

WORK ENGAGEMENT AND INDIVIDUAL WORK PERFORMANCE: RESEARCH FINDINGS AND AN AGENDA FOR EMPLOYEE RELATIONSHIPS

*Dr.Surekha Rana **, *Divya Pant ***, *Priyanka Chopra ****
Professor*,Research Scholar**,Research Scholar***

Department Of Management Studies, Kanya Gurukula Campus

Gurukula Kangri Vishwavidyalaya, Haridwar, India

Abstract

Employee engagement concept is gaining a vast and critical importance in today's highly competitive and dynamic business environment. The initiative of employees for their work and association with workplace lead their work performance. An engaged workforce is a vital asset for the organization that contributes their efforts for the benefit of the organization. The drive of engaged employee lead their association with their work performance. This co relational study ($N = 134$) was undertaken to examine the relation among work engagement (Absorption, vigor, dedication) on employees work performance. An internet-based survey was administered to a homogeneous sampling of organizations from the fields of IT / ITES/Telecom companies. Simple random sampling was used to select the employees from middle and lower managerial levels. A total of 200 questionnaires were distributed and 134 valid responses collected. Hypotheses were tested through co relational and regression analytic procedures to predict and estimate the relationships among variables. The findings of this study showed that all the constructs of work engagement were predictors of employee performance and work engagement had significant impact on employee performance. The research emphasizes the emergent importance and need for the concept of employee engagement been associated with work performance of employees.

Keywords: Employee engagement, work engagement, work performance.

INTRODUCTION

Employees association with their work and organization is considered predominant in today's highly sensitive and competitive business world. The work force of the organization plays a dynamic role in achieving the goals of the organization. The achievement of the organization is linked with the performance of the employees associated with the organization. When an employee is engaged, he is aware of his determination and commitment towards the work and the organization and continuously strives for the success of the organisational goals. Such employees will voluntarily devote their physical effort, mind and abilities to the organization. The management of the organization seek to have such employees who are competent or highly capable to optimize their performance .Thus, employees who manage their performance on prescribed standards will also support organizations to attain their objectives with optimisation. Thus, as the employee's performance increases, they are able to support organizational progress.

Employees with a zeal for high performance will show improved level of engagement. The concept of employee engagement in today's time has gained high importance, due to its influence on employee performance and well-being at place of work. In ever rising competition and challenge for success the physical and mental well-being of employees is a matter of high concern by the HR practitioners and managers. Various studies on engagement have developed the effect of employees' attitudes, absence and turnover levels that links with productivity, that is pointing towards the increase to a high correlation with organization performance, group and individual (as cited by Robertson-Smith , Markwick & Armir and Buckley, 2009, p.1)

Kahn first conceptualized Engagement at work (1990, p. 694) as the “harnessing of organizational members’ selves to their work roles”, explaining that “people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances”.

Performance can be understood as the matching up of target while seeking for the results. Performance evaluation is considered the heart of performance management (Cardy & Leonard 2004), the performance of an individual or an organisation depends heavily on all organisational policies, practices, and design features of an organisation. Employee performance is a form of outcome attained and the accomplishment made at work. The definition of Individual Work Performance as “*behaviors or actions that are relevant to the goals of the organization*”. Therefore work performance focuses on behaviors or action of the employee, rather than on results of these behaviors. In addition, behaviors should be under the control of the individual, thus excluding behaviors that are constrained by the environment (Campbell, 1990 & Rotundo & Sackett, 2002).

Employee engagement is one of the key determinants fostering high levels of employee performance (Macey, Schneider, Barbera, & Young, 2009;).

Organisational outcomes of engagement employee relates with employee productivity and business success (Robertson-Smith, Markwick, Armir & Buckley 2009). In the recent times there is an increasing awareness that employee engagement is pivotal to successful commercial and business performance, where engaged employees are the ‘*backbone of good working environments where people are industrious, ethical and accountable*’ (Levinson, 2007; Cleland & Townend, 2008). Employee engagement is a hard-nosed proposition that not only shows results but can be measured in costs of recruitment and employee output’ (Johnson, 2004 p. 1). Engagement is considered to be sign of employee willingness to expend discretionary effort towards their employer. In view of this there are various outcomes of considerable value and benefits for the contemplation of employee engagement in organization development. The individual outcomes of employee engagement are of significant importance for employer – employee relationship and chiefly for organization at large. The employee willingness to contribute in their work will possibly drive employees to outperform in their work in relation to the demand and expectations of their job.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Employee Engagement

Human capital is the unique resource in the organization that makes the most of the competitive advantage for the competitors. Moreover the engaged employee is the gain for employers who believe in the managing, leading and sustained success of their employees. Nowadays emphasizing employee engagement is a key HR practice to strive and gain employee’s association and commitment towards the organization. The concept of employee engagement was pioneered by Kahn (1990, p. 694) by giving his at present famous definition *quoted in the above section*, namely, “the harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances”. According to Kahn (1990) three psychological engagement conditions are necessary for an employee to be rightly engaged: meaningfulness (work elements), safety (social elements, including management style, process, and organisational norms) and availability (individual distractions).

When the employees relate themselves to their role performances they experience psychological safety and they are provided with sufficient personal resources to devote themselves to such performances. Then their work is adequately creates meaning to them. Therefore, for enhancing the role performances of an employee, it is very important to concern the condition of psychological availability that refers to a situation, wherein employees draw on their whole selves in an cohesive and dedicated manner. Thus, Kahn’s definition of employee engagement suggests that employee engagement is a multi-faceted construct and the more we provide to a role the more comfortable is our performance.

Buckingham and Coffman (1999) from Gallup organization's stated that "the right people in the right roles with the right managers drive employee engagement" (p. 248). Other authors has defined employee engagement as "the state in which individuals are emotionally and intellectually committed to the organisation or group, as measured by three primary behaviors: Say ,stay , strive"(Baumruk & Marusarz , Hewitt Associates LLC ,2004 p.2).

According to Gallup, Williams and Schneiderman (2002) there are three types of people: engaged employees, not engaged employees, and actively disengaged employees. Engaged employees work with passion and feel a profound connection to their company. They drive innovation and move the organization forward. Not-Engaged employees are essentially 'checked out'. They are sleepwalking through their workday, putting time – but not energy or passion – into their work. Actively Disengaged employees are not just unhappy at work; they are busy acting out their unhappiness. Every day, these workers undermine what their engaged co-workers accomplish.

Schaufeli and Bakker (2010) define work engagement as "the psychological state that accompanies the behavioral investment of personal energy" (p. 22). Further, Fleming and Asplund (2007) went a step further and presented employee engagement as: "the ability to capture the heads, hearts, and souls of your employees to instill an intrinsic desire and passion for excellence". (p. 2). Newman and Harrison (2008) defined engagement as the simultaneous presence of three behaviors in employees, namely, their performance in job, citizenship behaviour and involvement.

Employee Engagement is a distinct and unique construct that consists of cognitive, emotional, and behavioural components that are associated with individual role performance, it is also positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzales-Roma, Bakker,2002 & Saks, 2006). *Vigor* refers to high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one's work, and persistence even in the face of difficulties. *Dedication* is characterized by a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge at work. *Absorption* consists of being fully concentrated, happy, and deeply engrossed in one's work whereby time passes quickly, and one has difficulty detaching oneself from work. Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leither (2001) noted that engagement is characterized by energy, involvement, and efficacy—the direct opposites of the three burnout dimensions, exhaustion, cynicism and ineffectiveness. The focus of engagement is one's formal role performance rather than extra-role and voluntary behavior, the need for employee engagement to be viewed both as job engagement and organization engagement for strategic understanding of the construct where job engagement is the level of employee's commitment and dedication to his job role and organizational engagement is the level of employee commitment and loyalty to their organization. (Saks, 2006).

Employee performance

Employee performance or job performance is reflected as an aggregated value to an organization by the set of behaviors that an employee contributes in both forms as directly and indirectly to the organization goals (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997 & Harrison J. Kell, Stephan J. Motowidlo, Michelle P. Martin, Angela L. Stotts & Carlos A. Moreno, 2014). Job performance consists of task performance or in-role performance and contextual performance or extra-role performance. On the whole, job performance is referred as a function not only of task performance but also of contextual behavior like counterproductive behavior (CWB). (Rotundo and Sackett, 2002; Viswesvaran and Ones, 2000).

The performance of an employee indicates the outcome of the employee efforts (monetary and non-monetary) that has a direct connection with the attainment of organisational performance and its success. Past studies connote that the best way for enhancing the employee performance is to concentrate on the promotion of employee engagement.

In the review by Koopmans , Bernaards , Hildebrandt , Schaufeli , de Vet Henrica , van der Beek (2011), employee work performance can be categorized into three types of performance: Task Performance, Contextual Performance and Counterproductive work behaviour .Task performance can be defined as "the proficiency with which individuals perform the core substantive or technical tasks central to his or her job" (Campbell, 1990). Behaviors used to describe task

performance often include work quantity and quality, job skills, and job knowledge (Campbell, 1990; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). Task performance refers to in-role performance and refers to those officially required outcomes and behaviors that directly serve the goals of the organization (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). Task performance was defined as “the effectiveness with which job incumbents perform activities that contribute to the organization’s technical core” (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997, p. 99). Thus, any behavior related to the substantive tasks required by the job was included in this classification. Contextual performance was defined as performance that is not formally required as part of the job but that helps shape the social and psychological context of the organization (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993).

Contextual performance can be defined as “behaviors that support the organizational, social and psychological environment in which the technical core must function” (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Behaviors used to describe contextual performance include for example demonstrating effort, facilitating peer and team performance, cooperating, and communicating (Campbell, 1990; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). Contextual performance is the less formal behaviors that is not directly supporting to organizations (Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmitt, 1997). Though this form of behaviour are not directly supporting the organization’s technical core but relatively encourage a social and psychological environment favourable for the accomplishment of work involved in the organization’s technical core. Such individuals that devote energy in their work roles, shall showcase higher contextual performance. Such behaviour relates to an individual’s tendency to act in such ways that assist the social and psychological context of an organization (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Contextual performance is acknowledged as such form of performance which is not formally required as part of the job but the one that helps to shape the social and psychological context of the organization (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997).

Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) can be defined as “behavior that harms the well-being of the organization” (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). Behaviors used to describe counterproductive work behavior, often include absenteeism, off-task behavior, theft, and substance abuse (Koopmans et al., 2011). Counterproductive work behavior is a type of deviant behavior that is performed with the intention of harming organizations and/ or their members. Moreover, Counterproductive refers to negative employee behavior that is harmful to the organization or other employees. It represents such employee behavior that lies outside the spectrum of tasks included in the job description and that promotes organizational functioning. (Lee & Allen, 2002). Individual job performance consists of distinct sets of activities that contribute to an organization in many different ways. The constricted aspect of job performance is task performance and contextual performance

Studies on Employee Engagement and Work performance:

Earlier studies in their results (Christian, Garza and Slaughter, 2011; Fleming and Asplund, 2007; Rich, Lepine, and Crawford, 2010; Richman, 2006; Macey and Schneider, 2008; Holbeche and Springett, 2003; Leiter and Bakker, 2010) recommend that the presence of high levels of employee engagement enhances job performance, task performance, and organisational citizenship behaviour, productivity, discretionary effort, affective commitment, continuance commitment, levels of psychological climate, and customer service.

In the opinion of Kahn (1990), an engaged individual is one who approaches the tasks associated with a job with a sense of self-investment, energy, and passion, and translate that into higher levels of in-role and extra-role performance (as cited by Christian, et al., 2011). Kahn’s (1990) conceptualization of engagement states that work engagement should refer to a psychological connection with *the performance of work tasks* rather than an attitude toward features of the organization or the job (Maslach, et al., 2001). Employee engagement is recognized as a constructive significant force that connects employees in emotional, cognitive or physical manner with their organizations (Kahn, 1990; Wellins and Concelman, 2005). Kahn (1990) acknowledged engagement as a motivational concept, as it refers to the allocation of personal resources to role performance and also to how intensely and persistently those resources are applied. Few authors (Burke, 2008; Rich et al., 2010) similarly associate the same to the persistence and intensity with which

individuals pursue their task performance. Engaged employees are characterised to be vigilant and more focused for their work tasks, and thus considering engagement to be positively related to task performance.

Kahn (1990) did not clearly summarize a relationship between employee engagement and job performance, but academic research has linked employee engagement to job performance in limited studies. Kahn (1990) summarizes that “such employees who are highly engaged in their work roles not only focus their physical effort on the pursuit of role-related goals, but are also cognitively vigilant and emotionally connected to the endeavor. In contrast, employees who are highly disengaged in their work roles withhold their physical, cognitive, and emotional energies, and this is reflected in task activity that is at best, robotic, passive, and detached” (Kahn, 1990). Engagement is the degree to which an individual is attenuate and absorbed in the performance of their roles (Saks, 2006). The centripetal force of engagement is ones formal roles performance rather than extra-role and voluntary behavior (Saks, 2006). Generally, the engagement emphasizes the cognitive aspect of involvement with job task (Wefald & Downey, 2009).

The recent studies (Halbesleben, 2010; Mone and London, 2010) also suggest a positive relationship between engagement and individual performance. A strong significant relationship between employee engagement and employee performance exists (Anitha J, 2014) where working environment, team and co-worker relationship factors lead towards employee engagement and significantly reflect improvement in employee productivity. Recent literature of performance management includes studies focusing on the contribution of employee engagement towards employee work performance thus emphasizing the importance of engagement in the performance management process. The results of the study conducted by Kahn (1990) submitted that engagement affects employee performance. Sonnentag’s (2003) survey of employees from six public service organizations found that high levels of engagement at work support employees in ‘*taking initiative and pursuing learning goals*’ (p. 525). Engaged employees work harder, are more loyal and are more likely to go the ‘extra mile’ for the corporation. (Lockwood, 2007, p. 3). A report by (Corporate Leadership Council, 2004) outlined that the most engaged and committed perform 20 per cent better than their colleagues. Watson Wyatt’s (2007) conducted their study on 946 companies across 22 countries whose result concluded that employees who are highly engaged are more than twice as likely to be top performers as are other employees. Wellins and Concelman (2005 p. 1, cited in Macey and Schneider, 2008) suggest that engagement is an ‘*illusive force*’ that motivates an individual to achieve higher levels of performance in their work. Studies by Yalabik, Popaitoon, Chowne, and Rayton (2013) showed that engagement was positively related to job performance, measured by performance appraisal ratings, and mediated the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance.

Karatepe and Ngeche (2012) study revealed that engagement was positively associated with job performance and that job embeddedness mediated the relationship between engagement and performance. Similarly, the research work of Rich, et al., (2010) provided evidence of a positive association between engagement and performance. Their study showed that engagement mediated the relationship between value congruence, perceived organisational support, core self-evaluations and task performance. Further, Shantz, Alfes, Truss and Soane (2013) study showed engagement was positively related to task performance and mediated the relationship between job characteristics and task performance. Moreover, Bakker, Demerouti and Brummelhuis (2012) revealed a positive relationship between work engagement and task performance and also between work engagement and contextual performance.

Den Hartog and Belschak (2012) identified a negative association between engagement and counterproductive work behaviour. Moreover, engagement fully mediated the relationship between ethical leadership and counterproductive behaviour. Likewise, Sulea, Virga, Maricutoiu, Schaufeli, Dumitru and Sava (2012) demonstrated that engagement was negatively associated with counterproductive work behaviour. In their study, engagement partially mediated the relationship between interpersonal conflict and counterproductive work behaviour, as well as that between conscientiousness and counterproductive work behaviour. Finally, Shantz et al. (2013) revealed a negative association between engagement and deviant behaviours, where engagement mediated the relationship between job characteristics and deviance.

Researchers consider that individuals who invest their personal selves into their work role are likely to carry a broader notion of that role and are more likely to move outside of the formal limits of their job to facilitate the organization at large and the people within (Kahn 1990., Rich et al., 2010). Though Engagement is considered to be an sign of an employee's willingness to expend discretionary effort to help the employer (Erickson, 2005), the individuals investing energy into their work roles, would have higher contextual performance, which relates to an individual's propensity to behave in ways that facilitate the social and psychological context of an organization (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993).

Past few studies has found that employee engagement is related to increased job performance (Hakanen, Baker, & Schaufeli, 2006). The core area of concern by past researchers emphasized upon has been task or in-role performance that represented the extent to which employees effectively perform their official job duties (William & Anderson, 1991; Bowling, 2010). Individual job performance consists of distinct sets of activities that contribute to an organization in different ways. The narrow aspect of job performance is task performance and contextual performance. Recently, attention of researchers has been given to extra-role or contextual performance, which refers to behavior not included as part of an employee's official job duties that affect the well-being of the organization or its members. Ibrahim and Falasi (2014) signified the value of engagement in the public sector in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) as engagement of employees will improve employee performance, raise job satisfaction and consequently escort the organization to achieve its goals. Yalabik, Popaitoon, Chowne, and Rayton, (2013) in their study signified a positive relation between engagement and job performance, where individual performance was measured by performance appraisal ratings, and that also mediated the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. Similarly, a meta analysis based study by Christian, et al., (2011) expressed a positive relationship between engagement and task performance. Further Yongxing, Hongfei, Baoguo, and Lei, (2017) conducted their research with 1094 customer service employees in a large state-owned telecom company of South China identified positive relation of work engagement to objective task performance. Bakker and Bal (2010) showed that engaged teachers received higher ratings from their supervisors on in-role performance, indicating that engaged employees perform well and are willing to go the extra mile. Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, and Schaufeli (2009) conducted a study among the employees of a fast food restaurant in Greece, and results shows that day-level of work engagement were predicting objective daily financial returns. The results of the study by Ariani (2013) from service organization in Yogyakarta, Indonesia outlined a significant negative relation between employee engagement and counterproductive work behaviour stating that the employees with higher level of engagement reflect lower levels of counterproductive behaviour.

Objectives of the study

Though there is limited literature in the past that highlight the association between the engagement levels of employee with their work performance. This paper attempts to consolidate the relation among these constructs and present a comprehensive prediction of employee work performance based upon the depiction of employee engagement. This gives the null hypothesis as follows:

1. To identify the relationship between employee engagement and work performance.
2. To identify the relationship between the dimensions of employee engagement (vigor, absorption, dedication) and work performance (task performance, context performance, counter performance)
3. To study the strength of impact of employee engagement on work performance.
4. To analyze the impact of dimensions of employee engagement (vigor, absorption, dedication) on work performance.

To assess the relationship and impact of employee engagement on employee performance in terms of the strength of the relationship the null hypothesis was framed as under:

H₀₁. There is no statistically significant relationship between employee engagement and work performance.

H₀₂. There is no statistically significant relationship between dimensions of employee engagement (vigor, absorption, dedication) and work performance (task performance, context performance, and counter performance).

H₀₃. There is no statistically significant impact of employee engagement on work performance.

H₀₄. There is no statistically significant impact of dimensions of employee engagement (vigor, absorption, dedication) on work performance.

Research Methodology

The research study was conducted on homogeneous selected IT/ ITES/ Telecom companies in Delhi –NCR region. The investigated units were selected companies in BPO/ outsourcing /software development organizations. The sampling frame consisted of employees from different BPO/ outsourcing /software development companies. The sample consists of 134 respondents. The study included. The study included 62.7% men and women 37.3% .The questionnaire consists of twenty seven closed-ended questions, three questions relate to demographic data (gender, age, designation) of respondents. The questionnaire was divided in 3 section. Section A included the items related to Work performance questionnaire. Work performance was measured by the questionnaire developed by Koopmans et al., (2012).The questionnaire comprised of 18 items. The three respective dimensions were task performance (5 items), Contextual Performance (8 items), Counterproductive Performance (5 items). Section B comprises the items related to (Utrecht Work Engagement Scale) UWES-9 scale that was used to measure work engagement. The UWES-9 (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003) questionnaire consists of 9 items: Vigor (3 items), Absorption (3 items), Dedication (3 items).The measurement was made on 5 point liker scale where 5 =Strongly Agree to 1= Strongly Disagree. Section C includes demographic information of the respondents.

The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) and employee comprised of 9 items and 18 items correspondingly and were found to have good psychometric properties, with A total of 200 questionnaires were distributed through on- line mode where participants were given the embedded link to fill an online survey .134 valid responses were collected resulting in a 67 per cent response rate. Simple random sampling was used to select the employees from middle and lower managerial levels. The collected data were analyzed using IBM SPSS, version 20. The statistical tools of ANOVA test, correlation and linear regression were used to achieve the objectives of the research. Data analysis was carried out using correlation to identify the degree of relation between work engagement and employee work performance. The regression technique was used to identify the level of impact and prediction made by work engagement and its dimensions on employee work performance.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The Statistical Package of Social Science (SPSS) was used for analysis of data. The data collected was analysed using statistical techniques of inter-correlation and linear regression analysis. The dependent variable was employee job performance and the predictor variable was work engagement.

Table 1:Correlations between work engagement and work performance

		Work Performance	Work Engagement
Work Performance	Pearson Correlation	1	.678**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	134	134
Work Engagement	Pearson Correlation	.678**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	134	134

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

Table 1 shows the value of pearson's coefficient which indicates that correlation between work engagement and employee work performance was found .678. Therefore, a moderate positive correlation exists between work engagement and employee work performance. Hence, relationship among the variables undertaken exists at a moderate level under this study.

Table 2: Correlations between dimensions of work engagement with employee work performance.

		Vigor	Absorption	Dedication	Task Performance	Contextual Performance	Counter productive Performance
Vigor	Pearson Correlation	1	.828**	.731**	.673**	.651**	.408**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	134	134	134	134	134	134
Absorption	Pearson Correlation	.828**	1	.771**	.581**	.626**	.423**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	134	134	134	134	134	134
Dedication	Pearson Correlation	.731**	.771**	1	.649**	.745**	.406**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.005	.000	.000
	N	134	134	134	134	134	134
Task Performance	Pearson Correlation	.673**	.581**	.649**	1	.619**	.430**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.005		.000	.000
	N	134	134	134	134	134	134
Contextual Performance	Pearson Correlation	.651**	.626**	.745**	.619**	1	.574**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	134	134	134	134	134	134
Counter productive Performance	Pearson Correlation	.408**	.423**	.406**	.430**	.574**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	134	134	134	134	134	134

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

The Pearson correlation test was carried out to analyse the relationships between the dimensions of Work Engagement and Employee Work Performance .Table 2, indicates that there is significant positive relationship among all the three dimensions of Work Engagement with the three dimensions of Employee Work Performance. The most significant relationship was between Dedication and Contextual Performance ($p < 0.01$, $r=0.745$) followed by Vigor with Task Performance ($p < 0.01$, $r=0.673$) , Vigor with Contextual Performance ($p < 0.01$, $r=0.651$) and then Dedication with Task Performance ($p < 0.01$, $r=0.649$) and then Absorption with Contextual Performance ($p < 0.01$, $r=0.626$).All other relationships were also positive but exists at a weak level as Vigor, Absorption and Dedication with Counterproductive Performance ($p<0.01$, $r=.408$, $r=.423$, $r=.406$), under this study. Hence, the results revealed that there was a significant positive linear relationship between all variables. Thus, the relationship among the dimensions differs between 0.408 to 0.745.

REGRESSION ANALYSIS PERFORMED ON WORK ENGAGEMENT AND EMPLOYEE WORK PERFORMANCE.

Table 3: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.478 ^a	.529	.523	1.81492	.229	39.114	1	132	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Engagement

Table 4: ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	128.840	1	128.840	39.114	.000 ^b
	Residual	434.798	132	3.294		
	Total	563.638	133			

a. Dependent Variable: Work Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Work Engagement

The value of F-test determines the statistical significance of the model. The linear regression's F-test has the null hypothesis that there is no linear relationship between the two variables (in other words $R^2=0.529$). Here, $p=.00$, which is less than 0.05 ($p<0.05$), and $F = 39.114$ indicates that, overall, the regression model statistically significantly predicts the outcome variable (i.e., it is a good fit for the data).

Table 5: Coefficients^a (linear regression analysis)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardize d Coefficients	T	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	6.347	.742		8.553	.000	4.879	7.815
	Work Engagement	.499	.064	.478	6.254	.000	.273	.525

a. Dependent Variable: Work Performance

WORK PERFORMANCE= B_0+B_1 (WORK ENGAGEMENT)

$$=6.347+.499(\text{work engagement})$$

The R-squared value is .529 representing that approximately 53 % of the variance of employee Work Performance is accounted for the model by Work Engagement. Hence, from the above equation it is observed that one unit change in work engagement will effect 49 times in employee work performance, with the standard error of .064, that reflects 39% impact of work engagement on employee work performance with significant $p=.000 < 0.005$, It shows the model is significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. It can also be inferred that work engagement is a significant predictor of employee work performance in fields of IT / ITES/Telecom companies.

REGRESSION ANALYSIS PERFORMED ON DIMENSIONS OF WORK ENGAGEMENT WITH EMPLOYEE WORK PERFORMANCE.

Table 6:Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.885 ^a	.735	.718	1.82089

a. Predictors: (Constant), Dedication, Vigor, Absorption

Table 7:ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	132.607	3	44.202	13.332	.000 ^b
	Residual	431.031	130	3.316		
	Total	563.638	133			

a. Dependent Variable: Work Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Dedication, Vigor, Absorption

The regression analysis is applied to detect the impact of work engagement dimensions (vigor, absorption and dedication) on the level of work performance of employees. The results indicated that these dimensions have a positive and significant impact on the level of work performance, $R=.885$. The value of $R=86\%$ revealing that these dimensions have a positive and linear relationship with the work performance.

Furthermore, the value of $R^2=0.735$, defined the 73.5% proportion of variation of these dimensions in the work performance.

Table 8:Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	6.521	.771		8.457	.000
	Vigor	.685	.314	.173	1.225	.000
	Absorption	.769	.336	.301	1.988	.000
	Dedication	.593	.314	.037	.295	.012

a. Dependent Variable: Work Performance

$$\text{Work Performance} = 6.521 + 0.685(\text{Vigor}) + 0.769(\text{Absorption}) + 0.593(\text{Dedication})$$

From the above equation it clearly indicates that the work performance is the function of vigor, absorption and dedication. As a unit change in each of the variable (predictor) would lead to give work performance equals to 8.568 units. So, this equation will be used to anticipate the level of work engagement among the employees at a given frame of time with respect to their present job.

Discussion

Table 1, depicted a positive correlation between the work engagement and employee job performance. This finding is consonant with the findings of Karatepe and Ngeche (2012) who propounded a positive and significant relationship between work engagement and employee job performance. Similarly, the research work of Rich, Lepine and Crawford (2010) provided evidence of a positive association between engagement and performance.

Table 2, revealed that the dimensions of work engagement (vigor, absorption and dedication) have a positive and significant relationship with the dimensions of employee job performance (task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive performance). The similar results were reported by (Shantz, Alfes, Truss and Soane (2013). They concluded that engagement was positively related to task performance and mediated the relationship between job characteristics and task performance. Moreover, Bakker, Demerouti and Brummelhuis (2012) revealed that engagement was positively related to employees' task performance.

The results of our study ensure that work engagement of employee is an important predictor for having positive impact on employee's work performance. The whole some dedication of employee with respect to their work leads to higher work performance, hence the cognitive and emotional association of employee towards their work demand is crucial for outperforming their targets as well as contribution towards organizational goals and objectives.

On the basis of our analysis, we can recommend that work engagement is positively related to work performance. Researches from many previous authors have related engagement, as an affect-motivational state, that lead to high levels of job performance of employees (e.g., Kahn, 1990; Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010; Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002). A meta-analysis based study by Christian et al (2011) granted a support with identified correlations between work engagement and task performance. Our findings are in congruence with the proposition of association between work engagement and job performance and confirm positively relation between work engagement to work performance (Bakker & Bal, 2010; Bakker & Xanthopoulou, 2009; Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2008; Salanova et al., 2005; Xanthopoulou et al., 2009). Employees with high engagement levels are expected to perform extra-role behaviors, possibly because they are capable to "free up" resources by achieving goals and performing their tasks efficiently, enabling them to practise such activities that are not the element of their job descriptions. (Christian et al, 2011).

Practical Implications

The study provides potential implications for practice in information technology based organizations. The employees with high engagement levels will help the employees to maintain or improve work performance. As the results show that all the three dimensions of engagement has significant relations with employee work performance, this means engaged employees will possibly perform their tasks in more efficient and effective manner. Thus, organizations can emphasize in stimulating work engagement among their employees by creating engagement-evoking working environments that foster their emotional, cognitive and behavioural component. The organizations will acknowledge the issues related with employee engagement that prominently affect the work content and context of employee performance.

Conclusion

Engaged employees are the essence to deliver enhanced performance, the much needed requisition for business growth and success. The association and willingness of employees for their work contribute their elevated work performance. The employees strive to go ahead with their efforts to stay connected and outperform their work. Thus, engagement levels of employees boost their ability to improve their work performance and seek elucidation for future prospects for employee commitment, loyalty, and productivity and employee sustainability. Moreover, maintaining and improving high level of work engagement not only contributes toward employee better performance but holistically add for enhanced business performance and better competitive advantage. Thus to conclude, employees who are engaged are advanced workers and top performers as well as a great asset for the organization. With the scant literature availability to qualify the linkage of engagement-performance, more related studies in future are needed to examine the relationship between work engagement and employee performance. Furthermore, future researches may include situational variables and/ or organizational and individual characteristics to widen the scope of related studies. Future research studies may provide alternative explanations for the relationship between engagement with task, contextual and counterproductive performance. It could also investigate whether engagement simultaneously leads to all forms of work performance based on task, contextual and counterproductive performance, or whether engaged employees tend to prioritize in-role and extra-role tasks components.

References:

- Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3),308-323.Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-01-2013-0008>
- Ariani, D. W. (2013). The relationship between employee engagement, organizational citizenship behavior, and counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 4(2), 46.
- Bakker, A. B., & Bal, M. P. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83(1), 189-206.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Brummelhuis L, L. (2012). Work engagement, performance, and active learning: The role of conscientiousness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 555-564.
- Baumruk, R., & Marusarz, T. (2004). Employee engagement: Insights into why it matters and what you can do about it. *Hewitt Associates, LLC*
- Borman W.C, Motowidlo S. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In Schmitt N, Borman W (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp.71)San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human performance*, 10(2), 99-109. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_3
- Bowling, N.A. (2010). Effects of job satisfaction and conscientiousness on extra-role behaviors. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25(1), 119-130. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9134-0>
- Buckingham, M., & Coffman ,C .(1999). *First break all the rules*, Simon and Schuster
- Burke, M.J. (2008). On the skilled aspect of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 70–71.

- Campbell, J.P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology, In Dunnette, M.D. and Hough, L.M. (Eds), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, 687-732 Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA,.
- Cardy, R.L. (2004). *Performance management: concepts, skills, and exercises*, M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY.
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89-136.
- Cleland, A. & Townend, A (2008). *Engagement, assertiveness and business performance – A new perspective*, Ixia Consultancy Ltd
- Corporate Leadership Council .(2004). *Driving performance and retention through employee engagement*, Corporate Executive Board.
- Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2012). Work engagement and Machiavellianism in the ethical leadership process. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107(1), 35-47.
- Erickson TJ. (2005). Testimony submitted before the U.S. Senate Committee on Health, Education, *Labor and Pensions*,
- Fleming, J.,H. & Asplund, J. (2007). *Human Sigma*, New York, NY, Gallup Press,
- Gallup, Williams. & Schneiderman .(2002). The high cost of disengaged employees, *Gallup Business Journal*, retrieved from: <http://businessjournal.gallup.com/content/247/the-high-cost-of-disengagedemployees.aspx>
- Hakanen, J.J., Baker, A.B., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2006). Burnout and Work Engagement among Teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43, 445-513. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001>
- Halbesleben, J.R.B. (2010).A meta-analysis of work engagement: relationships with burnout, demands, resources, and consequences”, In Bakker, A.B. and Leiter, M.P. (Eds), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*, 102-117 Psychology Press, Hove.
- Holbeche, L. & Springett, N. (2003). *In search of meaning in the workplace*, Horsham, Roffey Park Institute.
- Harrison J. Kell, Stephan J. Motowidlo, Michelle P. Martin, Angela L. Stotts and Carlos A. Moreno, Testing for Independent Effects of Prosocial Knowledge and Technical Knowledge on Skill and Performance, *Human Performance*, 27, 4, (311), (2014).
- Ibrahim, M. and Falasi, S. (2014), Employee loyalty and engagement in UAE public sector, *Employee Relations*, 36 (5), 562-582.
- Johnson , M. (2004). *The new rules of engagement: life-work balance and employee commitment*, The chartered institute of personnel and development (CIPD) Publishing
- Kahn, W.A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work, *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Karatepe, O. M., & Ngeche, R. N. (2012). Does job embeddedness mediate the effect of work engagement on job outcomes? A study of hotel employees in Cameroon. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 21(4), 440-461.

- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Schaufeli, W. B., de Vet Henrica, C. W., & van der Beek, A. J. (2011). Conceptual frameworks of individual work performance: a systematic review. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 53(8), 856-866.
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C.M., Hildebrandt, V.H., van Buuren, S., van der Beek, A. J., & de Vet, H. C. (2012). Development of an individual work performance questionnaire. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 62(1), 6-28.
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 131.
- Leiter, M.P. & Bakker, A.B. (2010). Work engagement: introduction, In Bakker, A.B. and Leiter, M.P. (Eds), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*, 1-9, Hove, Psychology Press.
- Levinson E (2007a). Developing high employee engagement makes good business sense, *Interaction Associates*. Retrieved from www.interactionassociates.com/ideas/2007/05/developing_high_employee_engagement_makes_good_business_sense.php
- Lockwood ,N.R. (2007). Leveraging employee engagement for competitive advantage: HR's strategic role, *Society for Human Resource Management Quarterly*. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/acc4/4ab3d4cb3c648cb2993fe705129984440ffe.pdf>
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 3–30.
- Macey, W.H., Schneider, B., Barbera, K.M. & Young, S.A. (2009). *Employee engagement: Tools for analysis, practice, and competitive advantage*, Wiley-Blackwell, Malden, WA..
- Maslaach, C., Schaufelli, W. B. & Leither, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397-422.
- Mone, E.M. and London, M. (2010). *Employee engagement through effective performance management: A practical guide for managers*, Routledge, New York, NY.
- Motowildo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human performance*, 10(2), 71-83.
- Motowildo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 475–480.
- Newman, D.A. & Harrison, D.A. (2008). Been there, bottled that: Are state and behavioural work engagement new and useful construct; “wines”? *Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 1, 31-35.
- 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..
- Richman, A. (2006), “Everyone wants an engaged workforce how can you create it?”, *Workspan*, 49 (1),36-39.
- Robertson-Smith, G., & Markwick, C. Armir and Buckley. (2009). *Employee engagement: A review of current thinking*. Brighton: Institute for Employment Studies.

- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P.R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: a policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 66-80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.66>
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 21(7), 600-619. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). Utrecht work engagement scale: Preliminary manual. *Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University, Utrecht*, 26.
- Schaufeli, W.B. & Bakker, A.B. (2010). Defining and measuring work engagement: bringing clarity to the concept”, in Bakker, A.B. and Leiter, M.P. (Eds), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*, (pp. 10-24). NY: Psychology Press.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92.
- Shantz, A., Alfes, K., Truss, C., & Soane, E. (2013). The role of employee engagement in the relationship between job design and task performance, citizenship and deviant behaviours. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(13), 2608-2627.
- Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behaviour: anew look at the interface between non-work and work, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(3), 518–528
- Sulea, C., Virga, D., Maricutoiu, L. P., Schaufeli, W., Zaborila Dumitru, C., & Sava, F. A. (2012). Work engagement as mediator between job characteristics and positive and negative extra-role behaviors. *Career Development International*, 17(3), 188-207.
- Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8, 216–226. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00151>
- Wefeld, A.J., & Downey, R.G. (2009). Construct dimensionality of engagement and its relation with satisfaction. *The Journal of Psychology*, 143(1), 91-111. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/JRLP.143.1.91-112>
- Wellins, R., & Concelman, J. (2005). Creating a culture for engagement. *Workforce Performance Solutions*, 4, 1-4.
- Williams, L.J., & dan Anderson, S.E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700305>
- Wyatt, W. (2007). Playing to win in a global economy: Global strategic rewards report and United States findings. *Watson Wyatt Worldwide*.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82, 183–200.
- Yalabik, Z. Y., Popaitoon, P., Chowne, J. A., & Rayton, B. A. (2013). Work engagement as a mediator between employee attitudes and outcomes. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(14), 2799-2823.
- Yongxing, G., Hongfei, D., Baoguo, X., & Lei, M. (2017). Work engagement and job performance: the moderating role of perceived organizational support. *Anales de Psicología/Annals of Psychology*, 33(3), 708-713.

DETAILS OF THE AUTHORS:

AUTHORS BRIEF PROFILE

• Dr. Surekha Rana is working as Professor in the Department of Management Studies, Kanya Gurukula Campus (IInd Campus, Gurukula Kangri Vishwavidyalaya, Haridwar). She has qualified UGC-NET (JRF) and hold academic credentials of Ph.D , M.Phil and MBA in Human Resource Management & Marketing. She also embraces academic teaching with rich experience of 25 years. Area of interest is in the field of human resource management. Published more than 55 research papers and articles in the journals of national and international repute. She has also presented more than 52 papers at various conferences and seminars at international level. She is also been invited to deliver expert lectures and talk shows by eminent universities.

• Divya Pant is a Research Scholar in Department of Management Studies, Kanya Gurukula Campus (IInd Campus, Gurukula Kangri Vishwavidyalaya, Haridwar).She is a ICSSR Fellow. She did Integrated MBA(BMS +MBA). The areas of interest involve Competency Mapping, Individual Performance, Role efficacy, Sexual Harassment. Participated in various research conferences and various papers has been published in National and International Journal.

• Priyanka Chopra is a Research Scholar in Department of Management Studies, Kanya Gurukula Campus (IInd Campus, Gurukula Kangri Vishwavidyalaya, Haridwar).She has qualified UGC-NET (JRF) and holds 10 years of experience with a blend of industry and academic domain. The academic portfolio bears MHRD, BBA degrees along with various certificates of trainings and workshops under educational and industrial modules. The areas of interest involve Organizational learning, Job characteristics, Employee engagement, Attrition. Various research papers has been published in national and international journals

