

# Employee Engagement and Contextual Performance of Teaching Faculty of Private Universities

Hazrat Bilal\*, Bahadar Shah\*\*, Muhammad Yasir\*\*\* & Abdul Mateen\*\*\*\*

## Abstract

*This study was an effort to investigate the relationship between Employee Engagement (EE) and Contextual Performance (CP). Pearson correlation and simple regression analysis were applied to determine the relationship between independent and dependent variables. The data was collected conveniently from a sample of 231 teaching faculty of private universities situated in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. This was a cross sectional study and the results confirmed positive relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance. This study contributed to the existing literature by conducting such research in developing country, where no such study has been carried out earlier.*

**Keywords:** Employee engagement, Contextual performance, Extra-role Behavior, Organization citizenship behavior, Teaching faculty, Private university.

## Introduction

The employees are the backbone of an organization, without which an organization cannot progress. This progress can be achieved through nourishing employee engagement (EE). The main purpose of this paper is to explore the relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance of teaching faculty of private sector universities. Engaged employees are highly productive, committed to enhance performance, reduce turnover and led for sustainable growth and development of an organization. According to Kahn (1990) engagement is 'a psychological setting boosting and encouraging workers within organization to vigorously contribute in both own and organizational activities'. Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonza & Bakker, (2002) elaborated engagement as a three factor concept stating that engagement is 'a

---

\* Hazrat Bilal, PhD Scholar, Department of Management Sciences, Hazara University, Mansehra; Assistant Professor, School of Management and Commerce, University of Swat. Email: Bilalhazrat@yahoo.com

\*\* Dr. Bahadar Shah, Professor, Department of Management Sciences, Hazara University, Mansehra.

\*\*\* Dr. Muhammad Yasir, Assistant Professor, Department of Management Sciences, Hazara University, Mansehra

\*\*\*\* Abdul Mateen, Lecturer, School of Management and Commerce, University of Swat.

positive, fulfilling, work related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, absorption and dedication’.

On the other hand Contextual performance is conceptualized as the behaviors that support the core task performance in enhancing organizational effectiveness (Motowidlo & Van Scotter 1994). Therefore, it is an important aspect of job performance, which is concerned with behaviors that are required to safeguard and upgrade the organizational, social and psychological environment in the organization (Jex & Britt 2008; LePine *et al.*, 2000; Van Dyne *et al.*, 1994; Van Scotter & Motowidlo 1996).

### *Literature Review*

The organization needs to raise and cherish engagement, which is a two way link between employer and employee (Robinson, Perryman & Hayday, 2004). Engagement is a positive approach of employee in the direction of organization and its standards. According to Ncube and Jerie (2012) engagement is a psychological existence categorized in two important components: attention and absorption. Attention is an intellectual readiness and the extent of time one devotes thinking about a role, whereas absorption means being absorbed in a role and state to the intensity of one’s focus on a role. An engaged employee know his/her role and the goals of the organization. They are intellectually and emotionally certain with their organization and play their role to meet and exceed the organizational expectations with commitment to follow its values. Such workers go beyond elementary work obligations to glad the clients and struggle the business onward. High level of engagement not only direct individual towards positive results but also leads for high level organizational outcomes (Kahn, 1992). Engagement at individual level directs to high quality of employee’s work and their experience of performing specific job, while at organizational level leads to high growth and productivity of the organization. Thus engaged workers perform well, go beyond and above what are expected of them to support their organizational success (Gebauer, Lowman & Gordon 2008). They also show a better level of commitment, motivation and optimistic behavior about their work goals (Sarangi & Srivastava, 2012). Several studies reveals that the existence of high level of engagement considerably decreases turnover intentions, enhances commitment, create passion for work and increases earnings per share (Bhatla, 2011; Flemming, Coffman and Harter 2005; Truss *et al.*, 2006).

In organizational behavior and psychology, contextual performance is considered one of the important components and identified as an extra-role behavior or organizational citizenship behavior. Contextual performance is the voluntary, positive job behavior of employees that go beyond specified job or task behaviors (Spector &

Fox, 2002). According to Avery (1998), contextual performance is the supplementary job proficiency which forms the organizational, social and psychological environment for achieving organization goals. Contextual performance is a behavior adopted by employees to follow the organization rules, policies, go for an extra effort, helping and cooperating with others and sharing information with colleague for solving work related problems (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Motowidlo *et al.*, 1997). The more proactive view on contextual performance include concepts such as personal initiative characterized as self-starting, smart approach to work and going an extra mile for performing a particular work (Frese, Kring, Soose & Zempel, 1996).

Babcock-Roberson and Strickland (2010) established an association between employee engagement and contextual performance. They found that a strong positive relationship exist between employee engagement and contextual performance. It was also confirmed by other studies that there is a positive and significant relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance (Rurkkhum & Bartlett, 2012; Rich, LePine & Crawford, 2010). Similarly, Matamala, Pace and Thometz, (2010) further added this positive relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance in their studies of antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Therefore, in the light literature this study hypothesizes that the higher the employee engagement, the higher will be the contextual performance.

#### *Significance and Objective of the research*

The significance of the research was to explore and test the prevailing theory on employee engagement and contextual performance from perspective of developing countries. Whereas objective to explore the possible connection between employee engagement and contextual performance of teaching faculty working in private sector Universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

#### *Research Methodology*

The data was conveniently collected through self-administered questionnaire from a sample of 231 teaching faculty working as lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor and professor level in the private sector universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. For employee engagement UWES -17 item scale (Schaufeli *et al.*, 2002) was used with Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.95 and Contextual performance was measured by Goodman and Svyantek's (1999) scale having 9-item with a Cronbach's alpha value of .90.

### Data Analysis

The data for testing the hypothesis stating that there is a positive relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance was done through Pearson Correlation and Simple Regression analysis. The results of correlation in Table 1 shows a significant positive relationship ( $p < 0.01$ ,  $r = 0.46$ ) between employee engagement and contextual performance and hence supporting the stated hypothesis.

Table 1: Correlation between Employee Engagement and Contextual Performance

		EE	CP
EE	Pearson Correlation	1	.463**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.000
	N	231	231
CP	Pearson Correlation	.463**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	
	N	231	231

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

As the researcher has used single continuous independent variable, therefore simple regression analysis was applied for further verification of the relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance. The simple regression analysis result were determined through ANOVA and found F-value 62.65 significant at 0.05 for the relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance. Therefore, the results shown in Table 2 confirmed that employee engagement significantly predict the contextual performance.

Table 2: Analysis of Variance for Relationship between Employee Engagement and Contextual Performance

		ANOVA <sup>a</sup>				
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	14.135	1	14.135	62.647	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	51.669	229	.226		
	Total	65.805	230			

a. Dependent Variable: CP

b. Predictors: (Constant), EE

The slope and intercept were calculated in order to check the strength of the relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance. A constant value 1.351 and a slope of 0.498 of regression line for independent variable shown in Table 3 represents that one unit increase in employee engagement, can significantly predict a 0.498 units rise in contextual performance of the respondents.

Table 3: Coefficients of relationship of employee engagement and contextual performance

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	1.351	.197		6.848	.000			
	EE	.498	.063	.463	7.915	.000	.463	.463	.463
a. Dependent Variable: CP									

a. Dependent Variable: CP

A variance of 0.211 in contextual performance was calculated and the results are shown in Table 4. The R square of 0.211 demonstrating that 21.1 percent of variance in contextual performance can be count for employee's score on employee engagement.

Table 4: Model summary of relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance

Model	R	Model Summary							
		R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.463 <sup>a</sup>	.215	.211	.47501	.215	62.647	1	229	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), EE

## Discussion

The present study proposed that there is positive relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance. This relationship between independent and dependent variables was empirically examined. The results indicated significant positive relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance. The results of the present study were similar to the findings of Gorgievski, Bakker and Schaufeli (2010) who concluded significant positive connection between employee engagement and contextual performance calculated by a self-assessed UWES -9 item scale. Similarly Bakker, Demerouti, and ten Brummelhuis (2012), also determined the same positive relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance in developed countries.

## Conclusion, Limitations and Future Research Recommendations

The main aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance. The data of the study

was conveniently collected from 231 respondents and was measured through Pearson Correlation and Simple Regression analysis. The results of our study and previous studies conducted in developed countries confirmed the hypothesis that there is positive relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance.

This study contributed to the existing literature as there was no such study conducted in the context of teaching faculty working in private universities in developing country like Pakistan. As both the independent and dependent variables used in this study were related to behavior, therefore managers in universities and organization need to pay more attention on nurturing engagement. It will encourage employees to go beyond their job duties and achieve organization stated goals effectively and efficiently.

This study was a cross sectional study conducted on single point of time, the variations in relations to time were ignored, and therefore a longitudinal study shall be conducted to cover any variation over time in order to generalize its results. In addition, a future study shall also be conducted to cover other related variables with contextual performance such as task performance and counterproductive work behavior in relationship with employee engagement. Furthermore, the present study have collected data from private universities situated within developing countries. Therefore it is recommended that a comparative study of private and public universities in developing shall be conducted for the purpose to confirm significance and validity of this study.

## References List

- Avery, G., & Cameron, F. (1998) *The Enlargement of the European Union* (Vol. 1). Burns & Oates.
- Babcock-Roberson, M. E., & Strickland, O. J. (2010) The relationship between charismatic leadership, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Journal of Psychology*. 144(3). pp. 313-326.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & ten Brummelhuis, L. L. (2012) Work engagement, performance, and active learning: The role of conscientiousness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 80. pp. 555-564.
- Bhatla, N. (2011). To study the employee engagement practices and its effect on employee performance with special reference to ICICI and HDFC bank in Lucknow. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*. 2(8). pp. 1-7.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997) Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human performance*. 10(2). pp. 99-109.
- Britt, T. W., & Jex, S. M. (2008). Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach.
- Fleming, J. H., Coffman, C., & Harter, J. K. (2005) Manage your human sigma. *Harvard business review*. 83(7). p.106.
- Frese, M., Kring, W., Soose, A., & Zempel, J. (1996) Personal initiative at work: Differences between East and West Germany. *Academy of Management journal*. 39(1). pp. 37-63.
- Gebauer, J., Lowman, D., & Gordon, J. (2008) *Closing the Engagement Gap: How Great Companies Unlock Employee Potential for Superior Results*. Penguin.
- Goodman, S. A., & Svyantek, D. J. (1999) Person–organization fit and contextual performance: Do shared values matter. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 55(2). pp. 254-275.
- Gorgievski, M. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2010) Work engagement and workaholism: Comparing the self-employed and salaried employees. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*. 5(1). pp. 83-96.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990) Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*. 33(4). pp. 692-724.
- Kahn, W. A. (1992) To be fully there: Psychological presence at work. *Human Relations*. 45(4). pp. 321-349.
- LePine, J. A., Colquitt, J. A., & Erez, A. (2000) Adaptability to changing task contexts: Effects of general cognitive ability, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. *Personnel Psychology*. 53(3). pp. 563-593.

- Matamala, A. C., Pace, V. L., & Thometz, H. (2010) *Work engagement as a mediator between personality and citizenship behavior*. Interactive poster session at the 25th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994) Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 79(4). pp. 475.
- Ncube, F., & Jerie, S. (2012) Leveraging employee engagement for competitive advantage in the hospitality industry. A comparative study of hotels A and B in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences*. 3(4). pp. 380-388.
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010) Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*. 53(3). pp. 617-635.
- Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004) *The drivers of employee engagement*. Report-Institute for Employment Studies.
- Rurkkhum, S., & Bartlett, K. R. (2012) The relationship between employee engagement and organizational citizenship behaviour in Thailand. *Human Resource Development International*. 15(2). pp. 157-174.
- Sarang, S., & Srivastava, R. K. (2012) Impact of organizational culture and communication on employee engagement: An investigation of Indian private banks. *South Asian journal of management*. 19(3). pp. 18.
- 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). pp. 71-92.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002) An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*. 12(2). pp. 269-292.
- Truss, K., Soane, E., Edwards, C. Y. L., Wisdom, K., Croll, A., & Burnett, J. (2006) *Working life: employee attitudes and engagement 2006*. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Van Dyne, S. R. (1994) *Revising Life: Sylvia Plath's Ariel Poems*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996) Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 81(5). pp. 525.