ACADEMIC JOURNALS
expand your knowledge

Educational Research and Reviews

Full Length Research Paper

The relationship between perceived manager support and work commitments of sports instructors

Nedim Malkoc[1]* and Suzan Dal[2]

[1]Exercise and Sports Department, Health Science University, Istanbul, Turkey.
[2]Sports Science Faculty, Istanbul Cerrahpasa University, Istanbul, Turkey.

The aim of this study is to investigate the perceived role of supervisor support in predicting the work engagement levels of instructors working in sports venues. Sample of this study consists of a total of 254 instructors, 88 males and 166 females, age ranged 22 to 63, and working in various sports venues. Personal information form, perceived supervisor support and work engagement scale applied to the individuals in the sample group. This study was designed based on the screening model. To compare variables in the data obtained from the questionnaires applied on trainers, percentage, frequency, correlation, regression, t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used. In accordance with the analysis result, supervisor support was found to be an effective factor on work engagement. The results of the research revealed that the perceived supervisor support decreased as the trainers' level of education increased. However, it has been found that female trainers benefit from supervisor support in the workplace more than men and focus more on their jobs.

Key words: Sports instructors, work engagement, sport venues, quantitative study.

INTRODUCTION

Work engagement

Due to global change especially in recent years in management mentality in behaviours in the organization, positive attitudes are in the forefront instead of negative emotions and behaviours and positive organizational behaviour have become more of an issue (Bostancı and Ekiyor, 2015). Managers, human resources specialist and academicians have been intensively focusing on the concept of "work engagement" and the details of the

concept in recent years. In this sense, all these specialists accept the basic claim that if the employees' commitment levels are high, productivity will increase, and costs will decrease (Seanberg et al., 2011).

Kahn (1990), one of the theorists who first introduced the concept of work engagement, defined the work engagement as the physical, cognitive and emotional complete commitment of the employees to their work. Work engagement reflects a positive mood characterized by the concepts of being alive, dedication and assimilation. Dedicated employees can be described as

highly motivated people who receive energy from their jobs and fully accomplish their work. Therefore, their work results in profitability, productivity and customer satisfaction (Seanberg et al., 2011). It is seen that the employees who are integrated to the work and devoted to the work perform better than others, are more prone to taking initiative, and have higher motivation to learn than others (Bostancı and Ekiyor, 2015).

Work engagement can lead to some negative consequences as well as many positive outcomes mentioned earlier. According to Glassdoor (2016)'s study, 53% of employees who are committed to work are confident that they will find a similar position within six months if they lose their job. Despite the undesirable consequences of self-confidence of organizational commitment, the organization should work to nurture and develop a commitment that requires a two-way relationship between the employer and the employee (Sridevi, 2010). When employees are engaged to their tasks, they individually find their work meaningful, they think that the hard work required by the job can be overcome more easily and they are hopeful about the future of their work.

Supervisor support

With the understanding of the importance of organizational support, studies have begun to deal with the sub-elements of organizational support. In this context, the importance of supervisor support has been examined in many studies. Eisenberger et al. (2001) stated that employees expect their supervisor to support themselves. Supervisor support is defined as the importance of the supervisor's attention to the ideas of the employees, sincerity about their happiness, and the thinking of the goals and values of the employees (Rhoades et al., 2001).

According to Guchait et al. (2014), perceived supervisor support includes coaching, guiding each member with individual attention, helping subordinates to fulfil their job responsibilities, and evaluating performance.

Eisenberger et al. (2016) found a significant difference in their study from the studies concluded that supervisor support leads to positive organizational management results in doctrine. In this study, they made concrete suggestions about how to provide supervisor support. In doctrine, this is an important deficit. It has been an important resource for supervisors and human resources specialists in this sense. Suggestions include:

(1) Do not just do the things you have to do. Carry out workforce activities at the discretion of employees. What should already be in a business will not be perceived as administrative support. An example of this is the employee going to a training that the sector does not have to send.
(2) Be fair and righteous in implementing, monitoring and realizing executive activities.
(3) Set achievable goals and reward in proportion.
(4) Provide individualized benefits to employees instead of generalized benefits.
(5) Before being supportive to subordinate supervisors thus they become supportive to your employees.
(6) Train subordinate supervisors to be supportive of your employees.
(7) Create a strong social relations network.
(8) Start organizational support before employment starts.

Negative organizational behavior attitudes arise in employees who are not supported by their supervisor (Ng and Feldman, 2012; Fakunmoju et al., 2010). Positive organizational behaviors consist in employees receiving supervisor support (Turgut, 2011; Goh et al., 2015; Stinglhamber and Vandenberghe, 2003).

The relationship between work engagement and supervisor support

It is thought that supervisor support will contribute positively to many organizational management and governance as it substantially affects the organizational culture (İnce, 2016; Turgut, 2011). As employees' perceptions of organizational support increased, their engagement levels increased evenly. Organizational support was partially mediated by supervisor support (Woerkom et al, 2016). It has been reached as a result of researches that work engagement is strongly connected with organizations based on financial results such as productivity, profitability and customer satisfaction (Sorenson, 2013). It has been reached that the positive results that will arise from the work engagement can be provided with the support of supervisor (İnce, 2016).

In the study conducted by Latif and Gülzar (2011); they found that executive support and organizational support had a strong impact on organizational commitment. One of the conclusions reached in their studies is very important on behalf of this study. According to this result supervisor support is more effective than organizational support for organizational commitment. Supervisor support acts as an intermediary between organizational support and organizational commitment.

In a similar study, they stated that autonomy in the workplace, the relationship between the employees and the positive relationship with the supervisor are important in the continuation of the commitment to the work (Albrecht, 2010; Gagné and Bhave, 2011; Chirkov, 2011). In the study of Görgülü et al. (2019) on football referees, it was concluded that manager support and organizational commitment had a positive and significant effect. In the literature, it is expected that this study will

contribute to the field due to the limited work in the field of sports related to executive support and dedication to work.

METHODOLOGY

Research design

This study was designed based on the screening model. The screening model is a study approach that aims to describe a past or previous event exactly the way in which it happened (Karasar, 1999).

Population and sample

The working universe of the study consists of 310 trainers working in Kocaeli province in Turkey. The sample group of the research consists of a total of 254 instructors between the ages of 22 and 63, 166 women and 88 men. The data were collected by simple random sampling method.

Data collection tools

In this study which is quantitative study, perceived supervisor support and work engagement scales were used.

Personal information form

In order to learn the demographic information of the instructors questions related to age, gender, marital status, and educational status are asked in this form.

Perceived supervisor support

The scale used in the study was developed and the reliability and validity of the scale is also done by Şahin and Giray (2012). The scale is 11 items with a 5-point Likert type (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree). The Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale is 0.94.

Work engagement scale

In order to measure the work engagement, the scale is developed by Schaufeli et al. (2002) and the validity and reliability study of the Turkish version was conducted by Turgut (2011). The scale consists of 17 questions and three sub-dimensions (Vigour, Dedication, Absorption). The internal consistency level of the scale obtained from the research sample for the Turkish version was 89, indicating that the scale had a high reliability.

Statistical analysis

Statistical software (IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 IBM, USA) is used for analysis. Percentage, frequency, correlation, regression, t-test and ANOVA tests were used to compare the variables. The data were evaluated based on the total scores of the participants' answers to each question and statistical significance accepted at the $p \leq 0.05$ level.

Sampling adequacy and Barlett Sphericity tests were performed for the Perceived Supervisor Support Scale used in the study.

According to the results of the test Keiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sampling adequacy coefficient 0.936, and Bartlett Sphericity test was found to be χ^2 = 2299.141 at 55 degrees of freedom (p < 0.01). For the Work Engagement Scale, Keiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sampling adequacy coefficient was 0.921, and Bartlett Sphericity test was found to be χ^2 = 2906.791 at 120 degrees of freedom (p <0.01).

Internal consistency Cronbach alpha coefficient value of Perceived Supervisor Support scale is 0.950; and The Cronbach's alpha value of Work Engagement Scale is found to be 0.939.

FINDINGS

As a result of this study, demographic information is shown in Table 1. According to this, 65.4% of the participants were female and 34.6% were male. The average age was between 31 and 40 and the education level was concentrated at bachelor's level. 46.5% of the participants were married and 53.5% are single.

Independent sample t-test was used to determine the differences between the subscales and total scores of Work Engagement Scale and the Supervisor Support Scale. As a result of the analyses, it was determined that Work Engagement Scale sub-dimensions, the Vigor scores of the Women (Mean= 4.10) were significantly higher than the scores of men (Mean = 3.84) [t (252) = 2.707, p <.01]. In addition, it was found that the absorption points of women (Mean= 4.07) were significantly higher than men (Mean = 3.57) [t (252) = 4.694, p <0.01]. The dedication scores of women (Mean = 4.48) were significantly higher than those of men (Mean = 4.14) [t (252) = 3.699, p < 0.01]. The total engagement scores of women (Mean = 4.21) were also significantly higher than that of men (Mean = 3.85) [t (252) = 4.239, p < 0.01].

When the data in Table 2 are analyzed in general, it can be stated that the total scores of women in the Study Participation Scale and Supervisor Support Scale are higher than men. According to these findings, it can be said that they benefit more from Supervisor Support in their workplace and focus on their work better.

One-way ANOVA was used to determine the differences of Supervisor Support Scale and Work Engagement Scale subscale and total scores according to age. In the analyses, no significant difference was found in the scores of the Supervisor Support Scale and Work Engagement Scale subscales (Table 3).

One-way ANOVA was used to determine the differences between the subscales and total scores of the Work Engagement Scale and Supervisor Support Scale applied in the study. In the analyses, it was determined that the scores of the Supervisor Support Scale differed significantly between the groups [F (250, 3) = 2.777, p < 0.05]. After the post-hoc analysis (LSD), the scores of high school graduates (x = 4.18) was found to be significantly higher than the scores of the bachelor graduate students (x = 3.71) and the scores of the master graduate students (x =3.65) (Table 4).

Table 1. Participant demographic profile.

Profile		Number	Percentage
Gender	Female	166	65.4
	Male	88	34.6
	Total	254	100.0
Marital Status	Married	118	46.5
	Single	136	53.5
	Total	254	100.0
Educational status	High School	29	11.4
	Associate Level	19	7.5
	Bachelor's level	152	59.8
	Master Level	54	21.3
	Total	254	100.0
Age	≤ 30	130	51.2
	31-40	75	29.5
	≥ 41	49	19.3
	Total	254	100.0

Table 2. Differences of supervisor support scale and work engagement scale subscale and total scores according to gender.

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	SS	t (p)
Supervisor support	Female	166	3.7957	0.85488	0.776 (0.438)
	Male	88	3.7066	0.90035	
Vigor	Female	166	4.1024	0.76093	2.707 (**0.007**)
	Male	88	3.8409	0.67566	
Absorption	Female	166	4.0711	0.80393	4.694 (**0.000**)
	Male	88	3.5750	0.79701	
Dedication	Female	166	4.4855	0.64284	3.699 (**0.000**)
	Male	88	4.1455	0.79001	
Engagement (Total)	Female	166	4.2197	0.65368	4.239 (**0.000**)
	Male	88	3.8538	0.65630	

It was determined that the Work Engagement Scale subscales Vigour scores differed significantly between the groups [$F_{(250, 3)}$ = 4.957, $p < 0.01$]. After the Post-Hoc analysis (LSD), the scores of the master graduate students (x = 3.69) was found to be significantly lower than the scores of the high school graduates (x = 4.14), and also the scores of the associate graduates (x = 4.27) was found to be significantly lower than the scores of the undergraduate (x = 4.06).

It was determined that the Work Engagement Scale subscales dedication scores differed significantly between the groups [$F_{(250, 3)}$=3.335, $p<0.05$]. After the Post-Hoc analysis (LSD), the scores of the master graduate students (x = 4.10) was found to be significantly lower than the scores of the high school graduates (x = 4.50) and the scores of the bachelor graduates (x = 4.44).

It was also found that the total scores of the Work Engagement scale differed significantly between the groups [$F_{(250, 3)}$ = 3.098, $p < 0.05$]. After the Post-Hoc analysis (LSD), the scores of the master graduate

Table 3. Differences of Supervisor Support Scale and Work Engagement Scale subscale and total scores according to age.

Variable	Age	N	Mean	SS	F (p)
Supervisor support	≤30	130	3.7483	0.81284	
	31-40	75	3.7079	0.99185	0.740 (0.478)
	≥41	49	3.8961	0.82175	
Vigour	≤30	130	3.9654	0.78248	
	31-40	75	4.0911	0.71202	0.682 (0.507)
	≥41	49	4.0136	0.67601	
Absorption	≤30	130	3.8754	0.91339	
	31-40	75	3.9253	0.81059	0.108 (0.898)
	≥41	49	3.9224	0.64007	
Dedication	≤30	130	4.3877	0.72422	
	31-40	75	4.3867	0.74568	0.398 (0.672)
	≥41	49	4.2857	0.64420	
Engagement (Total)	≤30	130	4.0762	0.70549	
	31-40	75	4.1344	0.68432	0.199 (0.821)
	≥41	49	4.0739	0.58871	

Table 4. The difterince between the supervisor support scale and work engagement scale subscale according to educational status Post-Hoc analysis (LSD).

Variable	Education	N	Mean	SS	F (p)	Difference (LSD)
Supervisor Support	High School [1]	29	4.18	0.74410		
	Associate Level [2]	19	3.79	1.02397	2.777 (0.042)	1>3,
	Bachelor's level [3]	152	3.71	0.80906		1>4
	Master Level [4]	54	3.65	0.99215		
Vigour	High School [1]	29	4.14	0.61838		
	Associate Level [2]	19	4.27	0.78609	4.957 (0.002)	4<1, 4<2,
	Bachelor's level [3]	152	4.06	0.73800		4<3
	Master Level [4]	54	3.69	0.71771		
Absorption	High School	29	3.80	0.75873		
	Associate Level	19	4.03	0.81721	0.832 (0.477)	-
	Bachelor's level	152	3.94	0.89389		
	Master Level	54	3.77	0.69396		
Dedication	High School [1]	29	4.37	0.61955		
	Associate Level [2]	19	4.50	0.81478	3.335 (0.020)	4<2,
	Bachelor's level [3]	152	4.44	0.69459		4<3
	Master Level [4]	54	4.10	0.73484		
Engagement (Total)	High School [1]	29	4.11	0.60234		
	Associate Level [2]	19	4.26	0.76699	3.098 (0.027)	4<2,
	Bachelor's level [3]	152	4.151	0.68986		4<3
	Master Level [4]	54	3.8564	0.59751		

students (x = 3.85) was found to be significantly lower than the scores of the high school graduates (x = 4.26) and the bachelor graduates (x = 4.15).

According to these data, high school graduate participants can be said to get higher scores from Supervisor Support Scale than others. However, it can be stated that master graduate students have lower scores on the Work Participation Scale and the Job Participation Scale than others.

Pearson correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between the scores of the Supervisor Support Scale and the Work Engagement scale subscale. According to the analysis results, Supervisor Support scores was found to be positively correlated with Work Engagement scale subscale Vigour scores (r = 0.531, p < 0.01), absorption scores (r = 0.265, p < 0.01), dedication scores (r = 0.438, p < 0.01) and total engagement scores (r = 0.457, p < 0.01) (Table 5).

In order to examine whether the scores of the Supervisor Support Scale applied in the study predicted the total scores of the work engagement scale, the total score of work engagement scale was determined as the dependent variable and the scores of the Supervisor Support Scale were determined as independent variable and standard multiple regression analysis was applied to them. The simple linear regression model in which all independent variables are included in the equation together; it was determined that total engagement scores significantly predicted [$F_{(1, 252)}$ = 66.618, p < 0.01]. The model explains 20% of the variance in total engagement scores (R^2 = 0.209). When the standardized regression coefficients were examined, it was found that the scores of the Supervisor Support positively predicted the total engagement scores (β = 0.273, p < 0.01) (Table 6).

DISCUSSION

In this study, the effect of perceived executive support on commitment was investigated. The results obtained within the scope of the analyses conducted in the research are given subsequently.

As a result of the analyses, no statistically significant difference was found between the participants' supervisor support and total engagement scores according to gender (p = 0.438). As a result of the study conducted by Meriç et al. (2019) on teachers' organizational support, including supervisor support, it was concluded that male teachers perceived more organizational support than female teachers. This result is thought to be related to the same gender of the supervisor in the work environment. In the result of the work engagement, it was found that female employees have higher scores than male employees in the sub-scale of vigor, absorption, and dedication and total engagement. In a study conducted by Gulzar and Rafiq (2018) on academic staff, it was concluded that female academic staff were more likely to

engage in work than male academic staff. Banihani et al. (2013) concluded that work engagement differed by gender, and that men were more likely to engage in work than women. However, some studies in the literature say that work engagement does not differ in terms of gender. In another study, Reissová et al. (2017) concluded that work engagement was similar in both gender. As a result of the study conducted by Bostancı and Ekiyor (2015), it was found that gender was not a significant variable in work engagement. Mulaudzi and Takawira (2015) concluded that gender did not influence work engagement.

In line with these results, it can be stated that the effect of perceived manager support on employees' job loyalty does not vary much by gender. In addition, it can be said that the women participating in this research are trying to contribute more to the institution by working more selflessly and enthusiastically than men.

There were no significant differences between the participants' Supervisor Support and work engagement subscales and total engagement scores according to age. Similarly, Bostancı and Ekiyor (2015) concluded that age is not an important factor affecting work engagement. In a study conducted by Zincirkıran et al. (2016), it was concluded that young instructors had less perceptions of supervisor support than older Instructors.

There were no significant differences between the instructors' supervisor support and work engagement subscales and total engagement scores according to education status. It has been determined that instructors with a high school degree are more affected by supervisor support than instructors with bachelor and master degree. From this point of view, it can be stated that participants who receive high school degree need more supervisor support than participants with higher education status. In other words, as the level of education of the participants increases, their need for supervisor support decreases. It was concluded in previous studies that the perception of supervisor support did not change according to the level of education (Aksoy, 2017; Zincirkıran, 2016).

It was determined that the vigour subscale scores of the individuals who have postgraduate education are lower than those who have high school, associate and bachelor education. The total score of engagement and dedication subscale was found to be lower for those with postgraduate education than individuals with high school and bachelor education. Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) reached conclusions that as the level of education increases, the work engagement decreases which supports the findings of this study. Similarly, Güner's (2006) study on teachers found that the higher the level of education is associated with higher engagement to work. In some studies (Bostancı and Ekiyor, 2015; Meriç et al., 2018), it has been concluded that education is not effective in work engagement.

As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the

Table 5. Pearson correlation analysis of the supervisor support scale and commitment scale subscale scores with each other.

Variable	Supervisor support	Vigour	Absorption	Dedication	Engagement (Total)
Supervisor support	1				
Vigour	0.531*	1			
Absorption	0.265*	0.637*	1		
Dedication	0.438*	0.750*	0.651*	1	
Engagement (Total)	0.457*	0.892*	0.873*	0.894*	1

*$p<.01$, N: 254, r: Pearson correlation coefficient.

Table 6. Regression analysis of the subscale scores of the Work Engagement Scale and Supervisor Support Scale.

Variable	B	β	t	p
Constant	27.755	0.168	16.380	0.000
Supervisor support	0.289	0.273	8.162	0.000

$R=0.457$, $R^2=0.209$, $R^2_{adj}=0.206$, $F(1.252)=66.618$, $p<0.01$. Dependent Variable: Engagement (Total).

correlation coefficient showing the power (degree) of the relationship between the binary variables was significant. In other words, it was concluded that there was a high, positively correlation between variables. In the analysis conducted to examine the effect of concepts on each other, regression analysis showed that supervisor support had a statistically significant effect on work engagement. From these results, it was concluded that supervisor support has an effect on work engagement.

In this study, it is revealed that the instructors who receive supervisor support will increase their work engagement. When similar studies are examined, literatures on the sports are very limited. In a study conducted by Gorgulu et al. (2019) on football referees, they found that supervisor support, especially in upper leagues, positively and significantly affected organizational commitment. In a study conducted by İnce (2016) on garment industry workers, organizational support was found to be an effective factor on work engagement and supervisor support. Similarly, Burns's (2016) study on Southern California healthcare company found that organizational support is decisive on work engagement. Meriç et al. (2019) found a positive relationship between the perceived organizational support of teachers and their work engagement. As in other studies conducted on a similar subject, it was concluded in this study conducted on instructors of sports venues, that perceived supervisor support had a positive effect on work engagement.

Based on the research results reached, the suggestions presented can be listed as follows:

(1) Various strategies need to be developed in institutions to increase their job satisfaction and motivation in order to increase the job relations of instructors.
(2) Supervisor support should be provided to the instructors at regular intervals in order to improve their work-life balance.
(3) Various in-service training activities should be organized in order to increase the professional competence of instructors, thus improving the quality of the training provided at the institution.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

Aksoy C (2017). Çalışanlarda Adalet Ve Yönetici Desteği Algısının Güven Oluşumundaki Rolü: Havacılık Sektöründe Bir Uygulama. Journal of Aviation Cilt:1, Sayı:1.

Albrecht SL (2010). Handbook of Employee Engagement: Perspectives, Issues, Research, and Practice. Edward Elgar Publishing, Northampton, MA. 28.

Banihani M, Lewis P, Syed J (2013). Is work engagement gendered? Gender in Management: An International Journal 28(7): 400-423.

Bostancı H, Ekiyor A (2015). Çalışanların işe adanmasının örgüt içi girişimciliğe etkisinin incelenmesi: Sağlık sektöründe bir uygulama. Uluslararası Sağlık Yönetimi ve Stratejileri Araştırma Dergisi 1(1):37-51.

Burns KL (2016). Perceived Organizational Support and Perceived Supervisor Support as Antecedents of Work Engagement. Master's Theses, San Jose University.

Chirkov VI (2011). Dialectical relationships among human autonomy, the brain, and culture. In Human autonomy in cross-cultural context (pp. 65-91). Springer, Dordrecht.

Eisenberger R, Armeli S, Rexwinkel B, Lynch PD, Rhoades L (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology 86(1):42-56.

Eisenberger R, Glenn P, Malone D, Presson WD (2016). Optimizing Perceived Organizational Support to Enhance Employee Engagement. SHRM-SIOP Science of HR Series.

Fakunmoju S, Woodruff K, Kim HH, LeFevre A, Hong M (2010). Intention to leave a job: The role of individual factors, job tension, and supervisory support. Administration in Social Work 34(4):313-328.

Gagné M, Bhave D (2011). Autonomy in the workplace: An essential ingredient to employee engagement and well-being in every culture. In Human autonomy in cross-cultural context (pp. 163-187).

Glassdoor (2016). https://www.engagementmultiplier.com/blog/why-is-employee-engagement-so-important/ (Çevirimiçi) 18.7.2019.

Goh Z, Ilies R, Wilson KS (2015). Supportive Supervisors Improve Employees'Daily Lives: The Role Supervisors Play in the Impact of Daily Workload on Life Satisfaction via Work-Family Conflict. Journal of Vocational Behavior, pp. 1-27.

Gorgulu R, Adilogullari I, Ulucan H (2019). The Effect of Perceived Managerial Support of Coaches' Organizational Commitment in Professional Football. Journal of Education and Training Studies 7:3.

Guchait P, Paşamehmetoğlu A, Dawson M (2014). Perceived supervisor and co-worker support for error management: Impact on perceived psychological safety and service recovery performance. International Journal of Hospitality Management 41: 28-37.

Gulzar S, Rafiq M (2018). Gender and Work Engagement: A Study of Academic Staff in Higher Education. Arabian Journal of Business and bar A Management Review 8:2.

Güner H (2006). Öğretmenlerin adanmışlık sorunu: İstanbul ili örneğinde bir çalışma. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Marmara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

İnce AR (2016). Algılanan Örgütsel Desteğin İşe Adanmışlık Üzerindeki Etkisinde Yönetici Desteğinin Aracılık Rolü, Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi 15(57): 649-660.

Kahn WA (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of Management Journal 33:692-724.

Karasar N (1999). Scientific research methods - Concepts, principles, and techniques. Ankara, Turkey: Nobel.

Latif S, Gulzar A (2011). The Impact Of Organizational And Supervisory Support On Survivors 'Organizational Commitment After Downsizing In Telecom Sector Of Pakistan. International Journal of Economics and Management Sciences 1(5): 55-61.

Meriç E, Çiftci DÖ, Yurtal F (2019). Analysis of the Relationship Between Perceived Organizational Support and Work Engagement. Kastamonu Education Journal 27(1):65-74.

Mulaudzi MC, Takawira N (2015). Examining The Gender Influence On Employees' Work Engagement Within A South African University, Risk Governance and Control: Financial Markets and Institutions 5(2-1):110-119.

Reissová A, Šimsová J, Hášová K (2017). Gender Differences in Employee Engagement. Littera Scripta 10:2.

Rhoades L, Eisenberger R, Armeli S (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology 86(5):825- 836.

Rhoades L, Eisenberger R (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literatüre. Journal of Applied Psychology 87(4):698-714.

Schaufeli WB, Salanova M, González-Romá V, Bakker AB (2002). The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: A Two Sample Confirmatory Factor Analytic Approach. Journal of Happiness Studies 3:71-92.

Seanberg JE, Mckechnie SP, Ojla MU, James JBS (2011). Control supervisor support and work engagement: A winning combination for workers in hourly jobs. Journal of Vocational Behavior 79:613-624.

Sridevi MS (2010). Employee Engagement: The Key to Improving Performance. International Journal of Business and Management 5(12):90.

Sorenson S (2013). How employee engagement drives growth. Gallup Business Journal 1:1-4.

Stinglhamber F, Vandenberghe C (2003). Organizations and Supervisors as Sources of Support and Targets of Commitment: A Longitudinal Study. Journal of Organizational Behavior 24:251-270.

Turgut T (2011). Çalışmaya Tutkunluk: İş Yükü, Esnek Çalışma Saatleri, Yönetici Desteği ve İş- Aile Çatışması ile İlişkileri. Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi 25(3-4):155-179.

Woerkom V, Bakker MAB, Nishii LH (2016). Accumulative job demands and support for strength use: Fine-tuning the job demands-resources model using conservation of resources theory. Journal of Applied Psychology 101(1):141.

Zincirkıran M, Yalçınsoy A, Işık M (2016). Conference: 2nd International Congress on Economics and Business 2016, At Sarejova / Bosnia and Herzegovina.