Work Engagement and Leadership Management Characteristics in Tertiary Institutions in Ghana.

Aliata Issahaq Mumuni[1*], Kennedy Afenyo Biako[2], George Obeng Appah[3], Khalida Seidu[4] and Celestine Mawufemor Ladzakah[5]

[1,4] Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University, Box 553, Wa, Upper West Region, Ghana. Department of Secretaryship and Management, Business School.

[2] Quantum L C Limited, Box 1995 New Achimota Market, Accra, Ghana

[3] St. Thomas Aquinas Senior High School, Box 101, Osu, Accra, Ghana.

[5] Box DE 01, DENU

*Corresponding author: Aliata Issahaq Mumuni

Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University, Box 553, Wa, Upper West Region, Ghana. Department of Secretaryship and Management, Business School.

Abstract

This study investigates the relationship between work engagement and leadership management characteristics in tertiary institutions in Ghana. Employing a survey descriptive research design, a stratified sample of 285 employees from technical universities and colleges of education in the Northern and Upper West regions of Ghana was utilized. The research objectives were to examine the impact of work engagement dimensions (vigor, dedication, and absorption) on employee performance, explore the relationship between leadership and management characteristics and work engagement, and identify strategies for developing leadership competencies among employees. Hypotheses were formulated and tested using statistical analysis. A questionnaire was the primary instrument for data collection, covering concepts of work engagement and leadership management characteristics. Data analysis was conducted using mean and standard deviation, regression analysis with ANOVA, and correlation, facilitated by the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. The findings indicate a positive effect of the three work engagement dimensions on employee performance. A statistically significant difference was observed between the mean scores of work

14

engagement and leadership management competency. Furthermore, a strong correlation (0.973) was found between work engagement and leadership management competency. The study also identified various strategies for developing leadership competencies, including apprenticeship, role modeling, training participation, advance planning of leadership activities, and daily behavioral adjustments. These findings contribute to understanding the pivotal role of leadership in enhancing work engagement in Ghanaian tertiary institutions.

Keywords: *Leadership Management, commitment, Work Engagement, Influence, Characteristics.*

1. Introduction

Work engagement is a positive and fulfilling state of mind related to work, significantly impacting various outcomes for both employees and organizations. Its broader scope promotes organizational economic success, prompting organizations to prioritize employee work engagement. A high level of work engagement enables individuals to become more productive, vigorous, dedicated, and enthusiastic in performing their duties and responsibilities, particularly in dynamic academic institutions. The significance of work engagement for both employees and organizations has been well-documented (Steger et al., 2013).

In today's challenging business environment, leaders and managers must explore innovative strategies to drive growth and success. One effective approach is to examine the attitude of the workforce. Work engagement is generally viewed as a positive, fulfilling, affective-motivational state of work-related well-being. This concept has sparked a plethora of research, discussions, and logical frameworks that not only enhance employee well-being but also offer practical utility in organizational sciences (Moh & Nizarudin, 2017).

Studies have consistently shown a significant relationship between work engagement and increased productivity, leading to enhanced customer satisfaction (Shuck & Wollard, 2010; Wiley, 2010). By fostering a work environment that promotes engagement, organizations can reap numerous benefits, including improved employee performance and overall success.

1.1 Conceptualizing Work Engagement

Work engagement encompasses a multifaceted construct characterized by commitment, passion, zeal, absorption, concentrated effort, and energy. According to Kahn (1990), employees who are engaged in their work express themselves physically, cognitively, emotionally, and mentally during role performance. This concept can be further understood through three key dimensions: (1) Vigor (Behavioral-Energetic Dimension): Characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working (2) Dedication (Emotional Dimension): Involves a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge in one's work (3) Absorption (Cognitive Dimension): Defined by being fully concentrated and deeply engrossed in one's work, experiencing a sense of flow. These dimensions are integral to academic conceptualizations of work engagement, highlighting the complexities of involvement in work-related activities (Schaufeli et al., 2017). By understanding these components, organizations can better foster an environment that promotes employee engagement and overall well-being.

1.2 Leadership and Management Behavior: Impact on Employee Engagement

Employees often encounter various leadership and management behaviors throughout their careers, which can significantly influence their work experiences. Leaders may exhibit both positive and negative behaviors, and their level of attention can impact their ability to reflect on the effectiveness of their approaches to communication, management, and leadership.

Effective leadership involves understanding followership, which requires recognizing the strengths and weaknesses of team members to maximize their potential. This understanding can lead to the application of change management characteristics, including: (1) Involvement: Building human capability and creating a shared sense of ownership and responsibility among employees. This involves empowering employees to contribute to decision-making processes and fostering a sense of teamwork and collaboration. (2) Consistency: Establishing a consistent approach to leadership and management, ensuring that employees understand expectations and can rely on a stable work environment. (3) Adaptability: Being responsive to changing circumstances and willing to adjust leadership approaches as needed. (4) Mission: Clearly defining and communicating the organization's mission and vision, ensuring that employees understand their roles in achieving these goals. The involvement characteristic of leadership is particularly important for employee work engagement. When employees feel that they have a positive impact on the organization, they are more likely to be engaged and motivated. This can be achieved through capability development: (1) Investing in employees' knowledge and improvement, demonstrating that their abilities are valued and appreciated and (2) Empowerment: Providing employees with autonomy and responsibility, allowing them to take ownership of their work and contribute to decision-making processes. By prioritizing employee development and empowerment, organizations can foster a positive work environment that promotes engagement, motivation, and overall success

1.3 Organizational Effectiveness: Consistency and Adaptability

Consistency is a crucial characteristic of effective organizations, involving the definition of values and systems based on culture. Leaders model and reinforce these values, striving for agreement on critical issues to achieve organizational goals. Research has shown that stable and integrated organizations with strong core values tend to exhibit consistent behavior among employees (Ahmady et al., 2016). Key aspects of consistency include: (1) Core values: A clear set of values that guide decision-making and behavior among employees and leaders. (2) Binding agreements: Reaching compromises on difficult issues through dialogue and consideration of various perspectives. (3) Coordination and integration: Ensuring that work is aligned and integrated to promote efficiency and achieve organizational goals (Denison Consulting, 2009).

Adaptability is essential for organizations to respond to changing external demands and trends. This characteristic involves: (1) Customer focus: Understanding customer needs and continually

seeking ways to meet and exceed expectations. (2) Organizational learning: Gaining knowledge from successes and failures to improve processes and adapt to changing circumstances. (3) Innovation and risk-taking: Encouraging a culture where employees feel empowered to take reasonable risks and explore new approaches.

By prioritizing consistency and adaptability, organizations can create a stable and responsive work environment that promotes employee engagement, efficiency, and overall success.

1.4 The Role of Mission in Organizational Success

A well-defined mission is crucial for organizational success, providing a meaningful long-term direction that guides employees' understanding of the organization's strategies and goals. When employees comprehend the mission, they can effectively contribute to achieving organizational objectives.

Key Aspects of Mission (1) Strategic direction: A clear mission communicates the organization's purpose and strategic direction, enabling employees to understand how their daily work contributes to achieving organizational goals. (2) Goals and objectives: Short-term goals and objectives help employees adjust their daily activities to align with the organization's long-term strategy and vision (Denison Consulting, 2009).

1.5 Effective Leadership and Management

Effective leadership is essential for motivating employees and guiding them toward specific goals. Leaders play a critical role in influencing human behavior and promoting a direction based on a communication system that allows for permanent adjustments to structures and organizational processes (Iacob & Cismaru, 2002). Key aspects of effective leadership include (1) Communication: A vital component of organizational success, enabling managers to build strong relationships with subordinates and address challenges effectively (Zaccaro, 2007). (2) Adaptability: The ability to adjust to changing conditions and promote a culture of flexibility and responsiveness.

1.6 Linking Leadership to Employee Engagement

Numerous studies have investigated the impact of leadership and management characteristics on employee work engagement, a crucial factor in achieving organizational goals (Blomme, 2012). However, there remains a need for further research on the specific aspects of leadership and management that influence work engagement, considering organizational culture and personal character traits as moderating variables.

1.6.1 Leadership Styles and Employee Engagement: A Research Framework

The relationship between leadership styles and employee engagement is a complex one, with various studies highlighting the impact of different leadership approaches on employee motivation and involvement. This framework outlines the key propositions and findings from existing literature.

Propositions

i. Transactional Leadership: Lower levels of transactional leadership are associated with lower levels of employee engagement, although contingent rewards can positively influence engagement and enhance team performance by setting clear objectives, expectations, and rewards. Studies show that companies implementing structured objectives and reward-based motivation experience up to a 30% increase in employee performance and a 65% boost in team performance (Bass, 1985).

ii. Transformational Leadership: Higher levels of transformational leadership are linked to higher levels of employee engagement, as transformational leaders inspire and motivate their teams (Amor, Vǵuez, & Faina, 2020; Carasco-Saul, Kim, & Kim, 2015) and consistently shown to be positively related to employee engagement, inspiring and motivating their teams (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

iii. Autocratic Leadership: Autocratic leadership styles are negatively related to employee engagement, as autocratic leaders often don't consider their team members' input or ideas, reinforcing engagement through role clarification, organizational culture, empowerment, and psychological ownership (Carasco-Saul et al., 2015; Mehmood, Nawab, & Hamstra, 2016).

iv. Passive Management: A passive attitude on the part of managers is negatively related to employee engagement, leading to decreased motivation and involvement, directly related to a poor work environment, characterized by role stressors, psychological work fatigue, and poorer mental health (Skogstad et al., 2007).

v. Leader Congruence: Research on leader congruence suggests that alignment between leaders' and followers' characteristics, values, or goals can positively impact leadership effectiveness, team performance, and employee outcomes, including transformational leadership, leader-member exchange quality, and team effectiveness (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Zhang & Wang, 2012; Tamania, K. & Muhammad, Z. I., 2022; Junbang, et al., 2023).

1.6.2 Leadership Style and Employee Engagement: Implications for Organizational Performance

Research suggests that employees are motivated to act when they have a strong sense of purpose, which can be fostered through effective leadership (Crawford, Lepine, & Rich, 2010). The leadership style exhibited by management can significantly influence employee engagement, with motivated and inspiring leadership statements potentially increasing productivity and organizational development.

1.7 Managerial Involvement and Employee Engagement

The level of involvement of managers and leaders in employee roles and responsibilities can also impact work engagement. A less active attitude on the part of managers has been shown to be negatively related to employee engagement (Keller, 2003). Conversely, when employees are empowered to take on autonomous roles, participate in decision-making processes, and contribute to team and community goals, they are more likely to demonstrate knowledge, competence, and engagement (Howell & Mendez, 2008).

Research suggests that perceived leadership characteristics have a positive relationship with employee engagement, particularly when leadership is approached from a social identity perspective, thereby enhancing employees' perceptions of leadership effectiveness (Giessner, Van Knippenberg, & Sleebos, 2009).

Effective leadership, managerial involvement, and employee empowerment are key drivers of employee engagement and productivity, enabling organizations to develop targeted strategies for a more engaged and productive workforce.

16

1.7.1 Employee Engagement and Leadership: A Research Framework

Employee engagement is characterized by an employee's positive attitude toward their work environment and employers, often accompanied by a high level of perceived empowerment (Nieberding, 2014). Leadership plays a crucial role in fostering employee engagement and productivity, with effective leadership styles contributing to increased motivation and job satisfaction (Anand, 2017). Research has identified three key dimensions of employee engagement: (1) Vigor: Characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working (2) Dedication: Involves a sense of significance, enthusiasm, and challenge in one's work (3) Absorption: Defined by being fully concentrated and deeply engrossed in one's work.

1.9 Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study aims to investigate the relationship between leadership and management characteristics and employee work engagement, with a focus on:

  i. Investigating the effect of employee work engagement dimensions: Vigor, dedication, and absorption.
  ii. Examining the relationship between leadership and management characteristics: Toward employee work engagement.
  iii. Developing leadership competency among employees: Strategies for enhancing leadership skills.

1.9.1 The following hypotheses will be tested:

- H01: There is no significant difference between work engagement and leadership and management characteristics.
- H02: There is no significant difference between dimensions and influence and persuasion.

By exploring the relationship between leadership and employee engagement, this study aims to provide insights into the factors that contribute to a more engaged and productive workforce.

2. Literature Review

This literature review examines the key concepts and theories related to leadership competencies, work engagement characteristics, leadership through influence and persuasion, and the differences between leadership and management.

2.1 Employee Engagement Theory

Kahn's (1990) Employee Engagement Theory provides a foundational understanding of the psychological conditions that influence employee engagement. Building on Goffman's (1961) work, Kahn (1990) suggests that employees exhibit varying levels of attachment to their work roles and responsibilities, oscillating between attachment and detachment. This theory has been widely applied to explain employee behavior and attitudes towards work engagement. Kahn's work draws parallels with Hackman and Oldham's (1980s) job design concepts, highlighting the importance of job characteristics in shaping employee engagement. According to Kahn's theory, employees invest their affective, behavioral, and cognitive energies in the workplace, which enables them to develop a holistic perspective on their work connection and role (Barrick et al., 2015). Numerous studies have utilized Kahn's (1990) theory to investigate employee disengagement and the factors contributing to it. George and Joseph (2014) expanded on Kahn's theory, emphasizing the critical role leaders play in fostering employee engagement for organizational success. Employee engagement is characterized by a fulfilling work-related state of mind, marked by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Kim et al., 2016).

2.2 Developing Leadership Competencies

The development of leadership competencies is a multifaceted process that involves various strategies and approaches. Research has identified several key methods for developing leadership competencies, including: (1) - Participating in training: Formal training programs can provide leaders with the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to effectively lead others (2) - Observing role models: Observing effective leaders can be an excellent way to develop leadership competencies, as it allows individuals to learn from others and develop their own leadership style (3) Engaging in work experience: Hands-on experience is essential for developing leadership competencies, as it provides individuals with the opportunity to apply theoretical knowledge in practical settings (4) - Reading research and theory: Staying up-to-date with the latest research and theory can help leaders develop a deeper understanding of leadership principles and best practices (5) practicing self-leadership: Self-leadership involves taking personal responsibility for one's own development and performance, and is a critical component of effective leadership (Crawford et al., 2010).

Developing leadership competency also requires a conscious effort to change one's current behavior patterns, make a personal commitment to perform leadership tasks daily, and create mental activities for practicing leadership behaviors (Crawford et al., 2010). Apprenticeship or administrative assistantship is another effective way to develop leadership competencies, where leaders identify and place potential leaders in positions as apprentices or administrative assistants.

2.3 Work Engagement and Leadership Development

Work engagement is a critical component of effective leadership, as it enables individuals to translate their cognitive, affective, and physical energy into activities (Rich et al., 2010). Research has shown that engaged employees exhibit high levels of self-efficacy, directing their personal career, and putting energy into identified roles and responsibilities (Halbesleben, 2010). Studies have also found that work-related resources, such as social support from colleagues and managers, development opportunities, and work variation, are positively related to work engagement (Hakanen et al., 2005).

Furthermore, research has highlighted the importance of positive feedback, task identity, and creative and varied work in fostering work engagement (Hakanen et al., 2005). The social support offered by direct superiors has also been found to have a strong positive relationship with employee work engagement (Wiley, 2010).

2.4 Employee Work Engagement

Employee work engagement is a critical aspect of organizational behavior, characterized by a positive and fulfilling work-related state of mind. Employees with an optimistic mindset and a sense of purpose tend to be more enthusiastic, proactive, and dedicated to their work. These individuals are better equipped to capitalize on opportunities, mobilize resources, and perform effectively in their roles.

Research has shown that engaged employees exhibit high levels of enthusiasm, happiness, and pride in their work. They are also more likely to take decisive action to address performance issues and continually improve their work processes (Rich et al., 2010). Work engagement is a multifaceted concept that encompasses cognitive,

emotional, and physical aspects, and is not limited to job performance alone.

According to Rich et al. (2010), work engagement offers a broader perspective on employee behavior, highlighting the importance of individual agency and autonomy in determining how employees invest their energy and resources in their work. Engaged employees are able to make informed decisions about the tasks and activities that align with their values, skills, and interests, and are more likely to experience a sense of fulfillment and satisfaction in their work.

2.5 Leadership Through Influence and Persuasion

Effective leadership is often characterized by the ability to influence and persuade others, rather than relying solely on positional authority. Leaders who successfully employ influence and persuasion strategies can foster a positive and productive work environment, built on mutual trust, respect, and loyalty. The leader-follower relationship is critical in this context, with shared beliefs, values, and goals serving as a foundation for effective collaboration.

2.5.1 Influence Strategies

Research has identified several key influence strategies that leaders can use to achieve their goals. These include: (1) Simple requests: Leaders can make requests that are within the follower's capabilities and assigned duties. (2) Legitimized requests: Leaders can use their authority to legitimize requests and convince employees to follow their direction. (3) Task commitment: Leaders can use pressure, warnings, and close supervision to ensure task completion, although this approach should be used judiciously. (4) Coalition building: Leaders can work with others to influence an individual's behavior.

2.5.2 Rational Persuasion

Rational persuasion is a particularly effective influence strategy, as it involves using facts and logical reasoning to demonstrate the benefits of a particular behavior or action. This approach can be used to change behavior, initiate action, and gain consensus. The success of rational persuasion depends on the level of trust and respect between the parties involved, as well as the manner in which the persuasive appeal is presented.

2.5.3 Effective Leadership

Effective leaders are able to apply rational persuasion in a way that is both effective and powerful. By combining rational persuasion with other influence strategies, leaders can enhance their leadership skills and achieve their goals. Research has shown that the use of rational persuasion can lead to positive outcomes, including improved job performance and increased employee engagement (Wiley, 2010; Salanova et al., 2005).

2.6 Differences Between Leadership and Management

The distinction between leadership and management has been a topic of interest in organizational research. While both concepts are closely linked, they have distinct functions and characteristics.

2.6.1 Management Skills

Management skills are used to plan, build, and direct organizational systems to accomplish missions and goals. Managers focus on formal directing and controlling of their assistants, resources, structures, and systems (Moh. & Nizarudin, 2017). Their primary objective is to reach short-term goals, avoid risks, and establish standardization to improve efficiency (Kotter, 2006).

2.6.2 Leadership Skills

Leadership skills, on the other hand, are used to focus on potential change by establishing direction, aligning people, and motivating and inspiring. Leaders have a vision of what can be achieved and communicate this to others, evolving strategies for realizing the vision (Moh. & Nizarudin, 2017). They motivate employees, negotiate for resources, and take risks to accomplish common goals (Bass, 2010).

2.6.3 Key Differences

The differences between leadership and management are evident in their approach, focus, and outcomes. While managers maintain a smoothly functioning workplace, leaders encourage new functions and strive for long-term goals (Wiley, 2010). Leaders also possess certain qualities, such as integrity, vision, toughness, decisiveness, trust, commitment, selflessness, creativity, risk-taking, and communication ability (Capowski, 1994).

2.7 Leadership and Management Overlap

Although leadership and management are distinct, they can overlap. Some scholars argue that good leaders need management skills to be effective, and good managers should strive to be good leaders (Moh. & Nizarudin, 2017). The degree of overlap between leadership and management is a point of discussion, with some arguing that they are complementary, while others see them as distinct (Bass, 2010; Wiley, 2010).

3. Methodology

This study employed a survey descriptive research design to investigate the relationship between work engagement and leadership and management characteristics in tertiary institutions in Ghana. A stratified sample of 285 employees was selected from technical universities and colleges of education in the Northern and Upper West regions of Ghana.

The main instrument used for data collection was a questionnaire that covered the concepts of work engagement and leadership and management characteristics. The questionnaire utilized a Likert scale with five response options: strongly disagree (SD), disagree (D), neutral (N), agree (A), and strongly agree (SA).

Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including mean and standard deviation, as well as inferential statistics, including regression analysis with ANOVA correlation. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 was used for data analysis.

The survey descriptive research design was deemed suitable for this study as it allowed for the collection of data from a large sample size, providing a comprehensive understanding of the research phenomenon. The use of a stratified sample ensured that the sample was representative of the population, increasing the generalizability of the findings.

The questionnaire was administered to the selected sample, and data were collected and analyzed using the aforementioned statistical techniques. The results of the study are presented in the subsequent sections, providing insights into the relationship between work engagement and leadership and management characteristics in tertiary institutions in Ghana.

4. Results and Discussion

The results and discussions of each section of the collected data were shown.

Table 1 : Dimensions of Employee Work Engagement

Statements	N	Mean	SD
1. **Vigour** (the willingness to give the best in a job)	285	4.68	.027
2. **Dedication** (strength of engage in a job and experiencing)	285	4.23	.015
3 **Absorption** (full concentration and effective relationship with their work)	285	3.83	.132

Source: Aliata Field Data (2025)

The mean from the Table 1 shows that the respondents generally agree to most of the determinants. On the first dimension, the respondent's shows that vigour contributes the development of an organization during employee work engagement the mean score was 4.68 with a Standard Deviation of 0.027. The mean score of 4.68 is between 4 (agree) and 5(strongly agree) but approximately closer to 5 which suggests that the respondents strongly agree that vigour as a contributing determinant during work engagement and similarly the respondents with regards to dedication with mean of 4.23 which is approximately closer to 4 (agree) indicating that the respondents show agreement between dedication and work engagement. Finally, the mean of absorption is between 3 (neutral) and agree (4) but approximately closer to 4(agree) indicating that absorption is a deterministic towards employee work engagement with the given level of agreement

Table 2 : Percentage of Dimensions of Work Engagement

Dimensions	Freq.	Valid %	Comm %
1. **Vigour**	85	29.82	29.82
2. **Dedication**	80	28.07	57.89
3 **Absorption**	120	42.11	100

Source: Aliata Field Data (2025)

Table 2 shows the percentage of the dimensions of work engagement. The survey results show that the majority of the survey respondents considered absorption represents 120 (42.11%) of the study sample population, while 85(29.82%) represent the portion vigour as the key dimension for employee work engagement. Finally, the dedication dimension represents 80(28.07%) of the total study sample respondents in the survey. The results shows that respondents considered absorption as the major contribution determinant during work engagement of employee.

Table 3: Model Summary

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.789[a]	.607	.574	.850

Source: Aliata Field data (2025)

The results in table 3 shows that there is strong correlation (0.789) between work engagement and the dimensions (vigour, dedication and absorption). Again the R square shows that 60.7% of the dependent variable (work engagement) were explained by the predictors (vigour, dedication and absorption) respectively.

Table 4: Dimension ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	26.352	2	13.176	18.250	.000[b]
	Residual	203.604	282	.722		
	Total	229.956	284			

Source: Aliata Field Data (2025)

Table 4 shows the statistically significant between the employee work engagement and the dimensions (vigour, dedication and absorption). The table indicated the sum of squares, degree of freedom, mean square, F statistic (19.250) and the P- value (0.000). The regression and residual were also shown. If this p-value is less than $\alpha = .05$, we reject the null hypothesis of the ANOVA and conclude that there is a statistically significant difference between the means of the three groups (vigour, dedication and absorption).

Otherwise, if the p-value is not less than $\alpha = .05$ then we fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that we do not have sufficient evidence to say that there is a statistically significant difference between the means of the groups. The results this particular example, the p-value is 0.000 so we reject the null hypothesis. This means we have sufficient evidence to say that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean of vigour, dedication and absorption.

Table 5 Coefficients in Regression

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.298	3.400		.382	.0.02
	Vigour	.947	.225	.375	0.891	.001
	Dedication	.221	.438	.076	1 .505	.0.03

Absorption	.571	.288	.403	4.987	.001

Work Engagement = 1.298 + 0.947 Vigour + 0.221 Dedication + 0.571Absorption

The results the regression indicated that the constant value is 1.298. This implies that if the dimensions (vigour, dedication and absorption) are zero, the value of the work engagement would be 1.298. Again, the results also shows that a unit increase of vigour will increase the dependent variable (work engagement) by 0.298). Furthermore, a unit increase of dedication will also increase work engagement by 0.221. Finally, a unit increase of absorption will increase work engagement by 0.571.

Moreover, the beta values shows the most contributing dimension is the absorption (0.403), followed by dedication (0..076) and finally vigour(0.375). The results also showed that all the three dimensions were statistically significant with the given p-values less that than the alpa value of (0.05)

Table 6:   Developing Leadership Competency

Items		N	Mean	SD
1.	Apprenticeship or administrative assistantship	285	4.90	.71
2.	Change one's current behavior patterns	285	4.12	.84
3.	Perform leadership tasks daily	285	3.02	.88
4.	Participating in training,	285	4.67	.85
5.	Observing role models	285	4.77	.90
6.	Planning leadership activities in advance	285	2.82	.92

The mean (4.90) of apprenticeship is between 4(agree) and 5(strongly agree) but approximately closer to 5 indicating that the entire respondents strongly agree that Apprenticeship or administrative assistantship are contributing element for developing leadership competency.

The mean (4.11) of change of one's current behavior patterns is between 4(agree) and 5(strongly agree) but approximately closer to 4 indicating that the respondents strongly agree that change of one's current behavior patterns is a contributing element for developing leadership competency.

Additionally, the mean (3.02) of performing leadership tasks daily is between 3(neutral) and 4(agree) but approximately closer to 3(neutral) indicating that the respondents neither agree nor disagree that performing leadership tasks daily help to develop leadership competency.

Further, the mean (4.67) of participating in training is between 4(agree) and 5(strongly agree) but approximately closer to 5 indicating that the majority of the respondents strongly agree that participating in training is a contributing element for developing leadership competency.

Moreover, the mean (4.90) of apprenticeship is between 4(agree) and 5(strongly agree) but approximately closer to 5 indicating that the entire respondents strongly agree that Apprenticeship or administrative assistantship are contributing element for developing leadership competency. Additionally, the mean. The mean (4.77) of observing role models is between 4(agree) and 5(strongly agree) but approximately closer to 5(strongly agree) indicating that the majority of the respondents strongly agree that observing role models contributes in developing leadership competency.

Finally, the mean (2.82) of observing role models is between 2(disagree) and 3(neutral) but approximately closer to 3(neutral) indicating that some of the respondents neither agree or disagree that planning leadership activities in advance contributes to the development of leadership competency.

Table 7. Coefficient of developing Leadership Competency

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.732	3.500		.382	.0.00
	Apprenticeship	.647	.245	.871	0.891	.000
	Behaviour Pattern	.441	.450	.826	1 .505	.0.01
	Daily Leadership Task	-.631	.239	.284	0.987	.002
	Training	0.340	0.120	-0.34	2.343	0.23
	Observing	0.871	0.43	0.43	1.032	0.02
	Planning	0.234	0,32	-0.32	1.32	0.35

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15386307

20

Leadership competency = 0.732 $_+$ 0.647 Apprenticeship + 0.441 Behaviour Pattern - 0.731eadership Task + 0.340 Training + 0.871Observing role model + 0.234 Planning.

The multiple linear regression above indicates that a unit increase of each predictor will increase the dependent variable by the amount of coefficient in each predictor except daily leadership task which will decrease the leadership competency by 0.631. The most contributing factor is the apprenticeship and behaviour pattern with beta coefficient of (0.871) and (0.826) respectively.

Table 8: Percentage of Leadership Competency

Items	Frq	V%
1. Apprenticeship or administrative assistantship	100	35.09
2. Change one's current behavior patterns	25	8.80
3. Perform leadership tasks daily	20	7.70
4. Participating in training,	40	14.03
5. Observing role models	90	31.58
6. Planning leadership activities in advance	10	3.51

Source: Aliata Field Data (2025)

Table 8 shows the percentage of each of the parameters for developing leadership competency with apprenticeship and observing role models having the highest percentages of 35,09% and 31.58%. The least percentage is planning leadership activities in advance with only 3,5%

Hypothesis 1

H_{01}: There is no significant difference between work engagement and leadership and management characteristics

Table 9. Correlation between work engagement and leadership & Mgt Competency

	Work Engagement	Leadership & Mgt Comp.
Pearson Correlation	1	.973
Sig. (2-tailed)		.001

Source: Aliata Field Data (2023)

At 95% significant level, the p-value (0.001) from table 9 is higher than the alpha value (0.05), the null hypothesis is therefore rejected indicating that there is statistically significant difference between the mean of the work engagement and leadership and management competency. Again, there is strong correlation (0.973) between work engagement and leadership and management competency.

Hypothesis 2

H_{02}: There is no significant difference between dimensions and influence and persuasion.

Table 10 : Correlation between dimensions and influence and persuasion.

Dimensions		Influence and Persuasion
Vigour	Pearson Correlation	.841
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004
	N	285
Dedication	Pearson Correlation	.241
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.034
	N	285
Absorption	Pearson Correlation	.901
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001
	N	285

Source: Aliata Field Data (2025)

The data from table 10 shows strong correlation (0.901) between absorption and influence and persuasion as well as vigour (0.841) but weak correlation (0.241) between dedication and influence and persuasion. Again, only vigour and absorption showed p-value less than apha value of 0.05

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

This study examined the concepts of work engagement and leadership and management characteristics, including strategies for developing leadership competency. The findings highlighted vigour, dedication, and absorption as key dimensions of work engagement that impact leader management characteristics.

Implications

The study's results have implications for organizational practice, particularly in the context of tertiary institutions in Ghana. By understanding the dimensions of work engagement and their impact on leadership and management characteristics, organizations can develop targeted strategies to enhance employee engagement and leadership development.

6. Future Research Directions

Future research should focus on exploring strategies to address the challenges associated with the dimensions of work engagement and leadership management characteristics. Additionally, investigating the challenges of developing leadership competency and identifying effective approaches to overcome these challenges would be beneficial.

7. Recommendations

Based on the study's findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Organizations should prioritize employee engagement initiatives that foster vigour, dedication, and absorption.
2. Leadership development programs should be designed to address the challenges associated with leadership management characteristics.
3. Further research is needed to explore the complexities of work engagement and leadership management characteristics in different organizational contexts.

By addressing these areas, organizations can promote positive work environments, enhance leadership effectiveness, and ultimately improve overall performance.

8. Conclusion

In conclusion, leadership and management have distinct functions and characteristics. While managers focus on planning, directing, and controlling, leaders focus on establishing direction, aligning people, and motivating and inspiring. Understanding the differences between leadership and management can help organizations develop effective strategies for achieving their goals.

References

1. Ahmady, G. A., Nikooravesh, A., & Mehrpour, M. (2016). Effect of Organizational Culture on knowledge Management Based on Denison Model. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 230(May), 387–395.

2. Anand, G. (2017). Corporate excellence through governance and employee engagement. Journal of Commerce & Management Thought, 8, 554–562

3. Barrick, M. R., Thurgood, G. R., Smith, T. A., & Courtright, S. H. (2015). Collective organizational engagement: Linking motivational antecedents, strategic implementation, and firm performance. Academy of Management Journal, 58, 111–135.

4. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Sage Publications.

5. Bass, B. (1990). Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research & Managerial Applications, 3rd Ed., The Free Press, New York, NY

6. Bennis, W. G. and Nanus, B. (1997), Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge, HarperCollins, New York.

7. Blomme, R. J. (2012). Leadership, complex adaptive systems, and equivocality: The role of managers in emergent change. Organization Management Journal, 9, 4–19.

8. Capowski, G., (1994), ―Anatomy of a leader: where is the leader of tomorrow?‖, Management Review, Vol. 83 Issue 3, p. 10- 18

9. Covey, S. R. (2003). Principle Centered Leadership. New York

10. 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(5), 834–848.

11. Denison Consulting. (2009). Getting started with your Denison organizational culture survey results. 1–32

12. George, J. M., & Joseph, E. E. (2014). Understanding and predicting transformational leadership: A multi-level model. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 27(2), 143-157.

13. Giessner, S. R., Van Knippenberg, D., & Sleebos, E. (2009). License to fail? How leader group prototypicality moderates the effects of leader performance on perceptions of leadership effectiveness. The Leadership Quarterly, 20(3), 434–451.

14. Goffman, E. (1961). Encounters: Two studies in the sociology of interaction. Bobbs-Merrill.

15. Gosling, J. & Murphy, A. (2004). Leading Continuity. Working Paper: Centre for Leadership Studies, University of Exeter.

16. Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level, multi-domain perspective. Leadership Quarterly, 6(2), 219-247.

17. Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2005). How dentists cope with their job demands and stay engaged: The moderating role of job resources. European Journal of Oral Sciences, 113(6), 479–487.

18. Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2010). A meta-analysis of work engagement: Relationships with burnout, demands, resources, and consequences. In A. B. Bakker & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research (pp. 102–117). Oxon, UK: Psychology Press.

19. House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In: Hunt, J. G., Larson, L. L. (Eds.): Leadership: The cutting edge. Carpondale, Edwardsville, Southern Illinois University Press, pp. 189-205.

20. Howell, J. P., & Mendez, M. J. (2008). Three perspectives on leadership. In Ronald E. Riggio et al. (Ed.), The art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organizations (pp. 25–40).

21. Huertas-Valdivia, I., Llorens-Montes, J., & Ruiz-Moreno, A. (2018). Achieving engagement among hospitality employees: A serial mediation model. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 30, 217-241.

22. Junbang Lan, Yuanyuan Huo, IpKin Anthony Wong, Bocong Yuan. (2023). How (in)congruence of leader–follower learning goal orientation affects leader-member exchange quality and follower innovation: A polynomial regression analysis.

23. Kahn, W.A (1990). Psychological Conditions of personal Engagement and disengagement at Work. Academy of Management Journal Vol 33 No 4 pp. 692 – 724.

24. Keller, T. (2003). Parental images as a guide to leadership sensemaking: An attachment perspective on implicit leadership theories. The Leadership Quarterly, 4(2), 141–160.

25. 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, 1-11.

26. Kotter, J. P., (2001), ―What leaders really do?―, Harvard Business Review, Vol. 79 Issue 11, p.85-96

27. Kotter, J. P. (1990b). A force for change: How leadership differs from management. New York, NY: Free Press.

28. Moh. B. & Nizarudin, W. (2017). The Differences Between Management and Leadership. SINERGI, Volume 7, Nomor 2

29. Nieberding, A. (2014). Employee engagement and other bonding forces in organizations. Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 66, 320-323.

30. Popli, S., & Rizvi, I. A. (2015). Exploring the relationship between service orientation, employee engagement and perceived leadership style: A study of managers in the private service sector organizations in India. Journal of Services Marketing, 29, 59-70

31. Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. Academy of Management Journal, 53(3), 617–635.

32. Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiró, J. M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: The mediation of service climate. Journal of Applied Psychology, 90(6), 1217–122

33. Schaufeli, W. B., Shimazu, A., Hakanen, J., Salanova, M., & De Witte, H. (2017). "An UltraShort Measure for Work Engagement: The UWES-3 Validation Across Five Countries," European Journal of Psychological Assessment

34. Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human Resource Development Review, 9*(1), 89–110

35. Tamania Khan, Muhammad Zahid Iqbal. (2022). Exploring the relationship between leader-member exchange congruence and feedback-seeking behavior.

36. Wiley, J. W. (2010). The impact of effective leadership on employee engagement. Employment Relations Today, 37(2), 47–53.

37. Ylitalo, J. (2004). Leadership in the implementation of quality systems. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 25(1), 42-57.

38. Yukl, G., (1989) Managerial Leadership: a review of theory and research. Journal of Management, Vol. 15 Issue 2, p. 251-290

39. Zaccaro, S., J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership, American Psychologist, 62, 6–16.

40. Zhang, Z., & Wang, M. (2012). The congruence effect of leader and follower proactive personality on leader-member exchange quality, job satisfaction, commitment, and job performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 97(4), 761-771.