THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Drivers of Employee Engagement in the Nigerian Public Media Sector

Dr. Ifeanyichukwu Ojeka Ukonu
Lecturer, Department of Business Administration,
Veritas University, Abuja, Nigeria
Ikoro, E. I
Lecturer, Department of Industrial Relations and Personnel Management,
Michael Okpara University, Umudike, Abia State, Nigeria
O.O Ukoha
Professor, Department of Industrail Relations and Personnel Management,
Michael Okpara University, Umudike, Abia State, Nigeria

Abstract:
While much has been written on employee engagement, this research was prompted by the dearth of data on drivers of employee engagement in Nigerian public media corporations. Consequently, drawing on relevant literature, eight drivers of employee engagement viz. Leadership, Communication, Compensation/Recognition, Learning and Development Perceived Organisational Support (POS), Career Development, Job Crafting and Work Environment were selected. A mixed methodology research design involving both quantitative and qualitative techniques was used to generate data extracted from the expanded Gallup Q12 questionnaire. The data generated was analysed using mean, ranking method, regression analysis, Kendall tau-b correlation, and thematic content analysis. Empirical findings showed that the eight elements were predictors of employee engagement in the study population, with Perceived Organisation Support being the highest predictor, followed by Compensation and Rewards, Work Environment, Job crafting, Leadership, Communications, Career Development, Learning and Development (β=0.245, 0.223, 0.220, 0.214, 0.176, 0.142, 0.116 and 0.110) respectively and adjusted R^2 was 0.998; P<0.0001. The study findings revealed a great need for the government as an employer of labour to devote more attention to the drivers of employee engagement in the workplace to achieve improved performance and efficiency.

Keywords: Drivers of employee engagement, perceived-organisational-support, compensation, job crafting, work-environment

1. Introduction

Employee engagement becomes a topic of interest for scholars, business consultants and practitioners in the 21st century because most researchers reported a positive correlation between engagement and improved organisational performance. Thus, establishing an engaged workforce became a high priority for many organisations (Alfes, Soane & Lees *et al.*, 2010), to the extent that it has been argued that 'engaged' employees are the backbone of a good working environment where people are diligent, principled and accountable (Cleland Mitchinson & Townend, 2008). Scholarly reports suggested that one of the techniques for achieving improved organisational performance is to outline possible ways of getting employees more engaged (Clapon, 2014).

Drivers of employee engagement are those elements that influence and motivate employees, drive people's actions and transform them into productivity, profitability, organisational loyalty and performance (Clapon, 2014). O'Carroll (2015) argued that from the literature, there is no exhaustive list of the drivers of employee engagement; rather, on average, some drivers appear commonly in most of the research. Some of these drivers are grouped under the following: leadership, communications, compensation, recognition, training, learning and development, career development, perceived supervisor's support, perceived organisational support, job crafting, work environment and feedback. These drivers tend to motivate employees towards engagement in an organisation (Egwuonwu, 2015; O'Caroll, 2015).

Thus, in a bid to motivate employees in public media corporations, the government put in place employee engagement policies indirectly centred on employee engagement drivers. One such policy focuses on compensation referred to as weigh-in allowance for public media corporations such as the Federal Radio Corporation of Nigeria. The Federal government approved weigh-in-allowance for media workers on July 1st, 2011 (Alao & Alao, 2013) in addition to the minimum wage, which is a compensation scheme supposedly made to encourage and improve workers' performance and productivity in public media corporations. Other employee engagement policies are equal employment opportunities, training and development, adequate work environment, organisational support, career development and employee

welfare (Yisa, 2003). Similarly, the establishment of the National Broadcasting Commission (NBC) in 1992, the liberalisation of the media industry in 1992 and the passage of the Freedom of Information Bill in 2011 seem to have given the media industry an unprecedented leap (Akeem *et al.,* 2013; Inuwa, 2017). Thus, this study aims to determine the drivers of employee engagement and its relative importance in the public media corporation

1.1. Statement of the Problem

The performance of the media industry over the years cannot be overemphasised, especially with the advent of the COVID-19 pandemic. Assertively, the media plays a pivotal role in nation-building and national development (Akeem *et al.,* 2013; Inuwa, 2017), and with the passage of the Freedom of Information Bill in 2011, a lot of media houses, especially Radio Broadcasting has spread like *'wildfire'* across every *'nook and cranny'* of the nation making the media industry highly competitive. Moreover, there seems to be intense competition between the public, private, and individual social media bloggers on listenership and followership in the post-COVID-19 era. The question is: How will the public media implement employee engagement policies and programmes to keep afloat in the midst of these competitions?

1.2. Aim and Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study is to examine the drivers of employee engagement in the Nigerian Public Media Corporation with special emphasis on Federal Radio Corporation of Nigeria and Broadcasting Corporation of Abia State, Nigeria.

The specific objectives of the study are to:
- Determine the relationship between the drivers of employee engagement and employee engagement in the study population.
- Determine the relative importance of the drivers of employee engagement in influencing employee engagement in the study population.

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1. The Concept of Employee Engagement

Employee engagement (EE) has become a new management mantra, which is an emerging field still evolving (Truss, Deldridge, Alfes, *et al.,* 2013). The concept of employee engagement has received several definitions from its inception (Rogel, 2016). Among the definitions proffered by different authors, Kahn's definition seems to be comprehensive and precise in terms of the definition and measurement of the concept. Kahn defined employee engagement as harnessing organisation members' selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances (Kahn, 2010).

MacLeod's (2016) review identified over fifty different definitions, more than enough to confuse even the most positive people managers. As such, *its definitions and measurements of employee engagement have continually been a topic of debate (Gifford, 2015; Harley, 2016).* Rogel (2016) claimed that confusion exists as many try to define engagement for their particular organisation. Notwithstanding, "engagement" has become a catchphrase used to describe all the constructive, positive and good qualities an employer expects from employees, such as involvement, commitment, passion, enthusiasm, absorption, focused effort, zeal, dedication, and energy daily basis (Schaufeli, 2014). Employee engagement suggests a workplace approach that results in the right conditions for all members of an organisation to give their best each day, be committed to their organisation's goals and values, and be motivated to contribute to organisational success, with an enhanced sense of their own well-being (Macleod, 2016). Schaufeli (2014) and Macleod (2016) assert that engagement is a daily affair that is not just one-sided but a two-way commitment and communication between an organisation and its members based on trust and integrity. Thus, engagement can be considered from both employees' and employers' perspectives. This argument is supported by an article where Royal and Sorenson (2015) in the Gallup Business Journal argued that engagement is not just the responsibility of the organisation or management. They posited that the employees are also responsible for their own engagement. The second point from Macleod's definition is that it is an approach that increases the chances of business success, contributing to organisational and individual performance, productivity and well-being (Macleod, 2016). Also, Macleod (2016) argued that engagement could be measured at varying degrees (great to poor).

Another important landmark of employee engagement came with the popularisation of the concept by the Gallup Group in the 1990s. Other researchers of employee engagement alongside Gallup Group are The Institute of Employment Studies (IES), Blessing White team, Aon Hewitt, and TinyPulse, among others. Gallup researchers believed that engaged employees are emotionally dedicated to their jobs. They further posit that such employees usually exceed their fundamental job prospects and as well possess the desire to be key players in fulfilling the goals and objectives of their organisations.

2.2. The Drivers of Employee Engagement

Studies have associated an increase in levels of employee engagement with various employee engagement drivers. Dajani (2015) studied five drivers, namely: leadership, training and development, compensational benefits, policies and procedures and organisational justice. His study revealed that the relative strength of each driver is dependent on the type of organisation, sector and demographic variations in the country or region. Dajani (2015) found that leadership was the most significant driver of employee engagement, followed by organisational justice. The study concluded that

organisations could manage employee engagement levels by understanding the employee engagement drivers and leveraging them.

After studying 10,000 NHS employees in Great Britain, the Institute of Employment Studies (IES), Robinson *et al.* (2004) pointed out the following driver of employee engagement: a sense of feeling valued and involved (its components include: involvement in decision-making; the extent to which employees feel able to voice their ideas; the opportunities employees have to develop their jobs and the extent to which the organisation is concerned with employees' health/well-being). Their findings suggested that various engagement drivers will be common to all organisations regardless of the sector. However, they opined that some variability might occur. Moreover, the strength of each driver depends on the organisation being studied (Danjani, 2015). Lessons from their study revealed that in an attempt to increase engagement levels, there is a probability to miscarry unless the following 'building blocks' are put in place: good quality line managers, two-way communication, effective internal co-operation, a development focus, commitment to employee well-being, a clear, accessible Human Resource policies and practices to which managers at all levels are committed to.

In a study on *an examination of the key drivers influencing employee engagement in a declining outsourcing company in Dublin*, O'Carroll (2015) surveyed five key drivers of engagement, namely: leadership, communication, organisational support, learning/development and environment. He argued that these were the most common drivers of employee engagement surfacing in the literature. His findings strongly support that these drivers influence engagement levels.

Mani (2011), in a study on the *analysis of employee engagement and its predictors*, highlighted four drivers, namely: employee welfare, empowerment, employee growth and interpersonal relationships. Gibbons (2006), in a comprehensive meta-analysis, studied twelve research publications, each of which enunciated drivers of employee engagement. The meta-analysis identified twenty-six drivers. However, the meta-analysis highlighted eight drivers who appeared to have a greater frequency in all the publications. The eight drivers of engagement identified by Gibbons (2006) to drive engagement are: Trust and integrity, person-job fit, synchronisation of individual and organisation performance, career growth opportunities, pride about company, co-workers/team, employee development, line manager relationship.

The IES study 2004 identified the following as predictors: leadership, relationships at work, total reward, recognition, work-life balance and work itself (Robinson *et al.,* 2004). In addition, the IES (2004) study identified the following drivers: job satisfaction, feeling valued and involved, equal opportunity, health and safety, length of service, communication and co-operation (Robinson *et al.,* 2004).

BlessingWhite (2013) posited that a good leader/subordinate working relationship is an engagement driver which boosts the degree of engagement. The fifteen engagement drivers identified by Blessing White team (2011; 2013) were grouped into two broad categories: Satisfaction and contribution. The drivers under satisfaction comprise Opportunities to do my best, Career development, Flexible work conditions, more challenging work, improved co-operation among co-workers, greater clarity about what the organisation needs me to do and why, Better relationship with the manager and Greater clarity about my own work preferences and goals. The drivers under contribution include: Clarity of priorities and alignment with overall strategy, More resources and tools, Regular feedback, Development opportunities and training, Coach/mentor other than the manager, Better communication with the manager, and Improved relationships with co-workers.

Crawford *et al* (2013) listed the drivers of engagement, namely: Job challenge, Autonomy, Variety, Feedback, fit, Opportunities for development, leadership, rewards and recognition.

However, Macey and Schneider (2008) reported that positive effects on employee engagement are possible once leaders have clear anticipations, are fair, and recognise good performance. Moreover, MacLeod and Clarke (2009) confirmed that line managers played a significant role in promoting engagement by providing clarity of purpose, appreciating employees' effort/contribution, providing fair treatment, and ensuring work is organised efficiently/effectively so that employees feel they are valued, equipped and supported to do their job. Macey *et al.* (2009) accentuated the work environment and the jobs people do by noting that engagement requires a work environment that does not just demand more but promotes information sharing, provides learning opportunities and fosters a balance in people's lives, thereby creating the bases for sustained energy and personal initiative.'

Scholarly studies highlighted various significant elements that drive engagement. These elements are career development Conrad (2013), communications (Brooks, 2013) and meaningfulness at work (Penna, 2007). For employees to find meaningfulness at work and have psychological safety and availability, organisations should provide an environment that acts as a stimulant to drive employee engagement. Bedarkar and Pandita (2014) believe there are three main drivers of employee engagement: leadership, communication and work-life balance. The authors believe that once a company has these three things right, the organisation will have an engaged workforce and overall better organisational performance. They asserted that employees are the key components of an organisation. Hence, they should be provided with a work-life balance; otherwise, the employees could become disengaged, and this would affect the organisation's overall performance (Bedarkar & Pandita, 2014).

Other researchers asserted that employee engagement is a key to achieving improved performance, productivity, customer satisfaction and loyalty, employee retention, job satisfaction, involvement, organisational success and other positive behaviours at work (Egwuonwu, 2015; Maheshwari, 2016). Also, some researchers have dived into an exploration of elements that drive employee engagement that results in the variations of the levels of engagement observed in organisations (Radda *et al.,* 2015; Robinson *et al.,* 2004; Saks, 2006; Siddhanta & Roy, 2010).

Many researchers have carried out studies to ascertain factors that improve engagement (Markos & Sridevi, 2010). However, the analysis of most studies aimed to establish the drivers that will improve the employee engagement level in their study setting. However, there is no exhaustive list of drivers of engagement.

It is obvious from literature and studies on employee engagement that a definitive list of engagement is inexhaustive. These studies have revealed that the drivers of engagement can vary between organisations. They can be affected by factors such as industry type, role and organisational culture. However, there are similarities to be found among the various engagement models and some common drivers' surfaces (O'Carroll, 2015). This study will be limited to eight drivers (leadership, communications, compensation/rewards, career development, perceived organisational support, job crafting, work environment, learning and development). Each of the eight key drivers to be considered in this study can be related to Kahn's (2010) engagement model, tested by May *et al*. (2004). Kahn (1990), in his qualitative study, reveals that three psychological conditions need to be present for personal engagement to be attained. These conditions are: meaningfulness, safety and availability. Kahn believed that their presence would increase engagement levels.

Meaningfulness can refer to the extent to which the organisation supports its employees through leadership, communication, career development, job crafting, compensation, learning and development, reward and recognition, and making them feel that their contributions to their organisation are valued and appreciated. Learning and Development opportunities help employees improve their skills (Ukonu, 2016, 2017) and feel invested, which may lead to increased engagement.

Safety can relate to Perceived organisational support, work environment, job crafting, leadership, and recognition. It can be associated with having both a supportive line manager and interpersonal relationships. Availability relates to the job role, how available the employees are to do their job, and if they have a good work-life balance. Job crafting allows an employee to modify their duty and responsibilities in a way to effectively achieve organisational goals. Availability can relate to the work environment.

Studies have associated an increase in levels of employee engagement with various employee engagement drivers. Dajani (2015) studied five drivers, namely: leadership, training and development, compensational benefits, policies and procedures and organisational justice. His study revealed that the relative strength of each driver is dependent on the type of organisation, sector and demographic variations in the country or region. Dajani (2015) found that leadership was the most significant driver of employee engagement, followed by organisational justice. The study concluded that organisations could manage employee engagement levels by understanding the employee engagement drivers and leveraging them.

After studying 10,000 NHS employees in Great Britain, the Institute of Employment Studies (IES), Robinson *et al*. (2004) pointed out the following driver of employee engagement: a sense of feeling valued and involved (its components include: involvement in decision-making; the extent to which employees feel able to voice their ideas; the opportunities employees have to develop their jobs and the extent to which the organisation is concerned with employees' health/well-being). Their findings suggested that various engagement drivers will be common to all organisations regardless of the sector. However, they opined that some variability might occur. Moreover, the strength of each driver depends on the organisation being studied (Danjani, 2015). Lessons from their study revealed that in an attempt to increase engagement levels, there is a probability to miscarry unless the following 'building blocks' are put in place: good quality line managers, two-way communication, effective internal co-operation, a development focus, commitment to employee well-being, a clear, accessible Human Resource policies and practices to which managers at all levels are committed to.

In a study *examining the key drivers influencing employee engagement in a declining outsourcing company in Dublin*, O'Carroll (2015) surveyed five key drivers of engagement, namely: leadership, communication, organisational support, learning/development and environment. He argued that these were the most common drivers of employee engagement surfacing in the literature. His findings strongly support that these drivers influence engagement levels.

Mani (2011), in a study on the *analysis of employee engagement and its predictors*, highlighted four drivers, namely: employee welfare, empowerment, employee growth and interpersonal relationships. Gibbons (2006), in a comprehensive meta-analysis, studied twelve research publications, each of which enunciated drivers of employee engagement. The meta-analysis identified twenty-six drivers. However, the meta-analysis highlighted eight drivers who appeared to have a greater frequency in all the publications. The eight drivers of engagement identified by Gibbons (2006) to drive engagement are: Trust and integrity, Person-Job fit, Synchronisation of individual and organisation performance, Career Growth Opportunities, Pride About Company, Co-workers/Team, Employee Development, Line Manager Relationship.

The IES study 2004 identified the following as predictors: leadership, relationships at work, total reward, recognition, work-life balance and work itself (Robinson *et al.,* 2004). In addition, the IES (2004) study identified the following drivers: job satisfaction, feeling valued and involved, equal opportunity, health and safety, length of service, communication and cooperation (Robinson *et al.,* 2004).

BlessingWhite (2013) posited that a good leader/subordinate working relationship is an engagement driver which boosts the degree of engagement. The fifteen engagement drivers identified by BlessingWhite team (2011; 2013) were grouped into two broad categories: Satisfaction and contribution. The drivers under satisfaction comprise: Opportunities to do my best, Career development, Flexible work conditions, more challenging work, improved co-operation among co-workers, greater clarity about what the organisation needs me to do and why, better relationship with manager and Greater clarity about my own work preferences and goals. The drivers under contribution include clarity of priorities and alignment with overall strategy, More resources and tools, Regular feedback, Development opportunities and training, Coach/mentor other than the manager, better communication with the manager, and Improved relationships with co-workers.

Crawford *et al.* (2013) listed the drivers of engagement, namely: Job challenge, Autonomy, Variety, Feedback, fit, Opportunities for development, leadership, rewards and recognition.

However, Macey and Schneider (2008) reported that positive effects on employee engagement are possible once leaders have clear anticipations, are fair, and recognise good performance. Moreover, MacLeod and Clarke (2009) confirmed that line managers played a significant role in promoting engagement by providing clarity of purpose, appreciating employees' effort/contribution, providing fair treatment, and ensuring work is organised efficiently/effectively so that employees feel they are valued, equipped and supported to do their job. Macey *et al* (2009) accentuated the work environment and the jobs people do by noting that: Engagement requires a work environment that does not just demand more but promotes information sharing, provides learning opportunities and fosters a balance in people's lives, thereby creating the bases for sustained energy and personal initiative.' Other researchers asserted that employee engagement is a key to achieving improved performance, productivity, customer satisfaction and loyalty, employee retention, job satisfaction, involvement, organisational success and other positive behaviours at work (Egwuonwu, 2015).

3. Methodology

The mixed method was adopted in this study to achieve a more comprehensive and synergetic utilisation of data. Data were collected through interviews and questionnaires adapted from Gallup Q12, which were administered to staff members of the Federal Radio Corporation of Nigeria and BCA, who were randomly selected for the study. Data collection instruments were designed to provide information on the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the study. The sample size for the study was determined using Researchclue Taro Yamane's online Sample Size Calculator. To identify the drivers of Employee Engagement, questions were obtained from employee engagement survey questions online, and any of the variables that scored less than 3.0 in the Likert scale questions from the pilot study were excluded from the study as a driver of employee engagement. The results are illustrated through the use of both descriptive and inferential statistics using SPSS 26.0.

4. Results

A total of four hundred and forty-five (445) made up of 194 males and 251 females were recruited into the study. All the members of staff who had not been with the corporation for at least two years were excluded from the study, as well as any other respondent who did not wish to participate in the study. The mean age was 37.2 years, while the mean length of service was 9.5 years.

Drivers of Employee Engagement	Mean	Standard Deviation
Leadership	3.9	0.7
Communication	3.9	0.6
Compensation/Recognition	3.2	0.7
Learning and Development	3.6	0.7
Perceived Organisational Support	3.8	0.6
Career development	3.9	0.9
Job crafting	4.0	0.6
Work environment	3.5	0.6

Table 1: Identification of Drivers of Employee Engagement in the Study Population
(Source: Researcher's Field Work)

From table 1 above, all the determinants had a mean score of 3.0 and above from the Q12 questionnaire; hence, they were considered drivers of employee engagement in the study.

Indication	R	P-Value
Employee Engagement	1.000	
Leadership	0.637	<0.0001
Communication	0.537	<0.0001
Compensation /Recognition	0.671	<0.0001
Learning and Development	0.599	<0.0001
Perceived Organisational Support	0.736	<0.0001
Career Development	0.608	<0.0001
Job Crafting	0.656	<0.0001
Work Environment	0.659	<0.0001

Table 2: Relationship between Drivers of Employee Engagement in the Study Population
*(Source: Researcher's Field Work); R- Spearman's Correlation; **-Statistically significant*

Table 2 shows a strong correlation between employee engagement and drivers of employee engagement. In the study population, Perceived Organisational Support was highest (rho=0.736), followed by Compensation/rewards, Work environment, job crafting, Leadership, Career Development, Learning and Development, Communication (rho=0.671, 0.659, 0.656, 0.637, 0.608, 0.599, 0.537). All the variables had a high statistically significant correlation (P<0.0001).

From the Beta Coefficient, Perceived Organisation Support is the highest predictor, followed by Compensation and Rewards, Work Environment, Job crafting, Leadership, Communications, Career Development, Learning and Development. From the model summary below, R= 0.999 and adjusted R^2 =0.998 indicates a strong relationship between the drivers of employee engagement and employee's level of engagement. This implies that about 99.8% of the variation can be explained by the model, meaning that the effect of the independent drivers of employee engagement on the level of employee engagement in the study population was 99.8% [Table 3].

4.1. Thematic Content Analysis (Relative Importance of Drivers of Employee Engagement)

The result of the interview conducted concurrently at the point of sharing the questionnaires was analysed using thematic content analysis. Having explained to participants the concept of employee engagement and possible drivers of employee engagement, consented respondents were asked: What do you think are the drivers of employee engagement in your Corporation? Their answers were documented as presented in table 4. Furthermore, respondents were asked to rank the drivers in this study according to their relative importance to them. The mean of all ranked items was calculated using Kendall's tau-b correlation, and the result is presented in table 5. The issue of leadership was of utmost importance to the respondents in relation to their level of engagement (Tb =0.850; *P* <0.0001), followed by compensation which involves intrinsic and extrinsic compensation/rewards (Tb =0.833; *P* <0.0001) and perceived organisational support (Tb =0.831; *P*<0.0001). Other important elements were work environment (Tb =0.793; *P*=0.003), Job Crafting (Tb =0.791; *P*=0.003), Communications (Tb =0.784; *P*=0.001), Career Development (Tb =0.751; *P*=0.006) and, Learning and Development (Tb =0.744; *P*=0.004) [Table 4]

However, respondents' opinions of the other drivers of employee engagement varied, as seen in table 5. The interview results, as shown in the table above, revealed that employees interviewed understood the concept of employee engagement as explained to them and were assertive of determinants or elements that drive engagement (Table 5).

	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	0.037	0.009		3.917	<0.0001**
Leadership	0.109	0.002	0.176	50.420	<0.0001**
Communication	0.103	0.002	0.142	57.883	<0.0001**
Compensation/Rewards	0.138	0.002	0.223	76.563	<0.0001**
Learning and Development	0.068	0.002	0.110	42.126	<0.0001**
Perceived Organisational Support	0.177	0.003	0.245	61.854	<0.0001**
Career development	0.060	0.002	0.116	39.340	<0.0001**
Job Crafting	0.170	0.002	0.214	76.770	<0.0001**
Work environment	0.168	0.002	0.220	77.058	<0.0001**
Dependent Variable: Employee engagement					
Model Summary					
	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error Estimate	F	Sig.
	0.999ˣ	0.998	0.998	0.020	24728.624	<0.0001**

Table 3: Regression Analysis Showing Relationship between Drivers of Employee Engagement and Their Levels of Engagement in the Study Population Value Significant at P<0.01

Drivers of EE	Kendall's tau-b (Tb)	P-Value	Rank
Leadership	0.850	<0.0001***	1
Compensation/rewards	0.833	<0.0001***	2
Perceived Organisational Support	0.831	<0.0001***	3
Work environment	0.793	0.003***	4
Job crafting	0.791	0.003***	5
Communications	0.784	0.001***	6
Career development	0.751	0.006**	7
Learning and Development	0.744	0.004***	8

Table 4: Relative Importance of the Drivers of Employee Engagement in the Study Population

Interview Question/Theme	Response (Themes)	Outcome (Drivers)	Effect
What do you think are the drivers of employee engagement in your organisation? Theme: Drivers of employee engagement	Career progression/ development, job crafting, leadership, staff welfare, organisational support, Health and safety, job satisfaction, provision of working materials, improved/conducive work environment, learning and development, fairness, Job autonomy, organisational image, feeling valued and involved, regular feedback and communications, compensation/recognition, Management support, staff welfare, learning and development, organisational support, autonomy for job crafting, Work-life balance and work itself, Job satisfaction, Feeling valued and involved, Equal opportunity, Health and safety, organisational image, length of service, Communication, Work environment, Flexible work conditions, feedback	Motivation, Commitment, Job satisfaction, Organisational citizenship behaviour, Job involvement and maximum contribution. (These are elements of employee engagement). The content is very important in the media industry and requires more attention for maximum employee input/output.	Very strong in achieving Improved performance, increased productivity and competitive advantage, drive to ensure organisational sustenance. These drivers can help to improve employees' levels of engagement.

Table 5: Summary of Interview Question (Thematic Content Analysis)
Value Significant at P<0.01

5. Discussions

The qualitative study revealed that leadership ranked as the highest driver of employee engagement. Bakar (2013) accentuated that in a collectivistic culture, there is high traditionalism, interdependence and more responsibility–taking for others; paternalism is also viewed positively; besides, developing countries are characterised by high power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity (Anastasia, 2015). Employees in this setting perceive that life revolves around a community or a group, and how the leader relates to the group is very important. Employees who have supportive leadership would want to reciprocate it by having a positive attitude to work. Leaders who have the welfare and interest of the employees at heart are supposedly believed to be mostly successful in leading by example and being influential in inspiring others to achieve organisational goals (Anitha, 2014; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Egwuonwu, 2015). Some studies have argued that leadership is the most significant predictor of engagement (Dajani, 2015; Bakar, 2013). This finding is in line with the findings of previous work in paternalistic cultures such as North Africa, the Middle East and Asia countries. Empirically, leadership research has provided evidence that a positive association exists between effective leader behaviours and followers' attitudes and behaviours with regard to engagement (Thomas, 2011; Zhu *et al.,* 2009; Xanthopoulou *et al.,* 2011). This confirms the SET theory that believes that subordinates will respond positively to good and effective leadership.

Perceived organisational support (POS) was another key driver of employee engagement identified. Our finding is similar to most engagement findings that POS is a significant driver of engagement (Anitha, 2014; O'Carroll, 2015; Fletcher & Robinson, 2013; Siddhanta & Roy, 2010). Organisational support is an essential driver of engagement because employees will likely communicate better with managers and organisations that are honest and trustworthy and go by their word. People tend to feel important if they perceive that they have a voice and their contributions are recognised. This is similar to Kahn's psychological meaningfulness of work (Kahn, 1990; May *et al.,* 2004). Fletcher and Robinson (2013) revealed that 'feeling valued and involved is one of the major employee engagement drivers. Communication is vital here. Our study demonstrated that communication is a key driver of engagement. Other studies have accentuated these findings (AON Hewitt Global Report, 2017; Dajani, 2015; Srivastava, 2016). Also, Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) (2016) report stated that communication supports the organisation's smooth running, successful change programmes and good leadership on vision, strategy and values. Their report suggested that communication is a critical aspect of employee engagement, which in turn promotes better performance, employee retention and well-being. Where employees feel that there is effective two-way communication between them and management or the leadership, they will be able to tell the direction in which the leadership is towing. Another major reason is that where there is openness, the employees might be more involved to see that their organisation succeeds in their stated goals. According to

SET theory, if an employee perceives that he/she has organisational support, there is a tendency to reciprocate by being more engaged.

Learning and development and Career development have been demonstrated to be important drivers of employee engagement. Contemporarily, the business environment operates in a volatile environment. This requires constant update courses and learning and development programmes both on/off the job. This is germane if the employees are to keep abreast with the rapid changes in the business arena. Reports have shown that Nigeria is passing through a period of recession (Kazeem, 2017). Studies have shown that during periods of economic recession, training and development is the first to receive a budget cut (Kirke, 2012; Psichogios, 2016). The negative implication is that employees who are kept in the dark on current issues will not be able to flow with the trend of events as such, may score low on engagement. Consequently, an employee who possesses the necessary skills, knowledge and expertise is crucial for any organisation that desires to achieve high levels of business success. Thus, in the face of the current turbulent and competitive business environment, learning and development becomes a veritable mechanism to keep employees engaged and maintain competitive advantage. Similar studies have argued that learning and development are key drivers of employee engagement (Kirke, 2012; Psichogios, 2016). Thus, in line with SET theory, the more an employee acquires the requisite skills necessary for carrying out his/her, the more engaged that employee will be.

Career development was reported as another key driver of employee engagement in this study. The reason is that life is not static; thus, the desire to move ahead is normal. If people's desire to make advancement in their respective careers is not fulfilled, they are likely to start looking for work elsewhere. Conrad (2013), in support of this, argued that labour turnover will be high if promotion seems like a waiting game. Also, Milich (2014) demonstrated in his study that career development is consistently cited by employees as critical to their satisfaction with an organisation and a key reason why they may change jobs. Therefore, in accordance with SET theory, career development will lead to an improved level of engagement.

The work environment from this study is also a significant driver of engagement. Employees interviewed believed that they enjoy the corporate image they receive as employees of a media outfit. Apart from pride in the organisation, the day-to-day activities of the departments are very crucial. The top management must ensure that they create a meaningful workplace and provide adequate working materials and an appropriate work environment if they are to expect an increased level of engagement from employees. This finding is supported by the findings of Anitha (2014), who posits that there is a significant relationship between work environment and employee engagement. Moreover, Greenberg (2015) asserted that employee engagement can increase through a positive work environment. Furthermore, it has been reported that a meaningful workplace environment is considered a key determinant of employee engagement (Popli & Rizvi, 2016). Earlier studies have also shown that the work environment is a factor that can be used to determine the level of engagement for each employee working in the organisation (Harter *et al.,* 2001; Holbeche and Springett (2003), May *et al.*, 2004; Miles, 2001, and Rich *et al.* 2010). Studies by Miles (2001) and Harter *et al.* (2001) found that various aspects of the work environment can result in various levels of employee engagement. This is supported by studies conducted by Holbeche and Springett (2003), May *et al.* (2004), and Rich *et al.* (2010). The working environment impacts employee engagement. Recent studies also show that a meaningful workplace environment is considered a key determinant of employee engagement (Anitha, 2014). Summarily, previous studies on the drivers of employee engagement have associated the drivers of employee engagement as key factors for a higher level of engagement (Anitha, 2014; Dajani, 2015; AON Hewitt Global Report, 2017; O' Carroll, 2015). The result of Spearman's correlation demonstrated that all the drivers in our study had significant relationships with employee engagement.

6. Conclusion

The study set out to assess the drivers of employee engagement in public media corporations with emphasis on the Broadcasting Corporation of Abia State and the Federal Radio Corporation of Nigeria. The study identified the key drivers of employee engagement that significantly affected employee engagement in FRCN and BCA. These drivers are: Leadership, Communications, Career Development, Compensation/Recognition, Learning and Development, Perceived Organisational Support, Job crafting, and Work environment. Besides, it was established that drivers of employee engagement had positive effects on the levels of employee engagement. Thus, substantial evidence from this research supports and extends the already established relationship between employee engagement and the drivers of employee engagement. Furthermore, this study is significant to Public Media Corporations as the result could give significant actions for achieving a competitive edge in the midst of intense competition for listenership and followership of their audience. Moreover, this study proffered pragmatic steps which will aid Nigerian Public Media Corporations in taking remedial action to alleviate the challenges facing employees in Public Media Corporations. However, this study was limited to Public Media Corporations. Future studies may include a comparative study between the public and private media outfits. Therefore, this study suggests that organisations seeking to maintain a positive organisational outcome and a higher level of employee engagement in today's business arena would have to invest more in the drivers of employee engagement in order to craft a successful endeavour in the 21st century and beyond.

7. References

i. Akeem, R. A., Oyeyinka, O. T., Quism, A. O. (2013). "Deregulation of Broadcast Media in Nigeria: An Appraisal." *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 3(3), 6–13.
ii. Alao, D. O., & Alao, I. O. (2013). "A Midterm Evaluation of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan Transformation Agenda (May 2011 – May 2013)." *Journal of Research and Development*, 1(1), 53–69.
iii. Alfes, K. T., Soane, C., Rees, C. E., & Gatenby, M. (2010). "Creating an Engaged Workforce." London, CIPD.

iv.   BlessingWhite (2011). "A Video on BlessingWhite X Model." Retrieved from: https://vimeo.com/99766639.
v.   BlessingWhite (2013). "Employee Engagement Research Report Update." http://www.blessingwhite.com/EE2013. Accessed 12/2/2016.
vi.   Cheallaigh, O. N. (2015). "The Key Drivers of Employee Engagement: A Case Study in an Irish Private Sector Organisation." Dissertation submitted to the National College of Ireland for the MA in Human Resource Management, September 2015.
vii.   Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). "Work Engagement: A Quantitative Review and Test of Its Relations with Task and Contextual Performance." *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89–136.
viii. Clapon, P. (2014). "Why Leadership Development Is Crucial for Employee Engagement." Retrieved from: http://www.gethppy.com/employee-engagement/leadership-development-crucial-employee-engagement on 18/01/2018.
ix.   Cleland, A., Mitchinson W., Townend A. (2008). "Engagement, Assertiveness and Business Performance – A New Perspective." Ixia Consultancy Ltd.
x.   Crawford, E. R., Rich, B. L., Buckman, B., & Bergeron, J. (2013). "The Antecedents and Drivers of Employee Engagement." In C. Truss, R. Deldridge, K. Alfes, A. Shantz, & E. Soane (Eds.), *Employee Engagement in Theory and Practice*, London, Routledge, 57–81.
xi.   Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). "Linking Job Demands and Resources to Employee Engagement and Burnout: A Theoretical Extension and Meta-Analytic Test." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 834–848.
xii.   Dajani, M. A. Z. (2015). "The Impact of Employee Engagement on Job Performance and Organisational Commitment in the Egyptian Banking Sector." *Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, 3(5), 138–147.
xiii. Edward Elgar. (2013). *Employee Engagement: Perspectives, Issues, Research and Practice*. Cheltenham.
xiv.   Edward Elgar. (2013). *Employee Engagement: Perspectives, Issues, Research and Practice*. Cheltenham.
xv.   Gifford, J. (2015). "What is Employee Engagement and is it Worth Our Attention?" Retrieved from: http://www.businessandindustry.co.uk/hot-topics/employee-engagement/what-is-employee-engagement-and-is-it-worth-our-attention on 19/2/2017.
xvi.   Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). "A New Model of Work Role Performance: Positive Behaviour in Uncertain and Interdependent Contexts." *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 327–347.
xvii. Harley, J. (2016). "Employee Engagement: Are Confusion and Ambiguity Hindering Success?" Retrieved from: http://www.personneltoday.com/hr/employee-engagement-confusion-ambiguity-hindering-success/ on 14/2/2017.
xviii. Inuwa, I. M. (2017). "Role of the Media in National Development." Retrieved from: http://www.gamji.com/article6000/NEWS7617.htm on 19/2/2017.
xix.   Kahn, W. A. (2010). "The essence of engagement." In S. L. Albrecht (Ed.), *Handbook of...*
xx.   Kahn, W. A. (2010). "The essence of engagement." In S. L. Albrecht (Ed.), *Handbook of...*
xxi.   Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). "The Meaning of Employee Engagement." *Industrial and Organisational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 1, 3–30.
xxii. Macey, W. H., Schneider, B., Berbera, K. M., & Young, S. A. (2009). "Employee Engagement: Tools for Analysis, Practice, and Competitive Advantage." Wiley-Blackwell, Malden, WA.
xxiii. MacLeod, D. (2016). "What is Employee Engagement?" Retrieved from engageforsuccess.org/what-is-employee-engagement on 01/10/2016.
xxiv. MacLeod, D., & Clarke, N. (2009). *Engaging for Success: Enhancing Performance through Employee Engagement*. London, Department for Business Innovation and Skills.
xxv.   Mani, V. (2011). "Analysis of Employee Engagement and its Predictors." *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 1(2).
xxvi. Markos, S., & Sridevi, M. S. (2010). "The Key to Improving Performance." *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 89–96.
xxvii. Meyer, P. J., & Gagne, M. N. (2008). "Employee Engagement from a Self-Determination Theory Perspective." *Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 1, 60–62.
xxviii.Newman, D. A., Joseph, D. L., & Hulin, C. L. (2010). "Job attitudes and employee engagement: considering the attitude 'A-factor'." In S. L. Albrecht (Ed.), *Handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research and practice* (pp. 43–61). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781849806374.00010.
xxix. Newman, D. A., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). "Been there, bottled that: Are state and behavioral work." *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 31–35.
xxx.   O'Carroll, B. (2015). "An Examination of the Key Drivers Influencing Employee Engagement in a Declining Outsourcing Company in Dublin." Master's Thesis, National College of Ireland, Dublin.
xxxi. Robertson-Smith, G., & Markwick, C. (2009). "Employee Engagement: A Review of Current Thinking." *Report 469*, UK, Institute for Employment Studies.
xxxii. Robinson D., Perryman S., and Hayday S. (2004). "The Drivers of Employee Engagement." *Report 408*, UK, Institute for Employment Studies.
xxxiii.Rogel, C. (2016). "What Engagement Isn't." Retrieved from: https://decison-wise.co/what-employee-engagement-isnt/ on 04/20/2016.
xxxiv. Royal, K., & Sorenson, S. (2015). "Employees Are Resource for Their Employees Too." *Gallup Business Journal*, June 16.

xxxv.   Schaufeli, W. B. (2014). "What is Engagement?" In C. Truss, R. Deldridge, K. Alfes, A. Shantz, & E. Soane (Eds.), *Employee Engagement in Theory and Practice*, London, Routledge, 15–35.

xxxvi. Truss, C., Schantz, A., Soane, E., Alfes, K., & Delbridge, R. (2013). "Employee engagement, Organizational Performance and Individual Well-Being: Exploring the Evidence, Developing the Theory." *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(14), 2657–2669.

xxxvii. Ukonu, O. I. (2017). "Effects of Staff Recruitment and Selection Models on Labour Turnover in the Media Industry: A Case of Federal Radio Corporation of Nigeria." *Nigerian Journal of Management Sciences*, 5(1), 80–94.

xxxviii. Ukonu, O. I., & Dialoke, I. (2016). "An Assessment Of Training As A Tool For Developing Human Resources In Federal Radio Corporation Of Nigeria." *Journal of Management and Training for Industries*, 3(1), 1–18, DOI: 10.12792/JMTI.3.1.1.

xxxix. Yisa, S. B. (2003). "Nigerian Broadcasting Code Second Review." @ National Broadcasting Commission.