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Abstract:

Aim of current study is to find the relationship of personal resilience, employee engagement and job satisfaction. This is quantitative research and date is collected from 220 employees. Simple random sampling technique is used for data collection for selecting the banks of Lahore Pakistan. Three of the hypotheses are about direct relationships and one is about the mediation effect of employee engagement for the relationship of personal resilience and job satisfaction. Results revealed that hypotheses about direct relations are accepted. Furthermore, employee engagement emerges as partial mediator for the relationship of personal resilience with job satisfaction. In future, these types of studies may also conduct on other sectors like hotel industry, telecom, nursing sector and education sector. In future research, results of public and private banks will also compare this will provide the valuable insights. For generalizing the results data will be collected from banks of other cities like Islamabad, Karachi and Faisalabad.
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Introduction

This research is designed to study the mediating role of employee engagement between the relationship of personal resilience and job satisfaction. According to Mann & Harter (2016), the world is facing the crises regarding employee engagement. These crises have significant effect on global organizations (Mann & Harter 2016). They also describe that organizations and top management recognize the benefits of employee engagement and large number of organizations have conducted surveys of engagement periodically. Employee engagement develops enthusiastic employees (GLINT 2018). This rate is varying from 9% to 35% (GLINT 2018). This means that large number of owners is still facing big problems regarding employee engagement (GLINT 2018). It is also noted that 90% of respondents believed that engagement has strong link with performance and 60% organizations with better rate of engagement result in improved financial performers (GLINT, 2018). Moreover, 39% of organizations believe that their top management prioritizes employee engagement (GLINT, 2018).

Approximately 33% of employees of USA being actively engaged but engagement rate raised only 3% from 2012 to 2016 (Gallup 2017). It is also noted that the large number of employees of America almost half of all the employees, are not completely engaged or these employees are disengaged leads to an “engagement gap” and can cause $300 billion per year loss of productivity (Bates, 2004; Johnson, 2004; Kowalski, 2003). Researches of Gallup and Towers Perrin agencies concluded that 3 out of 4 workers had not been engaged during their jobs (Welbourne, 2007). So, it is important to study the level of employee engagement. Findings of Global Workforce Study in 2012 had shown that the organizational efforts regarding the improvement of engagement are not proper. A Global study on 32,000 full-time workers described that just over (35%) of the employees were highly engaged (Towers Watson, Global workforce Study, 2012).

Similarly, Crabtree (2013) conducted his research on the ratio of actively disengaged and engaged employees in New Zealand and Australia and found that it was 1:1. He also concluded that approximately 20% of the employees in Australia, Western Europe, and New Zealand were engaged. In India,
approximately 10% employees were engaged (Crabtree, 2013).

1- Does personal resilience has effect on the employee engagement in Pakistani cultural context?

2- Does Employee engagement has impact on job satisfaction in Pakistani cultural context?

3- Does employee engagement mediates the relationship of personal resilience with job satisfaction?

To answer these questions current research, choose the officer’s rank employees of banking sector and collect the data with the help of structured questionnaire.

Resilience

According to American Psychological Association (2014), resilience is defined as “the process of adapting well in the face of adversity, trauma, tragedy, threats or even significant sources of stress (para. 4)”. In simple words, resilience can be defined as “a stable trajectory of healthy functioning after a highly adverse event”. Incorporating the concept of Tonkin et al., (2018), the current study focuses on one dimensional construct of resilience, i.e. personal and employee resilience. But current research focuses on personal resilience.

Personal resilience

Resilience is a consequence of the procedures that describe the real human reactions to difficulty, including environment and genetic factor (Rutter, 2006). Personal resilience is defined as “the combination of resources and assets within the individual and their environment that facilitate the individual's capacity to adapt in the face of adversity” (Tonkin et al., 2018). This notion includes both contextual aspects and psychological process that add to resilience (Tonkin et al., 2018). According to Connor and Davidson (2003), during job employees show better results of work-related resilience but they may perform poorly regarding interpersonal relationships. There are different effects of resilience in different domains of life (Gillespie et al., 2007; Pietrzak & Southwick, 2011). It is possible to advance the level of personal resilience; by personal stress-controlling (Connor & Davidson, 2003) that can be advanced with the help of organizational support and resources.

Employee Engagement

This concept is comparatively new in the field of human resource management (HRM) and psychology (Malik, & Garg, 2017). It is also noted that previously employee engagement was rarely considered in the academic literature (Ram & Prabhakar, 2011). This gap
of researches has made employee engagement as an exciting area of research (Ologbo et al., 2011). This construct is now grasping the interest of both academicians and practitioners (Mirza Darani, 2013). In the last twenty years, researches on employee engagement were enhanced quickly (Bakker & Albrecht 2018). Employee engagement is rapidly considering significant indicators of employer job satisfaction (Brook 2019). Now-a-days employees are switching approximately 9-5 jobs during his/her career (Brook 2019) due to low employee engagement. It is top priority of employees to engage with their jobs and organizations and set examples for their fellows (Brook 2019). Organizations of modern age are focusing on increasing the level of employee engagement for elevating the better level performance, creativity, and customer satisfaction (Bakker et al., 2014).

Employee engagement is considered as famous notion because this concept is very significant predictor of prominent employee level, organizational level and team level consequences (Bakker & Albrecht 2018). Due to better involvement in their jobs and organizations, engaged employees result in good performance in their jobs (Christian et al., 2011) which results in good financial performance (Xanthopoulou et al., 2009). Engaged employees are main source of innovative concepts (Gawke et al., 2017; Orth and Volmer, 2017). Engaged employees are more helpful for their fellow employees (Bakker & Albrecht 2018). Kahn (1990) explains the notion of employee engagement by Goffman’s (1961) role behavior concept. This concept suggests that employee attitudes are shaped by the demands and rules of other employees (Biddle & Thomas, 1966). Thus, employee’s behaviors can be calculated by examining about their characters (Biddle & Thomas, 1966). Kahn (1990) endorses that employees can execute the tasks that are not stated in their job description. Kahn (1990) also states that employees are likely to attach themselves according to their characters or to refine their behavior with these roles. Kahn defines employee engagement as the “harnessing of organizational members themselves to their work roles” (Kahn, 1990). Truss et al. (2006) envision the employee engagement as “passion for work”.

**Job Satisfaction**

Fu and Deshpande (2013) defined job satisfaction as "A pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience". Job satisfaction
is also defined as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976). Employees show a positive attitude toward their jobs if they experience that their jobs fulfill values which are important to them (Locke, 1976). Satisfied employees are more likely to perform their jobs better. More satisfied employees result in more committed and with less intention to quit (Firth et al., 2004). The low level of job satisfaction causes employees to feel a poor sense of belonging to the organization and search for alternative jobs (Reed et al., 1994). Therefore, job satisfaction has an important role in maintaining commitment and influencing intention to leave (Calisir et al., 2011). Furthermore, there is good relation of job satisfaction with organizational commitment and intention to leave (Yucel 2012, Aydogdu and Asikgil, 2011, Colakoglu et al., 2010). Lee & Ok, (2012) and Saks (2006) have proved that employee engagement has a significant positive impact on job satisfaction. Schaufeli and Salanova & Schaufeli (2008) investigate that more engaged employees results in committed employees.

Personal resilience has positive effect on job satisfaction (Badran & Youssef-Morgan, 2015). Current study assumes the following hypothesis. H1: Personal Resilience has positive relationship with job satisfaction

Different researches specify that there is a relationship between resilience and engagement (Bakker, et al., 2011; Bande et al., 2015; Mache et al., 2014; Shin et al., 2012). Resilience has a close relationship with One kind of engagement, i.e. vigor (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Moreover, there is the positive impact on employee resilience on employee job engagement. From the best of researcher knowledge relationship, personal resilience is not yet checked. By these facts, the current study has proposed the following hypothesis.
H2: Personal resilience has positive effect on employee engagement.

Saks (2006) has also confirmed that there is positive impact of employee engagement on job satisfaction. And he has proved that both job engagement and organizational engagement has a positive impact on job satisfaction.

H3: Employee engagement has positive effect on job satisfaction

**Scale of measurements**

Job engagement scale was constructed by Rich, 2006 during the completion of his thesis from the University of Florida. This scale bases on William Kahn’s concept of employee engagement. Kahn’s model of employee engagement consists of three components, i.e. physical, cognitive and emotional engagement (Kahn, 1990). This scale consists of 18 statements. Factor loading of these items is greater than 0.75 with $\alpha = 0.90$.

Job satisfaction is measured by the scale of Cammann et al. (1983). This scale consists of three items with $\alpha = 0.84$.

Personal resilience estimates with 10-items adopted scale Connor & Davidson, (2003) using five-point Likert type scale ranges from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

**Target Population and Sampling**

Officer rank employees of public and private banks are the target population. With the help of simple random sampling technique 15 banks were selected randomly. From these banks’ 220 employees were selected for data collection.

**Reliability Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable’s Name</th>
<th>Alpha of Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Resilience</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no 1 indicates that all values of Cronbach’s Alpha of the variables are more than .060 thus all the collected data is reliable.

**Correlation Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Personal Resilience</th>
<th>Employee Engagement</th>
<th>Employee Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

369
Table no 2 provides the values of mean, standard deviation and nature of correlation i.e. either it is positive or negative. Employee engagement is positively correlated with personal resilience and its value of “r” is 0.46**. Employee satisfaction is positively correlated with personal resilience employee job satisfaction and its value of “r” is 0.33** and it is positively correlated with personal resilience employee job satisfaction and its value of “r” is 0.53**.

Regression Analysis

Table 3 Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“β”</th>
<th>“S.E”</th>
<th>“F”</th>
<th>“R”</th>
<th>“Decision”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Path c ( Step 1)”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Outcome”: Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Predictor”: Personal Resilience</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>81.47</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Step 2 (Path a)”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Outcome”: Employee Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Predictor”: Personal Resilience</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>98.35</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table No 3 provides the values of regression analysis. For the relationship of personal resilience with job satisfaction, Value of F is 81.47 and $R^2=0.28$ and Value of $\beta =0.35$. value of $p<0.01$, So hypothesis no 1 about this relationship is accepted. This result is similar with the results of previous researches (for e.g. Badran & Youssef-Morgan, 2015). As the value of $\beta$ of this research is very close to results of above-mentioned researchers.

For the relationship of employee engagement with job satisfaction, Value of F is 115.52 and $R^2=0.29$ and Value of $\beta =0.44$. value of $p<0.01$, So hypothesis no 2 about this relationship is accepted. This result is similar with the results of previous researches (for e.g. Bakker, et al., 2011; Bande et al., 2015; King et al., 2015; Mache et al., 2014; Shin et al., 2012). As the value of $\beta$ of this research is very close to results of above-mentioned researchers.
R²=0.31 and Value of β =0.51. value of p<0.01, So hypothesis no. 3 about this relationship is accepted. This result is similar with the results of previous researches (e.g. Saks 2006). As the value of β of this research is very close to results of above-mentioned researchers.

For checking the mediation influence of employee engagement for the relation of personal resilience with job satisfaction. Current research analyses the three direct relationships. Table no 3 describes that all these relationships are significant. For evaluating the mediation effect, current research regresses the independent variable (personal resilience) with mediator variable (employee engagement) on job satisfaction. It is observed that value of β is decreases from 0.35 to 0.23. This indicates that mediating effect is occur for the relationship of personal resilience with job satisfaction. As value is decreased so this mediating effect is partially occurred. This finding is also rationally acceptable because when one can increase the level of employee engagement which can result in decreasing the strength of relation of personal resilience and job satisfaction.

**Conclusion**
Organizations are continuously facing the problem about the satisfaction of their employees with their jobs. Due lack of this attribute organizations is facing the trouble in term of loss of organizational productivity and efficiency of their employees. Dissatisfied employees create trouble for their organizations. Current research is conducted on officer rank employees of banks of Lahore. Research is based on four hypotheses. Three of the hypotheses are about direct relationships and one is about the mediation effect of employee engagement for the for the relationship of personal resilience and job satisfaction. Three of the hypotheses about direct relations are accepted. Furthermore, employee engagement emerges as partial mediator for relationship of personal resilience with job satisfaction. In future, these types of studies may also conduct on other sectors like hotel industry, telecom, nursing sector and education sector. In future research, results of public and private banks will also compare this will provide the valuable insights. For generalizing the results data will be collected from banks of other cities like Islamabad, Karachi and Faisalabad.
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