

# Role of Mentoring and Psychological Capital in Enhancing Employee Engagement in Central Public Sector Enterprises

## Meetu Jain

Research Scholar  
GLA University,  
Mathura, U.P, India  
email: meetujain3@gmail.com

## Dr Aruna Dhamija

Professor  
GLA University,  
Mathura, U.P, India  
email: aruna.dhamija@gla.ac.in

## Dr Bharti Shauran

Associate Professor  
Maharaja Agrasen Institute of  
Management Studies  
New Delhi, India  
email: bhartimaims@gmail.com

## Abstract

Central Public sector enterprises (CPSEs) in India are encountering difficulties due to skill shortages, limited resource allocations, and insufficient infrastructure and support structures. Employees face high demands, and management support systems may not always be readily accessible to provide assistance. To develop and manage human resources in a more effective way, a new paradigm is needed in CPSEs. In this study, an attempt has been made to find out role of mentoring and psychological capital on work engagement of employees in Central Public sector enterprises. Mentorship offers excellent ways in sharing knowledge and skills among Central public sector enterprises in India. A sample size of 495 was taken and data was collected from employees of Central public sector enterprises located in Delhi/ NCR. For the purpose of the study, already validated instruments were used to measure constructs i.e Mentor Role Instrument (MRI) by Ragins & McFarlin to measure mentoring, Utrecht Work Engagement Scale by Schaufeli & Bakker to measure work engagement and Psychological Capital Questionnaire by Avey et al to measure psychological capital of employees. Research findings of this study indicated that both mentoring and psychological Capital are positively correlated with work engagement of employees of central public sector enterprises. Moreover, the work engagement of employees working in CPSEs of India is satisfactory as all the mean scores are higher than 4. Therefore, it is critical for CPSEs to focus on implementing proper strategies for creating a supporting ecosystem for mentoring in their organizations which in turn would make employees more productive by ensuring their high work engagement.

**Keywords:** Mentoring, Psychological Capital, Work engagement

## Introduction

Today organizations face potpourri of challenges posed by technology-driven disruption of business activities increasingly characterized by volatile, uncertain, ambiguous, and complex (VUCA) conditions. The

VUCA-specific significance of the skills receives strong support from studies like IBM's Global Chief Executive Officer survey, which concluded from the input of the 1,500 CEOs who participated that "rapid escalation of complexity is the biggest challenge confronting the world's leaders" (Palmisano, 2010). Organization needs to incorporate a differentiating factor so that workers get a competitive advantage in the VUCA world. Today's organizations are more prone and interested in hiring employees who are energetic, optimistic and dedicated to their works. Their mental stability and challenging attitudes are more accepted rather than their skills. These days Organizations hire only competent candidates with positive work attitudes. Organizations need to develop productive work behaviors and eliminate any counter-productive behaviors (Brown, 2004; Sanyal and Sett, 2011; Soni, 2004; Ulrich et al., 1995).

Key objectives of the study are as given below:

- i. To empirically examine the role of Mentoring on Work Engagement of employees in CPSEs.
- ii. To assess the role of Psychological capital in enhancing the Work Engagement of employees of CPSEs.

## Literature Review

### The Concept of Mentoring

Organizations today require new capabilities in their employees to cope with an array of challenges, from coping with narrowing profitability gaps to enabling continual innovation; increasing stakeholders responsiveness to meeting regulatory requirements; and uncertainty to managing increasingly complex new services and value chains. These challenges can be managed only if human resource is managed effectively. People are intellectual/creative Capital for an organization and they constitute important source of dynamic input in any organization. Performance of an employee significantly influences Organizational performance. There have been several studies to indicate that there is a significant correlation between people and the profits they bring to the organization. As per Luthans (2002), the study of psychological capital can be used in Organizational HRM

(Human Resource Management). With the changing workforce demographics and increasing demand for skilled workers, organizations are recognizing the importance of investing in their employees. While there is a growing emphasis on measuring the ROI of human resource investments, such as mentoring programs, it is important to also consider the intangible benefits, such as increased job satisfaction and organizational commitment, that may not be easily quantifiable in monetary terms. Furthermore, the benefits of mentoring programs extend beyond the individual participants and can positively impact the overall organizational culture and productivity. .

### The Concept of Psychological Capital

#### The Concept of Psychological Capital

As per the view of Luthans (2002), the study of psychological capital can be used in Organizational HRM (Human Resource Management). The practice and study of psychological capital has been initiated with positive organizational behavior in different domains including sports, health, military, education, work and life. The importance of psychological capital lies in turning one's dysfunctional behavior into creative, happy and productive approaches to life (Machado, 2008). Luthans, Avolio, Avey and Norman (2007) have explained the above-mentioned elements as per the following approaches.

- Optimism: Sustaining positive perspectives for orientation
- Hope: Persistent focus towards aims while redirecting and rearranging the paths for achieving the pre-desired objective.
- Resilience: To endure and spring back from extreme difficulties or adverse situations.
- Self-Efficacy: To have beliefs about self-capacity and competency for retaining performance attainments in challenging situations.

As per several psychological studies employees who are hopeful, resilient, optimistic, have good performance and enhanced workplace performance (Green, Medlin, & Whitten, 2004; Luthans, Avey, Avolio, Norman, & Combs, 2006; Luthans & Youssef, 2007).

## The Concept of Work Engagement

In today's intricate and highly competitive world, where competition is fierce, "retaining skilled and talented employees is no longer enough. Organizations must focus on fully engaging their employees, creating a sense of commitment and loyalty among them throughout their work life. Concept of Employee engagement has emerged as a significant factor for organizational success. At its core, employee engagement is about creating the right conditions for all employees to give their best every day. It is built on trust, integrity, and effective communication between the organization and its employees. By fostering a culture of engagement, organizations can improve both individual and organizational performance and productivity. In the 1990s, the Gallup organization used the term "Employee engagement." Based on a survey of CEOs worldwide, employee engagement has been identified as one of the most significant challenges for organizations (Wah, 1999). The concept of work engagement originated from the field of positive organizational behavior and has become a prominent psychological state in organizations (Bakker and Demerouti, (2008).

## Research Gaps

Numerous studies have investigated the significance of mentoring in organizations and its impact on employee retention, providing a strong basis for this concept (Ranft & Lord, (2000); Ramaaswami & Dreher, (2007). Several studies have emphasized the importance of retaining employees in organizations to reduce turnover (Ragins et al., 1990; Mitchell, 2001). Moreover, research studies have explored the potential benefits of mentoring, including enhancing employee self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986) and reducing stress levels (Habesleben & Buckleg, 2004). Lot of research has been conducted on mentoring in private sector. While certain facets of mentoring research in the private sector may be relevant to the public sector, it is not a given that a successful mentoring program in the private sector will also be effective in the public sector. Therefore, a study needs to be undertaken which can assess impact of mentoring and psychological capital on work engagement of employees of central public sector enterprises.

Hypothesis of the study are as given below-

H1: Mentoring is positively related with work engagement of employees in Central Public Sector enterprises.

H2: Psychological capital is positively related with work engagement of employees in Central Public Sector enterprises.

## Research Methodology

### Data Collection

For the purpose of data collection, random sampling was used. In order to have equal representation of all the three types of CPSEs in the study, Questionnaire was sent to employees of all the three categories of 09 number CPSEs i.e. Maharatna, Navratna and Miniratna category. Data was collected from Executives in the grade of E1-E8 level in the CPSEs.

### Data source

Both primary and secondary data sources has been collected in this study. Data was collected through a structured Questionnaire which was sent to around 550 officials of 09 CPSE's through Google Form. Out of 550 questionnaires sent, only 510 responses were received. Out of 510 responses, only 490 responses were valid and considered for data analysis. Secondary data was collected from the following sources i.e. Official website of CPSEs, Annual reports, Copies of relevant documents provided by the Organizations etc.

### Tools used

SPSS has been used to test the study hypotheses. Correlation analysis has been undertaken to check the association between variables.

### Instruments used

Three already validated instruments were used to measure Mentoring, Psychological Capital & Work Engagement which are as given below:

- Mentor Role Instrument (MRI) – by Ragins & McFarlin – to measure Career & Psycho-social roles of Mentoring. It is having 33 items.
- Utrecht Work Engagement Scale – by Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003 – to measure Work Engagement of

Employees. It is having 9 items.

- c. Psychological Capital Questionnaire-12 (PCQ-12)- by Avey et al., 2011 to measure Psychological Capital. It is having 12 items.

## Data Analysis

### Mean Scores of Sub- Constructs of Mentor Role

Upon data analysis, it was found that the mean scores for a

large number of items is more than 5 indicating the effectiveness of mentor role in CPSEs of India. The result depicts that CPSE in India should increase the mentors within the organization as the mentors are seen to be well performing their mentor roles. Finally, the mean score of item satisfaction with mentor is found to be 5.80 which show that employees are highly satisfied with their mentors.

**Table -1 show the sub-construct wise average scores of the 11 sub-dimensions of mentor role.**

**Table 1: Mean Scores of Mentor Role Sub-Constructs**

SN	Sub-construct	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Sponsor	5.3857	.87741
2	Coach	5.3901	.95977
3	Protect	5.2597	.98405
4	Challenge	5.6272	.87031
5	Exposure	5.4407	.92127
6	Friendship	5.5844	.86190
7	Social	5.0778	1.11206
8	Parent	4.9016	1.19429
9	Role model	5.2620	1.01765
10	Counseling	5.5288	.90954
11	Acceptance	5.5459	.86373

## Work Engagement

Table 2 presents the mean scores of 9 items of work engagement measured in 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Strongly disagree to 6 = Strongly agree.

**Table 2: Mean Scores of Work Engagement Items**

Work Engagement Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
<b>1. Dedication</b>		
I am bursting with energy at work.	4.73	1.323
I feel strong & Vigorous at my job.	4.96	1.069
I am enthusiastic about my job.	5.11	1.001
<b>2. Vigor</b>		
My job inspires me.	4.99	1.087
When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.	4.91	1.178
When I am working intensely, I feel happy.	5.23	.935
<b>3. Absorption</b>		
I am proud of the work that I do.	5.20	.911
I am immersed in my work.	5.09	.964
I get carried away, when I am working	4.65	1.425

The result reveals that the work engagement of employees working in CPSEs of India is satisfactory as all the mean scores are higher than 4. The perceived engagement by the employees is favorable. Feeling of vigour, dedication and absorption at workplace are found to be important dimensions of work engagement.

### Correlation between Mentor Role Sub-constructs with Work Engagement

Table given below exhibits the correlation matrix of mentor role sub-constructs with work engagement.

**Table 3: Correlation Matrix of Mentor Role Sub-constructs with Work Engagement**

		work_en	sponsor	coach	protect	challenge	exposure	friendship	social	parent	Role_model	counseling	acceptance
work_en	Pearson's r	—											
	p-value	—											
sponsor	Pearson's r	0.186***	—										
	p-value	<.001	—										
coach	Pearson's r	0.209***	0.803***	—									
	p-value	<.001	<.001	—									
protect	Pearson's r	0.163***	0.797***	0.825***	—								
	p-value	<.001	<.001	<.001	—								
challenge	Pearson's r	0.170***	0.680***	0.813***	0.715***	—							
	p-value	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	—							
exposure	Pearson's r	0.166***	0.788***	0.774***	0.805***	0.771***	—						
	p-value	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	—						
friendship	Pearson's r	0.199***	0.762***	0.754***	0.747***	0.800***	0.815***	—					
	p-value	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	—					
social	Pearson's r	0.095*	0.622***	0.540***	0.604***	0.460***	0.627***	0.670***	—				
	p-value	0.031	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	—				
parent	Pearson's r	0.173***	0.647***	0.615***	0.629***	0.516***	0.631***	0.662***	0.731***	—			
	p-value	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	—			
Role_model	Pearson's r	0.228***	0.690***	0.710***	0.693***	0.640***	0.719***	0.748***	0.668***	0.802***	—		
	p-value	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	—		
counseling	Pearson's r	0.188***	0.749***	0.769***	0.706***	0.759***	0.779***	0.822***	0.632***	0.712***	0.859***	—	
	p-value	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	—	
acceptance	Pearson's r	0.178***	0.738***	0.709***	0.654***	0.718***	0.717***	0.774***	0.549***	0.601***	0.739***	0.780***	—
	p-value	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	—

Note. \* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

In the table, it is seen that the correlation coefficient of interest are correlation of mentor role sub-constructs with work engagement as shown in the first column of correlation matrix. Among the mentor role sub-constructs; sponsor, coach, protect, challenge, exposure, friendship, and parent have significant correlation coefficients at 0.1% significance level. Only one sub-construct is found to be significantly correlated at 5% significance level. All the

sub-constructs are positively and significantly correlated with work engagement. The result reveals that mentor role sub-constructs are positively co-related with work engagement of CPSE employees. Role model and coach sub-constructs have relatively higher correlation coefficient.

### Correlation between Psychological Capital Sub-constructs with Work Engagement

**Table 4 presents the correlation matrix of the four psychological capital sub-constructs with employee engagement.**

		WorkEng		Efficacy		Resilience		Optimism		Hope
WorkEng	Pearson's r	—								
	p-value	—								
Efficacy	Pearson's r	0.509	***	—						
	p-value	< .001		—						
Resilience	Pearson's r	0.495	***	0.582	***	—				
	p-value	< .001		< .001		—				
Optimism	Pearson's r	0.480	***	0.539	***	0.548	***	—		
	p-value	< .001		< .001		< .001		—		
Hope	Pearson's r	0.556	***	0.702	***	0.654	***	0.654	***	—
	p-value	< .001		< .001		< .001		< .001		—
Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001										

The results of the correlation analysis reveal that all the four sub-constructs of psychological capital are positively correlated with work engagement. All the correlation coefficients are significant at 0.1 percent significance level. The correlation of hope and efficacy are the greatest.

Above Tables indicate that both the aforementioned hypothesis are accepted. This means that Mentor role and Psychological capital are positively related with work engagement.

## Discussion

From the Mentor Role Instrument, it has been found that the mean score of mentor's roles is more than 5 highlighting the positive impacts of mentors' role in public sectors of India. The mean score of satisfaction among employees from mentors is 5.80 that ensures the benefits of mentorship in Indian public sector enterprise. Based on this data, it can also be opined that mentors in Indian PSE highly influence employees' engagement. From the correlation table, it has been found that the positive connection between all the sub-constructs like counselling, acceptance, role model, friendship, sponsor and others and employee engagement at Indian PSU signifies the effectiveness of mentorship

programs. From the findings, it can be opined that mentoring programs in the public sector enterprises of India helps in increasing work engagement. Besides mentoring, effective psychological capitals such as self-reliance, efficacy, optimism and hope among employees increase their engagement in operational activities. CPSEs with mentorship programs can enable organizations to develop a more satisfied and engaged workforce while reducing negative attitudes.

## Conclusion

Employees serve as the foundation of any industry and its success is heavily reliant on an engaged workforce. It is the "Human" factor which creates all the difference between a successful and un-successful organization. In today's ever-changing environment, Organisations need to prepare employees to face various challenges posed to them by the environment (both external as well as Internal). Numerous studies have demonstrated the benefits of employee engagement to businesses. Engaged employees tend to work harder, be passionate about their jobs, and exert extra effort for their organization, resulting in better overall performance. Finding of this research has shown that

mentoring and psychological capital have positive correlation with work engagement of employees of Central public sector enterprises. In order to make the mentoring process more effective, a well robust policy on mentoring should be framed by CPSEs which can address all the issues pertaining to Mentor, mentee & their relationship. CPSEs can accrue benefits from mentoring scheme only when it is implemented effectively. Some of the suggestions to make mentoring a part of strategic function of the CPSEs are having Online Mentoring Forum, Orientation training for Mentors, Customized workshops for mentor & mentee etc. Since, Attrition rate in CPSEs is very low, hence, different needs of employees such as physical, intellectual and social required to be taken care of by the organisations in order to keep them committed and engaged towards their job. The study concludes that work engagement of employees in Central public sector enterprises can be increased by providing mentoring to employees and also by increasing their psychological capital.

### Implications

In terms of theoretical contribution, this study highlights the significance of Mentoring and Psychological Capital on Work engagement of employees in Central Public Sector enterprises. To the best of author's knowledge, no such study has been conducted in CPSEs to study the impact of mentoring and psychological Capital on Work engagement of employees. Results of this study indicate that Mentoring and psychological Capital have positive co-relation with Work engagement of employees of CPSEs. From a practical point of view, CPSEs need to develop and implement mentoring policy effectively keeping in view the benefits from mentoring program. In order to acquaint and equip the new inductees with the competencies for executing effective organisational processes, mentoring by senior and experienced shall form the integral element of professional development. This study can help Human resource practitioners in identifying various approaches in engaging employees of CPSEs.

### Limitations

The intricacies of mentoring and work engagement are

among the limitations of this study. It is improbable that mentoring alone will have an impact on engagement. This study was confined to investigating the correlation between three variables, namely mentoring, psychological capital, and work engagement. Mentoring, however, is unlikely to be the only variable impacting engagement. To broaden its scope, the study could be expanded to encompass employees working in other departments, as well as those working in private organizations. Further studies can also address other factors affecting work engagement like leadership of the organization, personal goals etc

### References

- Ashforth, B. E., Sluss, D. M., & Harrison, S. H. (2007). Socialization in organizational contexts. *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1–70). Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173–1182.
- Bauer, T. N., Bodner, T., Erdogan, B., Truxillo, D. M., & Tucker, J. S. (2007). Newcomer adjustment during organizational socialization: A meta-analytical review of antecedents, outcomes and methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 707–721.
- Bauer, T. N., & Elder, E. (2006). Onboarding newcomers into organizations. Presentation at the Society for Human Resource Management Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Bureau of Labour Statistics. (2010). Employee tenure in 2010. US Department of Labor USDL-10-1278.
- Bray, S. R., Brawley, L. R., & Carron, A. V. (2001). Efficacy for interdependent functions: Evidence from the sport domain. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Broadbridge, A. (1999). Mentoring in retailing: a tool for success? *Personnel Review*, 28(4), 336–355.
- Burke, R. J. (1984). Mentors in organizations. *Group and Organization Studies*, 9, 353–372.
- Campbell, J. P., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E. E., & Weick,

- K. E. (1970). *Managerial Job Satisfaction* 163 behavior, performance, and effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Carlson S. Dawn S. & Perrewé L Pamela (1999), “The Role of Social Support in the Stressor-Strain Relationship: An Examination of Work-Family Conflict”, *Journal of Management* August vol. 25 no. 4 513-540.
  - Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD). (2009). *Induction*. Retrieved June 16, 2009, from <http://www.cipd.co.uk/subjects/recruitment/induction/induction.htm>
  - Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD). (2011). *Resourcing and talent planning annual survey report 2011*. London, England: Author.
  - Cameron, K. S., & Spreitzer, G. M. (2012). *The Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
  - Champion, M. A., & Goldfinch, J. R. (1983). Mentoring among hospital administrators. *Hospital & Health Services Administration*, 28, 77–93.
  - Carver, C., Scheier, M., Miller, C., & Fulford, D. (2009). Optimism. In S. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of positive psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 303–312). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
  - Chalofsky, N. (2007). The seminal foundation of the discipline of HRD: People, learning, and organizations. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 18(3), 431–442.
  - Chao, G. T. (2009). Formal mentoring: Lessons learned from past practice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 40, 314–320.
  - Chao, G. T., Walz, P., & Gardner, P. D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with non-mentored counterparts. *Personnel Psychology*, 45, 619–636.