organization definition of health as a state of complete physical, mental and social wellbeing and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity. The integrated model further reduces duplication of effort, improves knowledge sharing, and leads to better engagement.

According to Maslow's hierarchy of needs, since individuals are already satisfied with lower-level deficit needs, they progress to meet a higher level of growth needs.

Usually, basic needs such as salary and work conditions need to be fulfilled before reaching high-level needs such as feeling part of something bigger within the organization.

In addition, based on Herzberg's theory, the researchers relate the high engagement with intrinsic drivers, which incline to generate motivation when they are present, like an accomplishment, which stems from an internal desire to undertake a task because it is found to be personally gratifying. The other factors are the extrinsic factors such as

supportive environment, which lessen motivation when absent. So when employees are motivated, they extend discretionary effort and become emotionally invested in the organization's success, leading to more engagement.

Thus, Herzberg's Theory of Motivation tries to get to the root of motivation in the workplace, However, according to this theory, it is possible for an employee to be highly motivated and dissatisfied. In addition, the role of the supervisors contributes to the overall employee engagement and has always been highlighted as being a key influencer of employee engagement. The supervisor who has a genuine commitment to the employees' wellbeing influences employee engagement. According to Xu and Cooper, the engagement among the employees increases when they feel involved through a collaborative leadership style. (Xu and H. Cooper, 2014) The results are consistent with the study of (Ruslan et al.), which demonstrated that low-level and high-level needs satisfaction impacts employee engagement. The study also reveals that an increase in the satisfaction of an individual's low-level needs can help them attain high-level satisfaction.

2. What is the relation of employee engagement to the variables (age, gender, and experience)?

**Table (2): Groups Statistics and t-test of Gallup scale and its domains related to Gender**

| Domain             | Gender | N   | Mean | Std. Deviation | t- value | Sig. |
|--------------------|--------|-----|------|----------------|----------|------|
| Basic Needs        | Male   | 60  | 3.92 | .724           | .238     | .812 |
|                    | Female | 161 | 3.95 | .694           |          |      |
| Management Support | Male   | 60  | 3.42 | .916           | .562     | .575 |
|                    | Female | 161 | 3.49 | .916           |          |      |
| Teamwork           | Male   | 60  | 3.75 | .796           | .960     | .338 |
|                    | Female | 161 | 3.85 | .666           |          |      |
| Growth             | Male   | 60  | 3.26 | 1.031          | .257     | .797 |
|                    | Female | 161 | 3.30 | .919           |          |      |
| Gallup Scale       | Male   | 60  | 3.56 | .769           | .659     | .510 |
|                    | Female | 161 | 3.64 | .699           |          |      |

**Gender differences:**

Table (2) shows virtual differences between the means of males and females in favor of females, but these differences are statistically not significant.

The researchers explain that females can be more engaged to work because employee engagement is a positive emotional state, and women are more likely to be responsible, connected to their surroundings, and prevent harm to others. According to (Mathieu and Zajac, volume No. 2, pp. 171-194, 1990.), gender also affects employee engagement.

The researchers explain that females can be more engaged to work because employee engagement is a positive emotional state, and women are more likely to be responsible, connected to their surroundings, and prevent harm to others.

The results mentioned above were consistent with the study of Rahimi et al., which demonstrated that women placed importance on satisfying physiological needs, safety, social needs, self-actualization needs which contribute to engagement. The results are also consistent with the study of (Shukla, S., Adhikari, B., & Singh, V. ,2015), where Female employees in the organization were more engaged in their jobs than their male counterparts. Moreover, consistent results were found in the study of (Marcus, A., & Gopinath, N. M., 2017), where female respondents were found to be more influenced by the employee engagement initiatives by the I.T. companies in Chennai.

**Table (3): Groups Statistics and ANOVA of Gallup scale and its domains related to age**

| Domain      | Age   | N  | Mean | Std. Deviation | F-Value | Sig. |
|-------------|-------|----|------|----------------|---------|------|
| Basic Needs | 21-29 | 96 | 3.88 | .671           | 2.333   | .057 |
|             | 30-39 | 86 | 3.98 | .701           |         |      |
|             | 40-49 | 26 | 3.79 | .839           |         |      |
|             | 50-59 | 8  | 4.56 | .417           |         |      |

|                    |                    |           |             |             |             |             |
|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                    | 60 and more        | 5         | 4.20        | .274        |             |             |
| Management Support | 21-29              | 96        | 3.42        | .881        | .629        | .642        |
|                    | 30-39              | 86        | 3.55        | .912        |             |             |
|                    | 40-49              | 26        | 3.32        | 1.040       |             |             |
|                    | 50-59              | 8         | 3.78        | 1.103       |             |             |
|                    | 60 and more        | 5         | 3.56        | .669        |             |             |
| Teamwork           | 21-29              | 96        | 3.80        | .650        | 1.063       | .376        |
|                    | 30-39              | 86        | 3.91        | .659        |             |             |
|                    | 40-49              | 26        | 3.61        | .984        |             |             |
|                    | 50-59              | 8         | 3.92        | .855        |             |             |
|                    | 60 and more        | 5         | 3.68        | .268        |             |             |
| Growth             | 21-29              | 96        | 3.32        | .926        | .348        | .845        |
|                    | 30-39              | 86        | 3.30        | .940        |             |             |
|                    | 40-49              | 26        | 3.09        | 1.141       |             |             |
|                    | 50-59              | 8         | 3.42        | 1.004       |             |             |
|                    | 60 and more        | 5         | 3.27        | .365        |             |             |
| Gallup Scale       | <b>21-29</b>       | <b>96</b> | <b>3.59</b> | <b>.673</b> | <b>.852</b> | <b>.494</b> |
|                    | <b>30-39</b>       | <b>86</b> | <b>3.68</b> | <b>.702</b> |             |             |
|                    | <b>40-49</b>       | <b>26</b> | <b>3.43</b> | <b>.923</b> |             |             |
|                    | <b>50-59</b>       | <b>8</b>  | <b>3.86</b> | <b>.840</b> |             |             |
|                    | <b>60 and more</b> | <b>5</b>  | <b>3.63</b> | <b>.367</b> |             |             |

**Age differences:**

table (3) shows that there are virtual differences between age levels in favor of (50-59) years, but these differences are statistically not significant.

The aging of the world's population is becoming more salient in the 21st century. By 2050, the number of individuals over 60 will be one-third of the world's population. The researchers explain the mentioned results because older individuals have already achieved their goals, and face challenges in the workplace, leading them to be more engaged. Also, older workers' engagement levels are less influenced by intrinsic motivational work values due to their experience. In contrast, younger employees' engagement levels are more affected by intrinsic motivations.

Increased personal competencies gained as one ages and having more experience in both work and life provides more resources to manage demands faced at work and prioritize basic needs rather than growth needs.

The results are consistent with (Pitt-Catsoupes, Matz-Costa, 2008). They showed that individuals with flexible work arrangements and those 45 years of age and older were more engaged overall than their younger counterparts. These study results are also supported by the study of (McClure, 2010), who found a positive relationship between age and engagement, indicating that older workers were more engaged than younger workers.

The results were inconsistent with (Robinson, Perryman, and Hayday's, 2004) study based on a survey of over 10,000 employees in 14 organizations, which found a decline in employee engagement levels with an increase in age and terms of service.

**Table (4): Groups Statistics and ANOVA of Gallup scale and its domains related to experience**

| Domain             | Years of Experience | N   | Mean  | Std. Deviation | F-Value | Significance. |
|--------------------|---------------------|-----|-------|----------------|---------|---------------|
| Basic Needs        | 0-3 yrs             | 114 | 3.91  | .679           | .154    | .927          |
|                    | 4-7 yrs             | 62  | 3.976 | .662           |         |               |
|                    | 8-10 yrs            | 25  | 3.980 | .770           |         |               |
|                    | More than 10 yrs    | 20  | 3.975 | .881           |         |               |
| Management Support | 0-3 yrs             | 114 | 3.51  | .885           | .736    | .531          |
|                    | 4-7 yrs             | 62  | 3.48  | .867           |         |               |

|              |                         |            |              |             |             |             |
|--------------|-------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|              | 8-10 yrs                | 25         | 3.22         | 1.076       |             |             |
|              | More than 10 yrs        | 20         | 3.55         | 1.025       |             |             |
| Teamwork     | 0-3 yrs                 | 114        | 3.81         | .671        | .367        | .777        |
|              | 4-7 yrs                 | 62         | 3.85         | .679        |             |             |
|              | 8-10 yrs                | 25         | 3.91         | .700        |             |             |
|              | More than 10 yrs        | 20         | 3.70         | .957        |             |             |
| Growth       | 0-3 yrs                 | 114        | 3.30         | .909        | .098        | .961        |
|              | 4-7 yrs                 | 62         | 3.28         | .947        |             |             |
|              | 8-10 yrs                | 25         | 3.20         | 1.072       |             |             |
|              | More than 10 yrs        | 20         | 3.33         | 1.076       |             |             |
| Gallup Scale | <b>0-3 yrs</b>          | <b>114</b> | <b>3.625</b> | <b>.680</b> | <b>.084</b> | <b>.968</b> |
|              | <b>4-7 yrs</b>          | <b>62</b>  | <b>3.630</b> | <b>.694</b> |             |             |
|              | <b>8-10 yrs</b>         | <b>25</b>  | <b>3.549</b> | <b>.823</b> |             |             |
|              | <b>More than 10 yrs</b> | <b>20</b>  | <b>3.613</b> | <b>.899</b> |             |             |

**Generational differences:**

Table (4) shows that there are virtual differences between the means of experience levels in favor of (4-7 Yrs) of Experience in the full scale and (more than 10 Yrs) in the (Manage Support) and (Growth) domains, and in favor of (8-10 Yrs) in the (Basic Needs) and (Teamwork) domains, but these differences are statistically not significant.

The researchers explain that engagement levels vary according to seniority and length of service in an organization. Senior employees are mostly presidents, managers, operational and hands-on staff who have a more senior role, with a greater chance of being engaged. In addition, employees with lower seniority have a stronger preference for salary and further financial rewards as motivational factors. Whereby employees with high seniority show less interest when it comes to rewards and recognition. The higher the years of service, the minor the effect on engagement comes from monetary rewards. Creating a positive work environment and H.R. initiatives on wellbeing have a lower strong positive effect on employees' engagement with seniority.

The results are supported by the study of (Nancheria, 2013) where employees who have worked for 6-10 years have a high engagement rate of 76%, and the respondents with more than ten years of experience have 79% engagement. The results are not consistent with the study of Kulik et al. which demonstrated that older employees, especially those who experience stereotyping, reported lower levels of engagement, and not consistent with the study of (Hinzmann, R. A., Rašticová, M., &Šácha, J., 2019) which reflected that there are differences on engagement based on the employee's seniority in favor of recently hired (less than six months).

**CONCLUSION:**

Employee engagement is one of the influential factors for the organization's success, which should be put at the center of the organization's strategy. Engaged employees can benefit their organization with their dedication, commitment to work, and support of its goals and vision. Many internal and external factors, which are dynamic, influence employee engagement; some of these factors include elements such as restructuring, the demographic makeup of the organization, change in management, and economic change.

This study aimed to identify the relation of employee engagement to variables as gender, age, and seniority or years of experience in a health organization (taking I.F.H. as an example) and aimed to explain employees' engagement based on Maslow's Herzberg theories.

The results show virtual differences between the means of males and females in favor of females, and there are virtual differences between the means of age levels in favor of (50-59) years. Moreover, there are virtual differences between the means of experience levels in favor of (4-7 Yrs.).

From an organizational perspective, the most salient contribution of the current study would benefit organizational leaders by providing an understanding of how employee engagement levels can be influenced and point out the need of monitoring policies, processes, and strategies in the workplace related to hiring, training, retaining and motivation of employees.



Organizational leaders need to be aware of these changes and actively design practices that address the needs of workers. Based on the results of this study and based on Herzberg's theory, a significant focus on enhancing younger workers' intrinsic motivation should be considered in organizational initiatives. This phenomenon has not gained much attention so far by business leaders.

The presence of an alliance between the employees' interests and that of the organization will support achieving its strategies and goals and enhance the employees' health and wellbeing of the employees. Researchers also suggest a relationship between engaged employees and customer engagement that needs to be investigated.

The results also indicate that employee engagement is complex, and there is not only one influencing factor. For leaders and H.R., this means that a multilateral approach is needed.

**References:**

1. Baumruk R (2006), 'Why managers are crucial to increasing engagement', Strategic HR Review, January/February
2. Douglas, Stephanie K., & Roberts, Robin A. (2020). Older and More Engaged: The Influence of an Employee's Age on Work Engagement. *Journal of Business Diversity*, 20(4), 73–84.
3. Fuller, Ryan. A Primer on Measuring Employee Engagement. (2014, November 17). Retrieved July 5, 2021, from Harvard Business Review website: <https://hbr.org/2014/11/a-primer-on-measuring-employee-engagement>
4. Gallup, I. (2020). The Power of Gallup's Q12 Employee Engagement Survey. Retrieved July 8, 2021, from Gallup.com website: <https://www.gallup.com/access/323333/q12-employee-engagement-survey.aspx>
5. Gallup, I. (2020). The Power of Gallup's Q12 Employee Engagement Survey. Retrieved July 3, 2021, from Gallup.com website: <https://www.gallup.com/access/323333/q12-employee-engagement-survey.aspx>
6. Hallberg UE, Schaufeli WB (2006), 'Same same but different? Can work engagement be discriminated from job involvement and organizational commitment?', *European Psychologist*, 11(2), 119–127
7. Havenga, W., Brand, C., & Visagie, J. (2013). Revisiting the validity and reliability of the Gallup workplace audit in a South African petrochemical company. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 37(1), 69-79.
8. Hinzmann, R. A., Rašticová, M., & Šácha, J. (2019). Factors of employee engagement at the workplace. Do years of service count?. *Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensis*.
9. J. Xu and H. Cooper Thomas, "How Can Leaders Achieve High Employee Engagement?", Leadership and A  
MARCUS AND NAMITHA M GOPINATH: IMPACT OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON THE  
EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT - AN ANALYSIS 510 *Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp. 399- 416, 2011.
10. John E. Mathieu and Dennis M. Zajac, "A Review and MetaAnalysis of the Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences of Organisational Commitment", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 108, No. 2, pp. 171-194, 1990.
11. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 692-724.
12. Kulik, C. T., Perera, S., & Cregan, C. (2016). Engage Me: The Mature-Age Worker and Stereotype Threat. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(6), 2132–2156. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0564>
13. Lailah Imandin, Christo Bisschoff, & Christoff Botha. (2014). A model to measure employee engagement. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 12(4), 520-532.
14. Lapoint, P. A., & Liprie-Spence, A. (2017). Employee Engagement: Generational Differences in the Workforce. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 17(5).
15. Marcus, A., & Gopinath, N. M. (2017). Impact of the demographic variables on the employee engagement-an analysis. *Ictact Journal on Management Studies*, 3(2), 502-510.
16. Maslach C, Schaufeli WB, Leiter MP (2001), 'Job burnout', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397–422
17. McClure, T. K. (2010, April). Driving Engagement among Older and Younger Workers- Not All Drivers are Created Equal. Paper presented at the 25th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.
18. Mcleod, Saul. (2007, February 5). Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. Retrieved July 3, 2021, from Simply Psychology website: <https://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html>.
19. Nancherla, Aparna (2013). Just A Number After All. *Training and Development* 62.6, 22. Business Source Complete.
20. Rahimi, Iman. Divsalar, Kouros. Rezvani, Mohsen. & Aramoon, Samaneh Sadat. (2016). The Relationship between Lifeguards' Needs and Their Job Satisfaction Based on Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. *Report of Health Care*, 2(2), 23–30.

21. Rasskazova, E., Ivanova, T., & Sheldon, K. (2016). Comparing the effects of low-level and high-level worker need-satisfaction: A synthesis of the self-determination and Maslow need theories. *Motivation and Emotion*, 40(4), 541–555. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-016-9557-7>
22. Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004), *The drivers of employee engagement*. Institute for Employment Studies, Brighton
23. Ruslan, Ruswahida binti Ibnu, Md., Islam, Aminul. & Idris Mohd Noor. (2014). The Relationship between Psychological Meaningfulness and Employee Engagement: Moderating Effect of Age and Gender. *Journal of Asian Scientific Research*, 4(12).
24. SadhnaSudershana, IpseetaSatpathy, B.C.M Patnaik. Impact of Age, Gender and Job Satisfaction on Employee Engagement in the I.T. sector. (2019). *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*, 9(2), 4841–4845. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijitee.b7816.129219>
25. Shukla, S., Adhikari, B., & Singh, V. (2015). Employee engagement-role of demographic variables and personality factors. *Amity global H.R.M. review*, 5, 65-73.
26. Sudarshana, Sadhna. Satpathy, Ipseeta. Patnaik, B.C.M. Impact of Age, Gender and Job Satisfaction on Employee Engagement in the I.T. sector. (2019). *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*, 9(2), 4841–4845. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijitee.b7816.129219>