

Dimensions of Pay Satisfaction as Predictors of Work Engagement among Military and Civilian Personnel

Akinbobola I. Olusola* and Nze D. Nathaniel

Department of Behavioural Studies, Redeemer's University, Ede, Osun State, Nigeria

Abstract: At the turn of the 21st Century, the world of work is experiencing phenomenal changes both at the workplace and in its work force. The reward output provided by organization may not commensurate with the input of personnel. This study therefore examined the predictability of dimensions of pay satisfaction on work engagement among military and civilian personnel in a Military Hospital in Nigeria. This study adopted cross-sectional survey utilizing an ex-post facto research design. A purposive sampling method was used to draw 256 participants comprising of 101 (39.5%) military and 155 (60.5) civilian personnel who completed structured psychological tests. Multiple regression and independent *t* test were used to analyse the data collected. The result showed that all the four dimensions of pay satisfaction which are (pay level, benefit, raise, and pay structure) jointly accounted for 16.7% of the total variation in work engagement. It is only one of the four dimensions of pay satisfaction (pay structure) that showed independent significant prediction of work engagement. Military personnel did not significantly manifest higher level of work engagement than civilian personnel. The implications of the result were discussed in line with management and sustainability of employment relationships in the world of work.

Keywords: Pay Satisfaction, Work Engagement, Personnel, Equity Theory, Employment Relationships.

INTRODUCTION

Since the last decade that ended the 20th Century, researches such as by (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Chung & Angeline, 2010; May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004; Ugwu, 2012) have escalated contribution to research writing in work engagement. Work engagement essentially takes its root from Kahn (1990) appraisal of self in ones work roles. Schaufeli *et al.* (2002) expound work engagement as having three dimensions of vigour, dedication and absorption. Work engagement entails investment in physical, cognitive and emotional disposition towards one's work (CIPD, 2010). There is a physical willingness to put in more effort for the required performance; a cognition for proper utilisation of one's skill and abilities; and emotional pleasure in coming to work, in doing work and in connecting with co-workers. Work engagement is a positive behaviour and the positive state of mind at work that leads to positive work-related outcomes (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000) such as organizational performance and sustainability (Kim *et al.*, 2016), productivity (Gorgievski & Bakker, 2011) and otherwise personnel turnover intention (Memon, Salleh & Baharom, 2017).

Work engagement may be driven by job-related working conditions termed job resources (Hakanen & Roodt, 2010) such as pay for the achievement of organizational goals. Pay is categorized as an

organizational level of job resources (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004; Kim, 2017). Pay is an important organizational reward (Heneman & Judge 2000) that creates avenue for employees to obtain other rewards and satisfaction (Mullins, 2010). Pay satisfaction is the amount of positive or negative feelings that individuals have toward their pay; the perception of fairness compared to the work performed by the personnel. According to Singh and Loncar (2010), pay satisfaction is a primary concern to both the personnel and the organisation. Pay is for meeting personnel's economic needs the satisfaction of the overall pay as this may impact one's attitudes and behaviours.

The organization's reward arouses personnel's interests, enhances performance; that is, organizations may utilize their pay system to motivate key behaviours (Lawler, 1971, 1990; Milkovich & Newman, 2008). When employees see fulfillment from their pay, how the pay is raised, the level of their pay, benefit, structure of their compensation, it tends to evoke them to engage in high levels of energy regarding their work (Smith, Farmer, & Yellowley, 2016). Personnel can be mutually ready to exert their dedicated efforts in the achievement of their organizational goals.

Pay satisfaction is a type of reward provided to personnel and emerging from their employment in the organization (Dessler, 2009). Reward is the center piece of the employment contract; reward is the main reason why people work (Harrison & Liska, 2008). Rewards can be both intrinsic and extrinsic. Salary covers, career values, pay structures, paying for job

*Address correspondence to this author at the Department of Behavioural Studies, Redeemer's University, Ede, Osun State, Nigeria; Tel: 234 802 3315058; E-mail: solaakinbobola@yahoo.co.uk

performance, ability, and expertise, and workers benefits (Bob, 2011). Pay satisfaction is more than money; it concerns non-monetary pay which gives intrinsic or extrinsic motivation to employees (Singh & Loncar, 2010). It may be rationalised that pay satisfaction is caused in part by perceptions regarding the equity of one's pay level.

Some organisations such as the Nigerian Army have personnel in different employment types in their service. The Nigerian Army is part of the Nigerian Armed Forces. The Nigerian Army is encumbered with enormous task in the 21st Century, charged with protecting the nation and providing security for the country. Combat Support Services under the auspices of the Nigerian Army cover the medical section which manages its Military Hospitals (Global Security, 2019). The Military Hospitals offer employment to both the military and the civilians. Both military personnel and civilians personnel attend the Military Hospitals as patients for treatment. The military personnel's primary assignment is to defend the nation and their other profession is secondary. The reward for the military personnel differs from the civilian personnel. The military personnel are offered some benefits that are not offered civilians. The health care, insurance, housing, travel and education offered the military personnel are cheaper when compared to the civilian personnel. However in some instances the benefits are free. In terms of scope of work, the military personnel are combatant ready and can be seconded to the war zone without prior notice. There is always threat of heading to a combat zone and risking their life. There are regimental rules which cannot be upturned. On the other hand, civilian personnel have more freedom than the military personnel. The perception of equity of pay of both military personnel and civilian personnel of the Military Hospitals may impact their pay satisfaction.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theories

Some theories of motivation are grouped as process theories of motivation which explain how satisfaction comes about. The process theories in general are concerned with identifying how an individual behaves and energises. The equity theory, categorized as a process theory specifically postulates that personnel will weigh their input into a job against the output they receive from it; the more the rewards the greater their motivation (Negi, 2015). Motivation is a pleasurable emotional state resulting from appraisal

of one's experiences; the emotional attachment a personnel has to the job and the deliberate review of a personnel's work by the employer (Saari & Judge 2004). Motivation is the set of forces that cause people to behave in certain ways. Motivation plays a key role in driving personnel towards achieving organizational goals. In every personnel, motivation maybe from within an individual (intrinsic) or from outside factors (extrinsic). Extrinsic motivation such as reward encourages significant social exchange and wider employment relationship (Smith, Farmer & Yellowley, 2016). The satisfaction with the rewards employees receive from the organisation is likely to determine personnel's engagement to their work.

Equity theory, postulated by Adam (1963) examines how personnel will react to perceived discrepancies between one's input/output ratio and that of a reference person. Input includes achieved (e.g. skills, experience, learning, military training) or ascribed individual characteristics of the employee (e.g. age, sex). Output includes (e.g. recognition, fringe benefits, pay and reward) the personnel receives from the organisation. Reference person is the one used for the purpose of comparison. The essence of equity which also means fairness is to create a balance between personnel's input and output in the organization. The personnel's perception of how one is initially treated in social exchanges at work usually result in the social comparisons one makes. Equity exists where the two ratios are equal meaning when personnel perceive that the ratios of their input to their output are equivalent to the ratios of other personnel. Inequity exists when the two ratios are not equal meaning when these ratios are not equivalent; an individual's own ratio of inputs to output could be greater than or less than, that of others (Adams, 1965).

Going forward from the last two decades of the 20th Century Adam's (1963) equity theory was used to further explain personnel attitudes and behaviour with concept of organizational justice. Organisational justice theory is the degree to which individuals feel fairly treated at the workplace. Organisational justice consists of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Distributive justice refers to the degree to which the outcomes (rewards, pay, compassion) received from the organization are perceived to be fair (Greenberg, 1997; Greenberg & Colquitt, 2003). Procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness of the organisation processes used to make resource and allocation of compensation decisions (Greenberg, 1997; Greenberg & Colquitt,

2003). Personnel care about reward fairness as well as decision-making processes fairness because they are likely to believe that fairness is an end in itself and it is the right thing to do; fair processes guarantee future rewards and fairness communicates that the organization values its personnel and cares about their well-being (Adams, 1963). Interactional justice refers to perceived fairness of disseminating information and relationships, when people are treated with respect, confidentiality, and dignity (Brockner & Wiesenfeld, 1996; Greenberg, 1997; Greenberg & Colquitt, 2003). In interpersonal relations such as with experience of negative outcomes of pay cut; inequity can be reciprocated with employees manifesting reduced work engagement (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997).

A vast number of research such as those of (De Mello, Wildermuth & Pauken, 2008; Fagbohunge, 2009; Kanter & Mackenzie, 2010; Rizal *et al.*, 2014) indicated that the effectiveness of the reward system can boost personnel's performance as well as improve organizational productivity and development. Equity theory (Adams, 1963) can be used to explain that pay will lead to better performance, depending that organizational output is commensurate with personnel input levels (Trevor, Reilly & Gerhart, 2012). Treuren and Frankish (2013) discovered that personnel's understanding of pay arrangements is found to have an indirect impact (through pay satisfaction) on personnel intention to leave from a non-profit, poorly paid occupational group. Memon, Salleh and Baharom (2017) found among professionals working in the oil and gas sector that pay satisfaction positively affects personnel work engagement; and work engagement negatively affects personnel intentions to leave. Jung and Yoon (2015) in a study on personnel of a deluxe hotel found that there is a relationship between pay satisfaction and its four dimensions (pay level, pay raise, benefits, and pay structure) job engagement and withdrawal. The results showed that employees' pay satisfaction and three dimensions (benefits, pay level, and pay structure) had a significant effect on personnel's job engagement. Vandenberghe and Tremblay (2008) revealed in a study with medical representatives that significant relationship exist between pay satisfaction and work engagement.

Statement of Problem

At the turn of the 21st Century, the world of work is experiencing phenomenal changes of both the workplace and the work force. Work place changes such as emergence of high technology and

communication system, increasing globalisation of the economy, doing business with people from around the world (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2010). There is increased competition among countries as globalisation brings together co-workers from different countries. There is also a changing work force of temporary online personnel; while the labour market has expanded beyond national personnel culminating in diversity (in age, gender, ethnicity, race, cultural) (Lerman & Schmidt, 2002). The workforce now multitasks, complement technical skills with soft skills, apply interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary approach; thus affecting employee engagement in their work (Greenberg & Baron, 2003; Stewart, 1993). Personnel may not be deeply involved in their field of employment, in the case that the job resources provided by the organisation are not enough or commensurate to the changing workforce.

The Nigerian Army is distressed; its personnel are under-staffed, under-trained, under-resourced, under-motivated and therefore over-stretched (International Crisis Group, 2016) and its equipment is in poor state (Fayemi, 2015). The ratio of about two hundred thousand (200,000) military personnel (Nigerian Army 76RRI, 2018) to the population of about one hundred million (100,000,000) Nigerians is grossly inadequate. There have been international watchers comments and public outcry to save the nation from further current and future security challenges. The military personnel too have reacted by engaging in criminal activities ranging from armed robbery to ransom kidnapping of members of the public. On the other hand, some military personnel courteously made their grievances known. The perception of fairness of reward of the personnel of Military Hospitals will manifest in their work engagement.

If there is no perceived pay satisfaction by the personnel, they will be unwilling to carry out the assigned work roles. Pay impacts the behaviour of personnel and reinforces certain organizational behaviour. Reward and output by organisation do not match input and effort of personnel. Personnel may work but how deeply engaged they are depends on how motivated they are (Smith, Farmer & Yellowley, 2016). Reward is motivation to boost the employees' to work. Personnel do not have control of that reward as it is external, rewards comes from the organization. Pay is relevant to organization and to the personnel. It is simply highlighted as giving in return for services rendered or to return value. It is a form of appreciating and recognising the personnel's engagement. Reduced

pay bring about dissatisfaction, pay dissatisfaction can have important and undesirable impact on personnel attitudes and behavior and can reduce work engagement. Management of employment relationship is a two-way relationship between employee and employer in organisations (MacLeod & Clarke, 2009; Rankin, 2008); the ability to reward various personnel will be studied for enhanced work engagement and performance.

Previous studies on pay satisfaction and work engagement was carried out in countries including Malaysia (Memon, Salleh & Baharom, 2017); South Korea (Jung & Yoon, 2015); Vandenberghe & Tremblay, 2008); Finland (Kallioniemi, *et al.* 2018) and career satisfaction in Nigeria (Adekola, 2011). Researches on job resources and work engagement were done on the level of interpersonal and social relations (Akinbobola & Nwankwo, 2017; Kallioniemi, *et al.* 2018); the level of the work organized in an organization using paramilitary organization (Akinbobola & Akinwole, 2017); and the level of the task (Akinbobola & Teluwo, 2018; Hakanen, Perhoniemi, & Toppinen-Tanner, 2008). The present study is on the organizational level of job resources using pay satisfaction.

The purpose of this study is to find the predictability of dimensions of pay satisfaction on work engagement among military and civilian personnel.

To achieve this purpose the following hypotheses were tested:

1. Pay satisfaction will significantly predict work engagement among military and civilian personnel.
2. The dimensions of pay satisfaction (Pay Level, Benefit, Raise, and Pay Structure) will significantly predict work engagement among military and civilian personnel.
3. Military personnel will manifest significantly higher level of work engagement than civilian personnel.

METHOD

Research Design

The design of this study is a cross-sectional survey utilizing an ex-post facto research design to examine the influence of pay satisfaction on work engagement

among military and civilian personnel of a military hospital in Port-Harcourt, River State, Nigeria. This cross-sectional survey obtains its data from participants at a single point in time. The present study is a qualitative study (Otokiti, 2010). The independent variables are pay satisfaction, employment type, gender and age, while the dependent variable is work engagement.

Participants

The population of this study is civilian and military personnel of a military hospital in Port-Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria. A purposive sampling which is a non-probability sampling method was used to draw 256 participants from the Military Hospital in Port-Harcourt, Rivers State.

Instruments

A battery of psychological tests was used for data collection in a questionnaire booklet. The questionnaire comprised three sections. Section A measures demographic data such as employment type, age and gender. Section B contains pay satisfaction test and Section C contains work engagement test.

Section B: Pay Satisfaction

Pay satisfaction was measured by Pay Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Heneman and Judge (2000). The scale captures 18 items made up of four components of pay satisfaction: Item number 1-4 measures pay level (four items; $\alpha = .96$) e.g. I am satisfied with my overall level of pay. Item number 5-8 measures benefit satisfaction (four items; $\alpha = .88$) e.g. I am satisfied with the number of benefits I receive. Item number 9-12 measures raise satisfaction (four items; $\alpha = .79$) e.g. I am satisfied with how my raises are determined. Item number 13-18 measures pay structure satisfaction (six items; $\alpha = .73$) e.g. I am satisfied with the differences in pay among jobs in the company. The responses format is a Likert - type scale ranging from 1- 5. Where 1 stands for 'very dissatisfied', while 5 stands for 'very satisfied'. Coefficient alpha for the composite measure of pay satisfaction ranged from 0.77 to 0.88. The subscales can also be combined into a composite measure for overall pay satisfaction.

Section C: Work Engagement

Work Engagement was measured by the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) developed by

Schaufeli *et al.* (2002). UWES is a self-report instrument that includes three dimensions which are vigour, dedication and absorption. The original UWES (UWES-17) includes 17 items with vigor (6 items), dedication (5items), and absorption (6 items). The responses format is a Likert - type scale ranging from 0- 6. Where 0 stands for ‘never’ while 6 stands for ‘always’. The coefficient alpha for the composite measure of work engagement is 0.83.

Procedure

The study used primary data. Primary data was obtained through a questionnaire. The questionnaires were administered to the civilian and military personnel in a Military Hospital in Port Harcourt on a drop and pick method. At the end 256 (85%) questionnaires were collected out 300 questionnaires that were initially given out.

Ethical Consideration

Participants were well informed about the research before they participated. Participation was voluntary and anonymity was ensured. If at any point they felt inconvenient with answering the questions they were allowed to decline or pull out of the research. The participants were also assured that the information provided was only for research purposes.

Statistical Analysis

Data collected in this study was analysed by latest version of Statistical Package for Social Sciences

(SPSS). Multiple Regression analysis and independent *t* test were used to analyse the stated hypotheses.

RESULTS

Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

There are 256 participants who are personnel in different units of a Military Hospital in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria surveyed in this study. The gender distribution shows that 121 (47.3%) men and 135 (52.7%) women participated in the study. The age distribution shows that 136 (53.1%) are younger employees and 120 (46.9%) are older personnel. The employment type distribution shows that there are 101 (39.5%) military personnel and 155 (60.5) civilian personnel.

Test of Hypotheses

Prior to regression analysis Pearson correlation was done. The result in Table 1 shows significant relationship between pay satisfaction and work engagement of the participants.

The results for the three hypotheses tested for this study are presented:

Hypothesis 1: Pay satisfaction will significantly predict work engagement among military and civilian personnel.

The result in Table 2 shows R square value of .157 indicates that pay satisfaction accounted for 15.7% of

Table 1: Correlations between Pay Satisfaction and Work Engagement

		work engagement	pay satisfaction
Pearson Correlation	work engagement	1.000	.396
	pay satisfaction	.396	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	work engagement	.	.000
	pay satisfaction	.000	.
N	work engagement	256	256
	pay satisfaction	256	256

Table 2: Simple-Linear Regression Analysis of Work Engagement by Pay Satisfaction

MODEL	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F ratio	R ²	Adjusted R ²	P-value
Regression	4550.766	1	4550.766	47.347	.157	.157	.000
Residual	24413.043	254	96.114				
Total	28963.809	255					

Table 3: Multiple Regression Analysis of Dimensions of Pay Satisfaction (Pay Level, Benefit, Raise, and Pay Structure) on Work Engagement

MODEL	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	R ²	Adjusted R ²	P-value
Regression	4822.851	4	1205.713	12.533	.167	.154	.000
Residual	24050.874	250	96.203				
Total	28873.725	254					

Model	Beta	t	P-value
Pay Level	.140	1.642	.102
Benefit	.164	1.861	.064
Raise	-.015	-.178	.859
Pay Structure	.182	2.288	.023

the total variation in work engagement. Table 2 also reveals that analysis of regression data produces a statistically significant F-ratio value $F(1,254) = 47.347$, $P < 0.01$. The result indicates that pay satisfaction significantly predict work engagement; hence the hypothesis 1 which states that pay satisfaction will significantly predicted work engagement among military and civilian personnel is therefore supported

Hypothesis 2: The dimensions of pay satisfaction (Pay Level, Benefit, Raise, and Pay Structure) will significantly predict work engagement among military and civilian personnel.

The result in Table 3 shows R square value of .167, which indicates that all the four dimensions of Pay Satisfaction which are (Pay Level, Benefit, Raise, and Pay Structure) jointly accounted for 16.7% of the total variation in work engagement. Table 3 also reveals that analysis of multiple regression data produced a statistically significant F-ratio value ($F(4,250) = 12.533$, $P < .01$).

Table 3 shows independent contribution of each of the four dimensions of pay satisfaction which are (Pay Level, Benefit, Raise, and Pay Structure). When observed singly, only one of the four dimension pay structure ($\beta = .18$, $t = 2,288$, $p < 0.05$) shows significant prediction of work engagement. The result indicates that the remaining three dimensions of Pay Satisfaction

which are (Pay Level ($\beta = .14$, $t = 1.642$, ns); Benefit ($\beta = .164$, $t = 1.861$, ns); and Raise ($\beta = -.015$, $t = -.178$, ns) did not significantly predict work engagement. Hence hypothesis two which states that the dimensions of pay satisfaction (Pay Level, Benefit, Raise, and Pay Structure) will significantly predict work engagement among military and civilian personnel is therefore rejected.

Hypothesis 3: Military personnel will manifest significantly higher level of work engagement than civilian personnel.

The result on Table 4 shows that military personnel obtained slightly higher mean score ($\bar{x} = 45.57$, $SD = 9.98$) than the civilian personnel ($\bar{x} = 45.33$, $SD = 11.63$) on the work engagement scale. The observed difference in their mean scores was however, found not to be significant $t(254) = 0.177$, $P > 0.05$. This indicated that there was no significant employee type difference in levels of work engagement of the military hospital personnel. This finding did not support hypothesis 3 which predicted that military personnel will manifest significantly higher level of work engagement than civilian personnel.

DISCUSSION

The hypothesis that states that pay satisfaction will significantly predict work engagement among military

Table 4: Independent Sample t-Test Showing the Influence of Employment Type on Work Engagement

Variables		N	Mean (\bar{x})	Standard Deviation (SD)	df	t	P-value
Employment Type	Military	101	45.57	9.983	254	.177	.075
	Civilian	155	45.33	11.634			

and civilian personnel is accepted. This finding is corroborated by the studies of (Memon *et al.*, 2017; Vandenberghe & Tremblay, 2008). Memon *et al.* (2017) found that pay satisfaction positively affects personnel work engagement while Vandenberghe and Tremblay (2008) indicated that significant relationship exists between pay satisfaction and work engagement. Pay received by the personnel from the organization encourages social exchanges and better employment relationships. When personnel have pay satisfaction from reward system of the organization they will be motivated for engagement with vigor, unwavering dedication and absorption to work. Reward such as pay is at the organizational level of job resources. Job resources drive work engagement therefore the personnel invest physically, cognitively and emotionally in work. The organization too will be productive, maximize profit, and have competitive advantage to attain organizational goals.

The hypothesis that states that dimensions of pay satisfaction (Pay Level, Benefit, Raise, and Pay Structure) significantly predicts work engagement among military and civilian personnel is rejected. The findings indicate that all the four dimensions of pay satisfaction (Pay Level, Benefit, Raise, and Pay Structure) jointly predicted work engagement but only pay structure independently influences work engagement. Previous study support these findings. Jung and Yoon (2015) showed that there is relationship between pay satisfaction and its four dimensions (pay level, pay raise, benefits, and pay structure) with job engagement. However, according to Jung and Yoon (2015) only three dimensions of pay satisfaction (benefits, pay level, and pay structure) independently had significant effect on job engagement. The world of work in the 21st Century comprises of workplace that is global and work force that is diversified. The present study made use of participants in diversified workforce comprising of military and civilians. A joint prediction of the dimensions of pay satisfaction shows there is reward fairness in distribution of reward by the organisation but the significant independent contribution of only pay structure indicates that there is no fairness in decision making process and interpersonal relationship in the organization. Pay structure bothers on administration and information of pay issues. When personnel perceive inequity, they perceive that they are neither valued nor respected by the organization. This inequity is reciprocated by personnel unwillingness to do their work and this drastically reduces their work engagement.

The hypothesis that states that military personnel will manifest significantly higher level of work engagement than civilian personnel is rejected. When organisational output is commensurate with personnel's input, there will be better performance and work engagement by all personnel irrespective of employment type (either military or civilian). Military personnel input differ from civilian input and therefore organizational output is different as per pay and benefit personnel receive.

RECOMMENDATION

Organisations in the 21st century own the job resources such as reward and should provide quality job resources for their personnel according to best global standards to remain competitive in the global market. Pay satisfaction is essential for personnel to get engaged with work therefore Human Resources Management should pay equitable salary to commensurate with personnel input. To remain relevant in the world of work, organisations should use effective information dissemination processes that are fair to its personnel. Fairness in decision making on pay issues should be paramount in the organization.

Pay structure is crucial to work engagement; the administration of pay should be standardised. In line with Sustainable Goal Development especially goal 8, all personnel should be treated fairly to improve capacity building, human rights, work ethics and civilian-military relations. Since employment relationship is a social exchange between the organization and its personnel, personnel should also be totally immersed and engaged in work to reciprocate and justify the pay received from the organization. Extrinsic motivation comes from the organization but the personnel must intrinsically desire to work with vigor and dedication.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

The main purpose of this study is to find the predictability of dimensions of pay satisfaction on work engagement among military and civilian personnel. Three hypotheses were tested and the findings indicated that pay satisfaction significantly predicts work engagement among civilian and military personnel. This findings support equity theory's postulation that personnel react to perceived imbalance between input and output ratio in social exchanges which eventually usually results in social comparisons one makes. Also, that the four dimensions of pay

satisfaction (Raise, Pay Level, Benefit and Admin) jointly significantly predict work engagement but only one dimension of pay satisfaction which is pay structure independently and significantly predicts work engagement among civilian and military personnel. Organisational justice theory is brought to bear as the personnel's reaction to pay structure reflects one's perception of interactional injustice in administration of pay, is reciprocated with employees reduced work engagement. Notably, employment type does not significantly influence work engagement of the military and civilian personnel.

LIMITATION OF STUDY

This study made use of both military and civilians as participants, future studies can use others professionals for wider generalisation of results.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 422-436. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040968>
- Adam, J. S., (1965). Inequity is Social Exchange in L. Berkouitiz (ed.) *Advance in experimental social psychology* (1.2, pp 267-299) New York: Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60108-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2)
- Adekola, B. (2011). Antecedents and consequences of work engagement among managers and professionals in Nigeria. *British Journal of Management and Economics*, 1(2), 83-99.
- Akinbobola, O. I. & Akintunde, A. (2017). Personality factors and organizational factors as predictors of work engagement among paramilitary personnel in Abuja, Nigeria. Lancaster University Ghana and the Richardson Institute U.K. joint conference 24th May, Ghana.
- Akinbobola, O. I. & Nwankwo, S. (2017). Appraisal of role facilitation on work engagement among corporate work force. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Organizational Studies* 12(3), 1-12. Champaign, Illinois. <https://doi.org/10.18848/2324-7649/CGP/v12i03/1-12>
- Akinbobola, O. I. & Adepeju, T. (2018). Mediatory Influence of Work Engagement on Employability Skill and Job Innovativeness. *International Journal of Applied Psychology* 8(2), 17-22.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E. & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management* 43(1), 83 – 104. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20004>
- Bakker, A. B. & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International* 13, 209–223. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430810870476>
- Bob, N. (2011). Making employees suggestions count. *Journal of Personnel Management* 1, 20 –41.
- Borralha, S., Jesus, S. N., Valle, P., & Viseu, J. (2016). Hotel employees: A systematic literature. *Journal of Spatial and Organisational Dynamics* 4 (1), 4-20. <https://doi.org/10.18089/tms.2016.12112>
- Brockner, J. & Wiesenfeld B. M (1996). An integrative framework for explaining reactions to decisions: the interactive effects of outcomes and procedures. *Psychological Bulletin* 1200, 189 – 208. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.120.2.189>
- Chung, N. G., & Angeline, T. (2010). Does work engagement mediate the relationship between job resources and job performance of employees? *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(9), 1837-1843.
- CIPD (2010) *Using the Head and Heart at Work; a business case for soft skills*, London. Chartered Institute of Personnel And Development, (Available): at www.cipd.co.uk
- De Mello, C., Wildermuth, A. & Pauken, S. (2008) A perfect march: decoding employees engagement Part 1: Engaging Culture and Leaders. *Industrial and Commercial Training* 40(3), 122-8. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00197850810868603>
- Dessler, G. (2009). *A Framework for Human Resource Management*. (5th Edition). Canada: Pearson
- Fagbohunge, O. B. (2009). *Personnel or Human Resource Management: The repertory for Human Resource Utilization*, Lagos: Olas ventures.
- Fayemi, J. O. (2015). Threats, Military Expenditure and National Security: Analysis of Trends in Nigeria's Defence Planning, 1970 - 1990 (PDF). University of London. Archived from the original (PDF) on 12 March 2015. Retrieved 12 March 2015.
- Global Security (2019). Nigerian Army Order of Battle. Retrieved from www.globalsecurity.org. Retrieved 16 February 2019.
- Gorgievski, M. J., & A. Bakker, A. B., (2011) 'Passion for work: Work engagement versus workaholism'. Pp 264-271 edited by S.L. Albrecht (Ed.), *Handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research and practice*. Glos, UK: Edward Elgar
- Greenberg, J. (1997). *The Quest for Justice on the Job*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Greenberg, J. & Baron, R. A. (2003). *Behaviour in Organisations* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Greenberg, J. & Colquitt, J. A. (2003). *Organizational Justice: A Primer*. Upper saddle river, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hakanen, J. J., Perhoniemi, R., & Toppinen-Tanner (2008). Positive gain spirals at work: From job resources to work engagement, personal initiative and work-unit innovativeness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73(1), 78-91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.01.003>
- Hakanen, J.J. & Roodt, G. (2010). 'Using the job demands-resources model to predict engagement: Analysing a conceptual model' Pp. 10–24 edited by A. B. Bakker & M. P. Leiter *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Harrison, D.A & Liska, Z. (2008). Promoting regular exercise in occupational fitness programme. *Journal of Personal Psychology*, 5(5): 27-45.
- Heneman, H. G., & Judge, T. A. (2000). Incentives and Motivation. 61-103. *Compensation in Organizations: Progress and Prospects* edited by S. Rynes and B. Gerhart, San Francisco, CA: New Lexington Press.
- International Crisis Group (2016) Nigeria: The Challenge of Military Reform. African Report No. 237 June 6 2016.
- Jung H. S., & Yoon, H. H. (2015) Understanding pay satisfaction: The impacts of pay satisfaction on employees' job engagement and withdrawal in deluxe hotel. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 48, 22-26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.04.004>
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 692-724. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256287>
- Kallioniemi, M. K, Kaseva, J., Lunner K. C., Simola, A., Kymäläinen, H. R. (2018). Job resources and work engagement among Finnish dairy farmers. *Journal of Agromedicine*. 23(3), 249–261. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1059924X.2018.1470047>

- Kanter, M. & Mackenzie, L. (2010) *Hewitt Analysis shows steady decline in global employee engagements levels* (Available at <http://talentmgmt.com/articles/view/hewitt-analysis-shows-steady-decline-in-global-employee-engagement-view-levels>)
- Kim, W., Khan, G. F., Wood, J., & Mahmood, M. T. (2016). Employee Engagement for Sustainable Organizations: Keyword Analysis Using Social Network Analysis and Burst Detection Approach Sustainability 8(7), 631. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su8070631>
- Kim, W. (2017). Examining mediation effects of work engagement among job resources, job performance, and turnover intention. *Performance Improvement Quarterly* 29(4), 407–425. <https://doi.org/10.1002/piq.21235>
- Lawler, E. E. III. (1971). *Pay and Organizational Effectiveness: A Psychological View*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lerman, R. I. & Schmidt, S. R. (2002). *An Overview of economic, social & demographic trends affecting the labour market*. Report to the urban institute for US Department of Labour (at www.dol.gov).
- Macleod, I. & Clarke, N. (2009). *Engaging for Success: Enhancing Performance Through Employee Engagement* (Available at www.bis.gov.uk/politics/employment-matters/strategies/employee-engagement). <https://doi.org/10.1037/e576512011-001>
- 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, 11-37. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317904322915892>
- Memon, M. A., Salleha, R., & Baharom, M. N. R. (2017). The mediating role of work engagement between pay satisfaction and turnover intention. *International Journal of Economics, Management and Accounting* 25, (1), 43-69.
- Milkovich, G. T., & Newman, J. M. (2008). *Compensation*. 8th ed. New York: McGraw- Hill Irwin.
- Mullins, L. J. (2010) *Management and Organisational Behaviour* (9th ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Negi, A. (2015) *Industrial Psychology* New Delhi. CBS.
- Nigerian Army (2018). 76RRI List of Successful Shortlisted Candidates for Zonal Screening. *Livegist.com.ng*. Retrieved 20 July 2018.
- Otokiti, S. O. (2010). *Contemporary issues and controversy in research methodology*. Dubai: Dubai Printing Press.
- Pearce, L. (2010). Managerial compensation based on organization performance. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 52(3), 28.
- Pricewaterhouse Coopers (2010). *Managing Tomorrow's People: The Future Of Work* to 202. Available at www.pwc.co.uk
- Rankin, N. (2008). *The Drivers of Staff Retention and Employee Engagement*. Available at www.xperHR.co.uk/article/86942.aspx#top
- Rizal, M., Idrus, M. S., Djumahir & Mintarti, R. (2014). Effect of compensation on motivation, organizational commitment and employee performance (studies at local revenue management in Kendari city). *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 3(2), 64-79.
- Saari, L. M. & Judge, T. A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resources Management* 43(4), 395-407. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20032>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout and: A confirmative analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3: 71-92. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
- Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction, *American Psychologist*, 55, 5-14. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066X.55.1.5>
- Singh, P. & Loncar, N. (2010). Pay satisfaction, job satisfaction and turnover intent, *Relations Industrielles / Industrial Relations*, 65(3), 470-490. <https://doi.org/10.7202/044892ar>
- Skarlicki, D. P. & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: the roles of distributive, procedural and interactional justice: a psychological analysis. Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.82.3.434>
- Smith, P. Farmer, M. & Yellowley, W. (2016) *Organizational Behaviour*. London: Hodder Education.
- Smith Farmer & Yellowley 2016 *Procedural & Interactional Justice: A Psychological Analysis*: Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stewart, T. A. (1993). Welcome to the Revolution. *Fortune* December (3). pp 66-68, 70, 72, 76, 78.
- Treuren, G. J. M. & Frankish, E. (2013). The impact of pay understanding on pay satisfaction and retention: Salary sacrifice understanding in the not-for-profit sector. Research Article. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022185613498657>
- Trevor, C. O., Reilly, G., & Gerhart, B. (2012). Reconsidering pay dispersion's effect on the performance of interdependent work: Reconciling sorting and pay inequality. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 585–610. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.0127>
- Ugwu, F. O. (2012). Are good morals often reciprocated? Perceptions of organizational virtuousness and optimism as predictors of work engagement. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities* 1(3), 188-198.
- Vandenberghe, C. & Tremblay, M. (2008). The role of pay satisfaction and organizational commitment in turnover intentions: a two-sample study. *Journal of Business and Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-008-9063-3>

Received on 14-11-2019

Accepted on 05-12-2019

Published on 23-12-2019

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-7092.2019.08.93>

© 2019 Olusola and Nathaniel; Licensee Lifescience Global.

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.