

PRAGMATIC IMPACT OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT ON JOB PERFORMANCE

Hazrat Bilal and Bahadar Shah

Department of Management Sciences. Hazara University, Mansehra

Email: bilalhazrat@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT: *The study's main purpose was to examine the association between Employee Engagement (EE) and Job Performance (JP) among private university faculty. To investigate influence of EE on JP, Pearson Correlation and Regression analysis were used. Data was acquired from a participant pool of 230 participants via questionnaire distribution. Employee engagement was assessed using the adapted UWES -17 scale, while job performance was assessed using the Goodman and Svyantek Scale. The cross-sectional study yielded results that supported a positive connection between EE and JP. This study is significant because it adds to the existing body of literature, particularly in the setting of private universities, where this is the first study being conducted.*

Keywords: Employee Engagement, Job Performance, Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, UWES

INTRODUCTION

Employee engagement was studied from many perspectives. According to [1] engagement is an enthusiasm, [2] associate it with the personal energy engaged in work, [3] considers it a psychological predisposition for organizational success, and [4] describes it as the cognitive, emotional as well as physical connection to work. The traits, behaviors, and environmental factors all donate to multidimensional nature of engagement [5]. The employees that are engaged demonstrate dedication as well as enthusiasm, which leads to proactive job execution [6]. Engagement is linked to creativity and problem-solving abilities, which thus improves overall performance [7-1].

Conversely, understanding how employees' engagement and job performance interaction is critical for the organizational effectiveness. It is consistent with Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory, which serves as foundation for understanding the relationship between EE and JP. According to the COR, individuals try to collect, safeguard, and build their resources, including psychological, social, and material resources, in order to sustain well-being and reduce stress [8].

The engagement-related behaviors, such as dedication, vigor, and absorption, match with the idea of individuals acquiring and investing psychological resources in work. Employees who are engaged in their jobs have good emotional ties to their jobs, which can be considered as a manner of conserving and improving their psychological resources. This enhanced engagement leads to higher commitment, proactive behavior, and, eventually, improved job performance that is compatible with the COR Theory concepts. As a result, conservation of resources theory provides appropriate theoretical framework for understanding the relationship between EE and JP. Hence, we hypothesize that EE has a significant positive impact upon job performance.

Literature Review

Employee engagement was conceptualized by using a variety of the interpretive frameworks. [1] emphasize it as aspects of enthusiasm, satisfaction, and eagerness in relation to work involvement, whereas [2] establish link between engagement and psychological state defined by an individual's investment of personal energy into professional behaviors. According to [9] engagement is a psychological predisposition within the work context that contributes considerably to achievement of organizational goals. On the other hand [4] defines employee engagement as cognitive, emotional and physical link formed between the individual and their work position. This leads to

multifaceted nature of EE, which includes self-motivation, commitment, and a sense of responsibility, all of which serve to drive both individual and organizational performance [10-11]. This complex construct combines various dimensions, such as inherent traits, temporal states, observable behaviors, contextual elements, and organizational factors, all of which contribute to a comprehensive understanding of both the state and behavioral aspects of engagement [9, 5-12]. Employee engagement is self-motivation, commitment and concern that drives individual and organizational performance [13-4].

This complex construct includes traits, states, behaviors, work contexts, and organizational elements that contribute to state and behavioral engagement [5-12]; which manifests in cognitive, emotional as well as behavioral states that foster the innovative and adaptive performance for organizational change [15, 16] instead, the contrast employee engagement with burnout, representing positive and negative dimensions on the shared continuum, while [17, 18] emphasis upon its positive

to spend energy into work, and a conscientious attitude [2]. Dedication is characterized by a sense of the purpose, loyalty, excitement, fervor, intrinsic motivation, personal investment, and a readiness to interact with the problems inherent in the fulfillment of assigned work [2]. Absorption is characterized by focused attention, sustained concentration, and a sensation of immersion and engrossment, all of which lead to condition of being engaged in one's professional pursuits. It engenders a perceptual distortion of time wherein the passage thereof is swift, accompanied by psychological detachment from task [18].

Finally, employee engagement is a multidimensional concept with roots in the psychology and organizational behavior. The scholars have studied it from a variety of perspectives, emphasizing its link toward the job satisfaction, commitment, and organizational performance. The research studies of the engagement's historical, psychological, as well as behavioral elements provide full knowledge of its importance in today's workplaces.

Job Performance

Job performance is critical for organizational success because it includes individual behaviors that drive goal attainment, task and contextual characteristics [19-20]. It is influenced by factors such as employment experience's relationship with task performance and personality alignment with contextual performance [21-22]. The natural qualities, learned skills, and

motivation all play a role [13]. Historically, from the results focused toward behavior-integrated, early definitions by [23] equated performance with outcomes, while [24] linked it with behaviors aligned to goals. The many definitions of the job performance range from individual outcomes [25] towards documented results [26].

[27] addressed job performance through the behavioral and outcome-oriented lenses. The goal-oriented driver of the job performance is behavior, which includes customer relations, education, and other activities [27]. The job performance is influenced by task as well as contextual behaviors [25], with contextual performance being critical [28]. Previously, task-related behaviors dominated the job performance perspective; however, its multidimensional nature has been emphasized, incorporating skills, motivation, knowledge and encompasses behaviors required for the organizational function [29]. [30] added elements like task, contextual performance behavior, resulting in a full understanding of job performance's critical role in organizational effectiveness.

[31] investigated intricacies of task performance, revealing its varied features. Task performance, important part of job performance, comprises functioning sure job-related activities with precision and efficiency. It includes key responsibilities associated with role that contribute directly to organizational goals. Their study emphasizes the complex character of task performance, which includes technical skills and knowledge. Proficient task performers adeptly handle challenges, meet deadlines, and yield high-quality outcomes.

Besides, task performance extends beyond individual duties, involving effective collaboration within teams. Proficient task performers exhibit communication skills, cooperation, and a readiness to contribute to group endeavors, thereby enhancing team efficiency and effectiveness. [31] study underscores task performance's importance as a foundational component of the overall job performance, offering the insights into how the employees' competencies and execution of the core duties significantly influence organizational success.

[31] investigated contextual performance in depth, signifying its dimensions and value. The contextual performance refers to employee acts that go beyond official job requirements, considerably improving overall organizational functioning. The study emphasizes behaviors such as supporting colleagues, providing support, and actively participating in organizational efforts, all of which contribute to building a healthy work environment through collaboration. Contextual performance includes activities that demonstrate employee's dedication to the organization's success, such as volunteering for extra duties, proactive problem solving. These behaviors increase adaptability and efficacy, resulting in favorable environment for the employees and the organization. Overall, Goodman and Svyantek's research climax's important role of contextual performance in the organizational success and fostering the collaborative work environment.

Relationship between employee engagement and job performance

The relationship between the employee engagement and job performance is of great interest in organizational psychology, human resource management, and other related subjects. The employee engagement displays an employee's enthusiasm, vigor, and absorption for their work and the organization. Job performance, on other hand, measures how well employees carry out their assigned jobs. According to research, there is a positive relationship between both characteristics, as engaged individuals demonstrate increased dedication and enthusiasm, leading in proactive task execution.

Their dedication results in extra effort, which improves job performance quality, productivity and efficiency [6]. Besides, engaged employees have higher levels of creativity, problem-solving ability, and invention, which improves overall task performance and the organizational efficacy. Their emotional connection promotes sense of ownership, which is especially noticeable in people who view their work to be important and connected with personal values, reinforcing engagement and subsequent job performance [32-2].

It is critical to understand that relationship between employee engagement and job performance is not one-sided. While, the engagement often has a favorable impact on performance, the opposite is also true. Job performance can boost engagement by providing the positive feedback, recognition, and intrinsic enjoyment from successes [1]. Briefly, literature repeatedly demonstrates mutually reinforcing affiliation amid employee engagement and job performance. The engaged employees demonstrate more dedication, enthusiasm, and discretionary effort, resulting in improved task & contextual performance. This virtuous loop of the engagement and performance has values for organizational success, as it promotes innovation, productivity, and harmonious work environment

Methodology

Self-administered questionnaires were used in order to collect data from a sample of 230 teaching faculty members engaged at different levels in the private sector universities in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. UWES - 17-item scale of W. B. [18] was adapted to assess EE, only if strong internal consistency with Cronbach Alpha score of 0.861. Contextual performance was assessed by using [31] measure, which included 16 items and demonstrated high internal reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.829.

Analysis

To examine the hypothesis suggesting a positive relationship between engagement and performance, Pearson Correlation and Regression analyses were used. Outcomes of correlation analysis, as presented in Table 1, indicate notably substantial and the positive association ($p < 0.01$, $r = 0.607$) between the engagement and performance. This outcome provides the substantial support for the hypothesis

Table 1: Correlation Analysis

Correlations		EE	JP
EE	Pearson Correlation	1	.607**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	230	230

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As researcher used a single continuous independent variable, a simple regression analysis was performed to support the positive connection between EE and JP. ANOVA test results of simple regression determined significance $F=133.459$ at $p < 0.05$ for connection between EE and JP, which is shown in Table 2. Thus, findings support the hypothesis by revealing that EE scores significantly predict JP.

Table 2: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	28.176	1	28.176	133.459	.000 ^b
	Residual	48.347	229	.211		
	Total	76.523	230			

a. Dependent Variable: JP

b. Predictors: (Constant), EE

It is the slope and intercept values related towards employee engagement which reveal the robustness of this relationship. As shown in Table 3, the constant value of 1.19 coupled with the slope of 0.656 in the EE regression line indicates that a

single unit increase in employee engagement can be expected to lead to a 0.656 unit increase in employee performance.

Table 3: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.190	.229		5.191	.000
	EE	.656	.057	.607	11.552	.000

a. Dependent Variable: JP

The R^2 value of 0.365 indicates that employee engagement scores make up 36.5% of the variability in job performance. Table 4 gives the results.

Table 4. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.607 ^a	.368	.365	.45948

a. Predictors: (Constant), EE

DISCUSSION

The present research endeavor has undertaken comprehensive exploration of the intricate interconnections existing between EE and JP. The findings arising from this study accentuate a notably robust and positive association between constructs of EE and JP. This observation finds resonance in the recent scholarly investigations. For instance, [7] conducted a study examining the connection between weekly engagement and performance among the teachers and identified positive bond between EE and JP. Similarly, [33] investigated mediating role of learning goal orientation in the relationship between engagement and performance, substantiating a positive association amid EE and JP. Furthermore, the reaffirmation of this constructive and significant relationship between EE and JP is evident in the studies conducted by [6], [34], [35] and [36]. Notably, the current study establishes the predictive nature of EE with regard to JP.

The further validation of this relationship finds support in the inclusive meta-analysis undertaken by [37], systematically substantiates the positive connection between EE and JP. It is important to emphasize that the augmentation of engagement levels entails allocation of dedication, vigor and absorption to job-related responsibilities, thus exerting discernible impact on JP. This proposition is highlighted not only by [7] but also by scholarly insights provided by [38].

Implication of the study

The implications of study are significant for policymakers as well as universities. The findings emphasis the relevance of increasing employee engagement as a strategy of improving job performance within organizations for policymakers. Thus, recognizing the beneficial association between the employee engagement and job performance, policymakers should put in place initiatives that encourage supportive work environment, opportunities for skill growth, and channels for employee appreciation. This, in turn, results in enhanced productivity, better results, and organizational success.

Future Research Recommendations

Building on insights gained from this study, future research endeavors can further contribute to the understanding of the complex relationship between employee engagement and job performance. Exploring moderating factors that influence this relationship, such as organizational culture, leadership styles, as well as job characteristics, could provide a more nuanced perspective. Longitudinal studies tracking the development of engagement and its impact on performance over time could yield valuable insights into causal direction of relationship. Additionally, investigating the role of the different types of engagement (e.g., affective, cognitive, behavioral) and their distinct effects on the various dimensions of job performance could provide a deeper understanding of the mechanisms at play.

The study's findings underscore importance of incorporating employee engagement efforts within educational programs for institutions. The universities can prepare students with the skills and mentality required for the success in their future employment by emphasizing the link between engagement and job performance. Incorporating engagement-promoting features, such as interactive learning, collaborative projects, and mentorship opportunities, can help students become more involved, productive professionals. In addition, universities can use similar tactics to engage their own faculty and staff in order to foster good work environment that supports teaching, research, and overall institutional excellence.

Limitations

Despite the fact that this study offers important information, several limitations should be acknowledged. For example, the cross-sectional character of study precludes the development of causal associations between employee engagement and job performance. Longitudinal research strategies that examine changes in the engagement and performance over time could solve this problem. Second, relying on the self-reported data collected via questionnaires may introduce common method bias and social desirability bias, potentially altering the observed associations. To reduce these biases, future studies could incorporate objective performance measurements and multi-source data collection approaches. Besides, the study's focus on certain businesses or situations may limit the study's generalizability to other sectors. Future research should look into different organizational settings to improve the external validity of the findings. Finally, the study makes no mention of any likely boundary conditions/individual characteristics that could modify the association between engagement and performance. Investigating these variables may provide a more complete picture of the intricacies underlying this relationship.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study sheds light on the subtle interplay between employee engagement (EE) and job performance (JP), indicating a strong positive association between the two categories. Study supports previous studies by demonstrating the predictive potential of EE for JP. The study emphasizes the importance of engagement's impact on job performance, emphasizing importance of allocating dedication, vigor, and absorption as vital components. The study adds to considerate of how employees' engagement influences job performance by emphasizing their interdependence and implications for organizational success.

REFERENCE

- Harter, JK, Schmidt, FL & Hayes, TL. Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*. 2002: 87(2), 268.
- Schaufeli, WB, Bakker, AB. Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*. 2010: 12, 10-24.
- Albrecht, SL. Employee engagement: 10 key questions for research and practice. 2010.
- Kahn, WA. Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of management journal*. 1990: 33(4), 692-724.
- Macey, WH, Schneider, B. The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and organizational Psychology*. 2008: 1(1), 3-30.
- Rich, BL, Lepine, JA, Crawford, ER. Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of management journal*. 2010: 53(3), 617-635.
- Bakker, AB, Bal, MP. Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*. 2010: 83(1), 189-206.
- Hobfoll, SE. Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American psychologist*. 1989: 44(3), 513.
- Kular, SM, Gatenby, MS, Rees, AC, Soane, E, Truss, K. Employee engagement: A literature review. *Journal of applied psychology*. 2008: 10-24.
- Britt, TW, Dickinson, JM, Shortridge, TM, McKibben, ES. Self-engagement at work. *Positive organizational behavior*. 2007:143-158.
- Lather, AS, Jain, AV. Developing a scale to measure employee engagement. *Dias Technology Review*. 2014: 11(2).
- Riggio, RE. *Introduction to industrial and organizational psychology*. 2015: Routledge.
- Jex, S, Britt, T. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach*. 2007: 131-166.
- Little, B, Little, P. Employee engagement: Conceptual issues. *The Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*. 2006: 10(1), 111-120.
- Shuck, B, Wollard, K. Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human resource development review*. 2010: 9(1), 89-110.
- Maslach, C, Jackson, SE, Leiter, MP. *Maslach burnout inventory: Scarecrow Education*. 1997.
- Saks, AM. Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of managerial psychology*. 2006: 21(7), 600-619.
- Schaufeli, WB, Salanova, M, Romá, V, Bakker, AB. The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness studies*. 2002: 3, 71-92.
- Motowidlo, SJ. The job performance. *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology*. 2003: 12(4), 39-53.
- Rotundo, M, Rotman, J. Defining and measuring individual level job performance: Review & integration. *Journal of applied psychology*. 2002: 90(5), 225-254.
- Johnson, JW. Relative importance of task and contextual performance dimensions to supervisor judgments of overall performance. *Journal of applied psychology*. 2001: 86(5), 984.
- Motowidlo, SJ, Scotter, JR. The Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of applied psychology*. 1994: 79(4), 475.

23. Bernardin, HJ, Beatty, R.W. Performance appraisal: Assessing human behavior at work. (1984).
24. Murphy, KR. Is relationship between cognitive ability and job performance stable over time? *The Human performance*. 1989: 2(3), 183-200.
25. Campbell, JP. Modeling performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. *Journal of occupational & organizational psychology*. 1990: 33(4), 692-724.
26. Kane, JS, Lawler, EE. Methods of peer assessment. *Psychological bulletin*. 1978: 85(3), 555.
27. Viswesvaran, C, Ones, DS. Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*. 2000: 8(4), 216-226.
28. Organ, DW. *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*: Lexington books/DC heath and com. 1988.
29. Borman, WC, Motowidlo, SJ. Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human performance*. 1997:, 10(2), 99-109.
30. Dalal, RS. A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior & counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of applied psychology*. 2005: 90(6), 1241.
31. Goodman, SA, Svyantek, DJ. Person-organization fit and contextual performance: Do shared values matter. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 1999: 55(2), 254-275.
32. Bakker, AB, Demerouti, E. Towards a model of work engagement. *Career development international*. 2008: 13(3), 209-223.
33. Chughtai, A.A, Buckley, DF. The Work engagement: Antecedents, the mediating role of learning goal orientation and job performance. *Career development international*. 2011: 16(7), 684-705.
34. Babcock-Roberson, ME, Strickland, OJ. The relationship between charismatic leadership, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Journal of psychology*.2010: 144(3), 313-326.
35. Hoon, J, Kolb, JA, Lee, U, Kim, H. The Role of transformational leadership in effective organizational knowledge creation practices: Mediating effects of employees' work engagement. *Human resource development quarterly*. 2012: 23(1), 65-101.
36. Shantz, A, Alfes, K, Truss, C, Soane, E. The role of employee engagement in relationship between job design task performance, citizenship and deviant behaviours. *International journal of human resource management*. 2013: 24(13), 2608-2627.
37. Christian, S, Garza, S, Slaughter, JE. Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel psychology*. 2011: 64(1), 89-136.
38. Bakker, AB., Demerouti, E, Brummelhuis, LL. Work engagement, performance, and active learning: The role of conscientiousness. *Journal of vocational behavior*. 2012: 80(2), 555-564.