

## **Relationship of Work Engagements and Job Performance of University Teachers**

Khadija Sittar\* and Abid Hussain Ch.\*\*

---

### **Abstract**

The research was conducted to find out the relationship of work engagement and job performance of university teachers. Quantitative approach was selected and correlation research design was used. The sample of the study was four hundred teachers of public and private universities of Central Punjab. Data were collected through questionnaire. Pearson product moment was applied to examine the correlation between work engagements with job performance at university level. Mean and standard deviation was calculated. One-way ANOVA and independent samples t-test were used to find the significant difference among demographic variables. The findings of the study indicated that there was a weak positive correlation between work engagements with job performance of university teachers.

**Keywords:** Work engagement, job performance.

---

\*PhD Scholar, Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore.  
Email: khadijasittar@gmail.com

\*\* Professor, Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore.

## **Introduction**

Work engagement is a positive, fulfilling, and work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. The vigor is characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience, vitality and flexibility during work, and being determined even in the face of difficulties during work (Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008). Dedication is the state in which an individual shows complete enthusiasm and involvement for work, and there is a practical effort, passion, respect and challenging task. Absorption means that an individual is deeply focused and determined engrossed in working, while the time moves rapidly (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004).

Work engagement is a construct that captures the ideas which involves different varieties among individuals and the extent to which they put effort and dedication to complete their work (Kahn, 1999). It is well defined as the concurrent engagement and impression of an individual own task which encourages relation to work with others, one's individual existence and the outcome. Almost all researchers are agreed to the subjectivity of engagement of work. There were different points of views about its conceptualization. Engaged employees have higher energy levels and are very optimistic and excited to do work and they are deeply involved in their work and never get to know that time flies (Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008).

Work engagement is distinguished from related concept like the embeddedness of job (Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2008), workaholic and complete assurance and commitment to organization (Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006). The general conceptualization about the work engagement in research is reasonably of a constant variable because there is a continuous availability of a particular work and characteristics of an organization (Macey & Schneider, 2008). However, it can be considered that there are temporary (day to day or weekly) variations in engagement of work (Sonnentag, 2003).

As it is comparatively a new concept, work engagement is becoming a frequent topic of research extending along a continuum from job performance. Clearly, the researches in recent times showed that job performance is increased by work engagement (Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006). Resources of the job are considered as interpreter of work engagement, specifically when demands of jobs are high. The employees that are engaged and have a great wisdom of strengthen and active relations with the activities of work and they consider them as capable of dealing with the requirements of their job (Bakker, 2009).

Job performance has significant importance as the employees' behavior influences the organizational objectives directly as well as indirectly (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Job performance has been explained well as the generally predicted significance of the behavior of employees over a specific period. However, it involves the particular concept of value that behavior is the strength to job performance and simply explained as what the individuals do and how they perform their job tasks. Job performance comprises of performing tasks, in-role, contextual, or extra-role performances. The association among the employee engagement and job performance is related with the commitment toward the organization. The employees who were engaged highly with their work and job tasks, they also emphasize on their physical efforts and the task relevant goals, but they were also rational and emotionally linked to the organization (Kahn, 1999). This study observes the relationship among work engagement and commitment of organization by performance of teachers in university.

Teachers' performance is principally contingent on the features of teacher such as based on information, their accountability and imagination and the characteristics of students such as learning prospects, theoretical work; teaching features such as structure of a lesson and interaction; learning factors such as: the organization and management, classroom phenomena such as atmosphere (Bishay, 1996).

Teacher appearance and exit examination scores, experience, advanced degrees, dependent on the knowledge, curiosity and accountability and the features of the trainee that are prospects for learning, the work in academics, the organization of the lesson and the characteristics of learning that are involvement and accomplishment and the occurrence in the class i.e. atmosphere and surroundings, and the organization. If the teacher gives due consideration to these factors, their performance will be improved to an optimal level (Bishay, 1996). Teacher examines scoring of entrance and exit and the experience of years, degrees and advanced degrees and the teaching qualification are not relevant to the achievement of students and the efficacy of teachers. The teaching quality and excellence of teaching have been gradually decreased worldwide, that exhibits that the teaching skills have been depressive and nonoperational from teachers and there are immobilized reimbursement strategies by the institutions of education (Crossman & Harris, 2006).

The review of literature is give understanding about engagement involved with both employment execution and work Engagement. Work execution was collected budgetary and non-money related incentive by the representatives which were focused on hierarchical objectives and commitment to the satisfaction. Engagement impacts categorized performance, for example, fulfillment of work, efficiency, turnover, responsibility of authoritative engagement, and security (Davis, 2000). There is

association between ordered performance and representatives' mentalities. In this manner, authoritative performance lists are high when it brings inspiring states of mind among laborers. Work performance and authoritative performance was immediate outcome of representative engagement (Imran, Arif, Cheema, & Azeem, 2014).

As a multifaceted phenomenon performance, Arvey and Murphy (1998) emphasize the importance of individual and contextual factors in the work environment in the conceptual definition. However performance can be defined based on the nature of the work, and it is underpinned in the individual capacity of workers to adapt occupations that are constantly changing. Based on the conceptual grouping of individual job-performance dimensions found in the literature, Koopmans, Bernaards, Hildebrandt, Schaufeli, de Vet, and van der Beek (2011) identified four major dimensions: (1) execution of tasks, (2) contextual performance, (3) counterproductive work behavior, and (4) adaptive performance. Coelho Jr. (2009) and Sonnentag and Frese (2002) emphasize that performance is closely related to actions relevant to the achievement of organizational goals, so that not all behaviors expressed by individuals can be translated into performance, only those that are desired for the implementation of the office and are related to the duties and performance of tasks.

Different studies related job performance like Arvey and Murphy (1998) described the importance of individual and contextual factors in the work engagement. Based on the conceptual grouping of individual job-performance dimensions found in the literature, Koopmans, Bernaards, Hildebrandt, Schaufeli, de Vet, and van der Beek (2011) identified four major dimensions: (1) execution of tasks, (2) contextual performance, (3) counterproductive work behavior, and (4) adaptive performance. Coelho Jr. (2009) and Sonnentag and Frese (2002) emphasize that performance is closely related to actions relevant to the achievement of organizational goals, so that not all behaviors expressed by individuals can be translated into performance, only those that are desired for the implementation to the duties and performance of tasks.

### **The Objectives of the Study**

The objectives of the study were to:

1. Explore the relationship between work engagements and job performance of university teachers.
2. Find out the difference between work engagements and job performance of public and private university teachers
3. Find out difference between work engagements and job performance of university teachers based on their demographic variables e.g. gender, university types departments, designation, qualification and experience.

### Research Questions

The research questions of the study were:

1. What is the relationship between work engagements and job performance of university teachers?
2. What is the difference between work engagements and job performance of public and private university teachers?
3. Find out difference between work engagements and job performance of university teachers based on their demographic variables e.g. gender, university types, departments, designation, qualification and experience.

### Research Methodology

#### Research Design

Keeping in view the significant nature of the problem under investigation, appropriate study can be designed and its reporting format can be organized in a number of ways. The nature of the research study was descriptive and correlation design was used.

#### Population

The target population of the study consisted of all public and private universities located in the Central Punjab. The rationale for selecting Central Punjab as a population is its overall greater percentage of population as compared to other zones of the Punjab, and the number of universities in Central Punjab is comparatively more than other zones. The detail of universities in Central Punjab is given below:

Table 1

*Higher Education Commission Recognized General type of Universities in Central Punjab*

| Type Of Universities | Total |
|----------------------|-------|
| Public universities  | 9     |
| Private universities | 12    |
| Total universities   | 21    |

Source: [www.hec.edu.pk](http://www.hec.edu.pk)

#### Sample of the study

Sampling of the study was conducted in the following stages:

##### Stage One

At the first stage, five public and five private general types of universities were selected from the central Punjab.

Table 2  
*Sample Distribution of Public and Private Sector Universities*

| Sr # | Public Sector Universities                | Private Sector Universities                     |
|------|---|---|
| 1    | University of the Punjab                  | Beacon House National University, Lahore        |
| 2    | University of Gujrat, Gujrat              | University of Lahore, Lahore                    |
| 3    | University of Education, Lahore           | University of Management and Technology, Lahore |
| 4    | University of Sargodha, Sargodha          | The University of Faisalabad                    |
| 5    | Government College University, Faisalabad | The Minhaj University, Lahore.                  |

**Stage Two**

At the second stage, three similar departments (Education, Sociology and Economic) were selected from each university. Social sciences departments were selected from ten general types of universities

Table 3  
*Description of the Sample on the Basis of Departments*

| Departments | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------|-----------|---------|
| Education   | 120       | 42.5    |
| Sociology   | 70        | 38.2    |
| Economic    | 77        | 19.2    |
| Total       | 400       | 100     |

It shows that 170 (42.5%) teachers were taken from Education and 153 (38.2%) teachers were taken from Sociology and 77 (19.2%) teachers were taken from Economics departments from the public and the private universities.

**Stage three**

At the third stage census sampling technique was used to select teachers according to their demographic characteristics (Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Lectures).

Table 4  
*Description of the Sample on the Basis of Gender*

| Gender | Frequency | Percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|
| Male   | 194       | 48.5    |
| Female | 206       | 51.5    |
| Total  | 400       | 100     |

Table shows that there were 194 male and 206 female teachers from public and private universities. The total sample consisted of 400 teachers

Table 5  
*Description of the Sample on the Basis of Designation*

|                     | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|-----------|---------|
| Lecturer            | 200       | 50      |
| Assistant Professor | 109       | 27.2    |
| Associate Professor | 51        | 12.8    |
| Professor           | 40        | 10      |

It shows that 200 (50%) teachers were Lecturers, 109 (27.2%) were Assistant Professors, 51 (12.8%) were Associate Professors and 40(10%) teachers were Professors.

### **Instrumentation**

Questionnaire was used for the data collection. Questionnaire for teachers consisted of two parts; first part of questionnaire was related to the demographic variables of the teachers (gender, experience, teacher's designation and academic qualification) and second part was related to the work engagement and its factors (Vigor, Dedication, and Absorption) and job performance of the teachers (teaching skills, management skills, discipline and regularity, and interpersonal relations).

Every item rated on five point likert type scale; 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

### **Data Collection**

Data were collected through questionnaire from teachers of public and private universities of Central Punjab. Questionnaires were personally administered and collected from the respondents on the given time.

### **Data Analysis**

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. Data were analyzed by using inferential statistics and descriptive statistics. Pearson-r was applied to examine the correlation among work engagement with job performance of university teachers. Mean and Standard Deviation were calculated. One Way ANOVA and independent sample t-test were used to see the significance of difference among demographic variables (gender, experience, teachers' designation and academic qualification).

### Data Analysis and Interpretation

Table 6  
*Mean and Standard Deviation of Work Engagement and its Sub Factors*

| Factors    | Minimum | Maximum | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|------------|---------|---------|----------|-----------|
| Vigor      | 8       | 25      | 20.36    | 2.872     |
| Dedication | 6       | 25      | 21.97    | 2.845     |
| Absorption | 8       | 25      | 21.11    | 2.713     |

Table 6 shows that mean value of Dedication was high ( $M = 21.9$ ,  $SD = 2.845$ ), mean value of absorption was moderate ( $M = 21.11$ ,  $SD = 2.713$ ) and the mean value of vigor was low ( $M = 20.35$ ,  $SD = 2.872$ ), and It showed that the mean of dedication is higher than the other factors.

Table 7  
*Mean and Standard Deviation of Job Performance and its Sub Factors*

| Factors                    | Minimum | Maximum | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|----------------------------|---------|---------|----------|-----------|
| Teaching Assessment Skills | 16      | 35      | 30.47    | 3.595     |
| Management Skills          | 11      | 28      | 21.41    | 2.583     |
| Discipline And Regularity  | 11      | 36      | 26.82    | 3.246     |
| Interpersonal Relations    | 17      | 30      | 25.77    | 3.255     |

Table 7 shows that mean value for the factors of teaching assessment skills was high ( $M = 30.47$ ,  $SD = 3.595$ ), the mean value of discipline and regularity was moderate ( $M = 26.82$ ,  $SD = 3.246$ ) and Interpersonal Relations was also moderate ( $M = 25.77$ ,  $SD = 3.255$ ) and mean value of management skills was low ( $M = 21.41$ ,  $SD = 2.583$ ) It is concluded that the mean of teaching assessment skills is higher than the other factors.

Hence, it is concluded that the job performance factor (teaching assessment skills) was more focused by the teachers as compared to the other factors (management skills, discipline and regularity and interpersonal relations).

Table 8  
*Relationship between Vigor Dimension of Work Engagement and Job Performance*

| Variables                 | <i>N</i> | <i>r</i> -value | Sig. |
|---------------------------|----------|-----------------|------|
| Vigor and job performance | 400      | .367            | .000 |

Table 8 shows the results of Pearson Product moment correlation test which was performed to identify the relationship between job performance and Vigor dimension of work engagement at university level. The first dimension of work engagement is Vigor and it showed moderate significant correlation with job performance. The *r*-value shows that there was moderate relationship  $r = .367$  at  $p = .000$  between the two variables. It means substantial relation exists between the job performance of teacher and Vigor dimension of work engagement.



Table 9

*Relationship between Dedication dimensions of Work Engagement and job performance*

| Variables                      | N   | r-value | Sig. |
|--------------------------------|-----|---------|------|
| Dedication and job performance | 400 | .272    | .000 |

Table 9 shows the outcome of the correlation test which was performed to identify the relationship between job performance and Dedication dimension of work engagement at university level. The second dimension of work engagement is Dedication that showed significant correlation with performance of job. The *r*-value depicts that there was weak correlation ( $r = .272$  at  $p=.000$ ) between the dedication and job performance of teachers. It showed weak relation between job performance of teachers and dedication dimension of work engagement.

Table 10

*Relationship between Absorption dimensions of Work Engagement and job performance*

| Variables                      | N   | r-value | Sig. |
|--------------------------------|-----|---------|------|
| Absorption and job performance | 400 | .232    | .000 |

Table 10 shows the outcome of test correlation which was performed to identify the relationship between job performance and Absorption dimension of work engagement at university level. The third dimension of work engagement is Absorption and it is showing significant correlation with performance of job. The *r*-value depicts that there was weak correlation ( $r = .232$  at  $p=.000$ ) between Absorption and job performance. It showed weak relation between job performance of teachers and dedication dimension of work engagement.

Table 11

*Relationship of Work Engagement with Job Performance (N =400)*

|                                     | N   | r-value | Sig. |
|-------------------------------------|-----|---------|------|
| Work Engagement and Job Performance | 400 | .391**  | .000 |

Table 11 shows the relationship between work engagement and job performance of teachers. There was significant moderate correlation ( $r=.391^{**}$  at  $p =.000$ ) between work engagement and job performance of teachers. It is concluded that there was moderate relationship between work engagement and job performance of teachers.

Table 12

*Independent Samples t-test Identify the Difference between the Male and Female Teachers regarding Work Engagement*

| Variables       | Gender | N   | Mean  | SD    | t-value | df  | Sig. |
|-----------------|--------|-----|-------|-------|---------|-----|------|
| Work Engagement | Male   | 194 | 63.65 | 6.466 | .678    | 398 | .498 |
|                 | Female | 206 | 63.23 | 6.122 |         |     |      |

Table 12 shows that independent samples *t*-test was applied to find out the difference between male and female teachers regarding work engagement. Results showed that there was no significant difference between male ( $M = 63.65, SD = 6.466$ ) and female teachers  $M = 63.23, SD = 6.122, t(398) = .678$  at  $p = .498$ , regarding work engagement in institutions.

Table 13  
*Independent Samples t-test to identify the Difference between the Male and Female Teachers regarding Job Performance*

| Variable        | Gender | <i>N</i> | Mean   | <i>SD</i> | <i>t</i> -value | <i>Df</i> | Sig. |
|-----------------|--------|----------|--------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|------|
| Job Performance | Male   | 194      | 104.92 | 8.936     | .950            | 398       | .343 |
|                 | Female | 206      | 104.04 | 9.529     |                 |           |      |

Table 13 shows that an independent-samples *t*-test was applied to check the difference between male and female teachers regarding their job performance. Results showed that there was no difference in the male ( $M = 104.92, SD = 8.936$ ) and female teachers scores  $M = 104.04, SD = 9.529, t(398) = .950, p = .342$  regarding their job performance.

Table 14  
*Independent Samples t-test to identify the Difference between the Public and Private Universities Teachers regarding Work Engagement*

| University | <i>N</i> | Mean  | <i>SD</i> | <i>t</i> -value | <i>df</i> | Sig. |
|------------|----------|-------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|------|
| Public     | 273      | 63.60 | 6.52      | .755            | 398       | .450 |
| Private    | 127      | 63.09 | 5.78      |                 |           |      |

Table 14 shows that an independent-samples *t*-test was applied to identify the difference between public and private universities teachers regarding work engagement. There was no significant difference between the public ( $M = 63.60, SD = 6.52$ ) and private universities teachers  $M = 63.09, SD = 5.78, t(398) = .76, p = .450$  in the work engagement. Therefore, it is concluded that both public and private universities teachers have the same views about work engagement.

Table 15  
*Independent Samples t-test to identify the Difference between the Public and Private Universities Teachers regarding Job Performance*

| University | <i>N</i> | Mean   | <i>SD</i> | <i>t</i> -value | <i>df</i> | Sig. |
|------------|----------|--------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|------|
| Public     | 273      | 104.10 | 9.83      | -1.273          | 302.764   | .204 |
| Private    | 127      | 105.26 | 7.83      |                 |           |      |

Table 15 shows that an independent-samples t-test was applied to find out the difference between universities teachers regarding job performance. There was no significant difference in the job performance of the teachers of public ( $M = 104.10$ ,  $SD = 9.825$ ) and private universities  $M = 105.26$ ,  $SD = 7.834$ ,  $t(302.764) = -1.27$ ,  $p = .204$ . Therefore, it is concluded that teachers of public and private sector universities had same opinions regarding their job performance.

Table 16

*One way ANOVA for the Difference among Teachers' Opinion about Work Engagement on the Basis of Different Departments*

| Variable        |                | sum of squares | df  | Mean Square | f    | Sig. |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| Work Engagement | between groups | 31.473         | 2   | 15.736      | .397 | .673 |
|                 | within groups  | 15740.837      | 397 | 39.649      |      |      |
|                 | Total          | 15772.310      | 399 |             |      |      |

Table 16 depicts that one way ANOVA was applied to identify difference in the opinions of teachers about work engagement. There was no significant difference  $F(2, 397) = .397$ ,  $p = .673$  in work engagement of teachers on the basis of their different departments. It is concluded that there was no significant difference in work engagement of teachers on the basis of departments.

Table 17

*One way ANOVA for the Difference among teachers' Opinions about Job Performance on the Basis of Different Departments*

| Variable        |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | f    | Sig. |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| Job Performance | Between Groups | 122.103        | 2   | 61.051      | .713 | .491 |
|                 | Within Groups  | 33983.407      | 397 | 85.601      |      |      |
|                 | Total          | 34105.510      | 399 |             |      |      |

Table 17 showed that One-way ANOVA was applied to identify difference in the job performance of university teachers. There was no difference  $F(2, 397) = .713$ ,  $p = .491$  in job performance of teachers on the basis of departments (Education, Sociology and Economics).

Table 18

*One way ANOVA for the Difference among teachers' Opinions about Work Engagement on the Basis of Qualification*

| Variable        |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | f     | Sig. |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Work Engagement | Between Groups | 568.182        | 2   | 284.091     | 7.418 | .001 |
|                 | Within Groups  | 15204.128      | 397 | 38.298      |       |      |
|                 | Total          | 15772.310      | 399 |             |       |      |

Table 18 depicts that One-way analysis of variance was applied to identify difference in the work engagement of teachers. Results indicate that there was significant difference  $F(2, 397) = 7.418, p = .001$  in work engagement of teachers on the basis of their qualification. It is concluded teachers have different perceptions about work engagement on the basis of their qualification.

Table 19

*One way ANOVA for the Difference among Teachers' Opinions about Job Performance on the basis of Qualification*

| Variable        |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Job Performance | Between Groups | 183.744        | 2   | 91.872      | 1.075 | .342 |
|                 | Within Groups  | 33921.766      | 397 | 85.445      |       |      |
|                 | Total          | 34105.510      | 399 |             |       |      |

Table 19 shows that one way analysis of variance was run to identify difference in the job performance of university teachers. Results indicate that there was no significant difference  $F(2, 397) = 1.075, p = .342$  in job performance of teachers on the basis of their qualification.

Table 20

*One way ANOVA for the Difference among Teachers' Opinions about Work Engagement on the Basis of Designation*

| Variable        |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | f     | Sig. |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Work Engagement | Between Groups | 137.381        | 3   | 45.794      | 1.160 | .325 |
|                 | Within Groups  | 15634.929      | 396 | 39.482      |       |      |
|                 | Total          | 15772.310      | 399 |             |       |      |

Table 20 shows that one way analysis of variance was run to check the difference in the work engagement of university teachers. Results indicated that there was no significant difference  $F(3, 396) = 1.160, p = .325$  in work engagement of teachers on the basis of teachers designation. It is concluded that teachers have different perceptions about work engagement on the basis of their designation.

Table 21

*One way ANOVA for the Difference among Teachers' Opinions about Job Performance on the Basis of Designation*

| Variable        |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | f     | Sig. |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Job Performance | Between Groups | 832.988        | 3   | 277.663     | 3.305 | .020 |
|                 | Within Groups  | 33272.522      | 396 | 84.022      |       |      |
|                 | Total          | 34105.510      | 399 |             |       |      |

Table 21 shows that One-Way ANOVA was applied to check the difference in the job performance of university teachers. Results indicated that there was significant difference  $F(3, 396) = 3.305, p = .020$  in job performance of teachers on the basis of their designation. It is concluded that teachers have different perceptions about job performance on the basis of their designation.

Table 22

*One way ANOVA for the Difference among Teachers Opinions about Work Engagement on the Basis of Experience*

| Variable   |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | f     | Sig. |
|------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Work       | Between Groups | 446.054        | 3   | 148.685     | 3.842 | .010 |
| Engagement | Within Groups  | 15326.256      | 396 | 38.703      |       |      |
|            | Total          | 15772.310      | 399 |             |       |      |

Table 22 shows that one way ANOVA was applied to identify the difference in work engagement of university teachers. Results indicated that there was significant difference  $F(3, 396) = 3.842, p = .010$  in work engagement of teachers on the basis of their teaching experience.

Table 23

*One way ANOVA for the Difference among Teachers Opinions about Job Performance on the Basis of Experience*

| Variable    |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | f     | Sig. |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Job         | Between Groups | 399.156        | 3   | 133.052     | 1.563 | .198 |
| Performance | Within Groups  | 33706.354      | 396 | 85.117      |       |      |
|             | Total          | 34105.510      | 399 |             |       |      |

Table showed that One-way ANOVA was applied to identify difference in the job performance of university teachers. Results indicated that there was no significant difference  $F(3, 396) = 1.563, p = .198$  in job performance of teachers on the basis of their job experience. It means that there was no significant difference in job performance of teachers on the basis of their teaching experience

## Discussion

The current study explored the relationship of the work engagement with job performance of university teachers. The result of correlation analysis generally supported the proposed relationship that works engagement are correlated with the job performance of university teachers. As it has been noticed, the researchers had reported the finding similar this study, work engagement had positive relationship with performance of in and extra roles (Bakker, Tims, & Derks, (2012b); Kim, Kolb, & Kim, (2013); Xanthopoulou, Baker, Heuven, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, (2008), and the accretion of resources of the job

(Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004; Leiter & Bakker, 2010), the practice of optimistic sensations (Frederickson, 2001; Frederickson & Branigan, 2005), and the well-being physical and psychological (Salanova, Schaufeli, Xanthopoulou, & Bakker, 2010) make the promising affiliation.

A recent work done by Alessandri, Borgogni, Schaufeli, Caprara, and Consiglio (2014) showed the association among engagement and performance to be positive as per the evaluations received and also figured out that work engagement intercedes the association among positive orientation (showing and increasing authenticity in a positive way) and the performance. These results indicate that effectiveness of engagement is the milestone for individual success at work, and it also inspires that the individual's optimistic view of life might have a positive performance and engagement association.

Results of correlation analysis generally supported the proposed relationship that work engagement was correlated with the job performance. The research depicted that work engagement had correlation with the job performance.

## **Conclusions**

The aim of the study was to find out the relationship between work engagement and job performance at university teachers. Correlation research design was used to find the relationship among work engagement and job performance at university teachers. Population of the study were five public and five private general type universities located in Central Punjab. The sample of the study was teachers of public and private universities of the Central Punjab. In the light of results, it is concluded that work engagement had positive relationship with the job performance of teachers. The study concludes that all factors of work engagement vigor, dedication and absorption had a positive correlation with job performance. The result showed that there is no significant difference between public and private university sectors. The different approaches and dimensions of job performance were discussed as well as the different methods for conducting performance appraisal. There were also finding out the difference among work engagement and job performance of university teachers which showed significant difference among male and female university teachers.

## **Recommendations**

According to the outcomes extracted from the research the following recommendations are given.

1. The universities may provide resources to foster employee growth learning and development to increase employee engagement and job performance
2. The organization may increase the cooperation among employees in order to increase the relationship in every department.

3. Furthermore, the teachers may be a helpful, supportive, developing understanding with their colleagues. This will ultimately increase the performance level of the employees and can inspire the desire to assist the colleagues. Giving ample chances for up gradation will maximize the satisfaction of worker
4. Findings of the study were that the reward advantages might be included in the form of educational allowances of employees, increments in pay, permits in the form of gift, recreation for their creative work and upgrades.

## References

- Alessandri, G., Borgogni, L., Schaufeli, W. B., Caprara, G., & Consiglio, C. (2014). From positive orientation to job performance: The role of work engagement and self-efficacy beliefs. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 97(35), 121-134.
- Bakker, A. B. (2009). Building engagement in the workplace. In R. J. Burke & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *The peak performing organization* (pp. 50–72). Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: an emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work and Stress*, 56(22), 187-200.
- Bambacas, M. (2010). Organizational handling of careers influences managers' organizational commitment. *Journal of Management Development*, 29(9), 807-827.
- Bishay, A. (1996). Teacher motivation and job satisfaction: A study employing the experience sampling method. *Journal of Undergraduate Sciences*, 3(1), 147-154.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Chan, C. C., & Chew, J. (2008). Human resource practices, organizational commitment and intention to stay. *International Journal of Manpower*, 29(6), 503-522.
- Chew, C. C. (2008). Human resource practices, organizational commitment and intention to stay. *International Journal of Manpower*, 66(29), 20-29.
- Crossman, A., & Harris, P. (2006). Job satisfaction of secondary school teachers. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 34(1), 29-46.
- Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43(2), 495–513.

- Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Wheeler, A. R. (2008). The relative roles of engagement and embeddedness in predicting job performance and intention to leave. *Work and Stress, 66*(22), 242–256.
- Hallberg, U., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). ‘Same ’ but different: Can work engagement be discriminated from job involvement and organizational commitment? *European Journal of Psychology, 66*(11), 119–127.
- Kahn, W. A. (1999). To be full there: Psychological presence at work. *Journal of Human Relations, 88*(45), 321–349.
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 11*(1), 3–30.
- May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability and the engagement of human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 149*(77), 11–37.
- McElroy, J. C., & Morrow, P. C. (2010). The relationship between career growth and organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 77*(3), 391–400.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (2008). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 134*(78), 538–51.
- Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: A new look at the interface between non work and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 211*(88), 518–528.