

An Overview of Job Engagement in Jerash Private University: Job Engagement and its Influence on Job Performance

Dr. Hamzeh AlHawamdeh
Jerash Private University

Eslam Al-Hawamdeh
Ministry of Finance

Aya Faour,
Knowledge engineering- Communicative executive

Abstract

The purpose of this study mainly focus on testing the relationship of job engagement and job performance in Jerash private university. The results of this research concerned with three dimensions of engagement summarized in physical, emotional, and cognitive as next; there is no relationship between employee's physical engagement and employee performance, positive relationship between emotional engagement and employee performance, no relationship between cognitive engagement and employee performance, and positive relationship of employee engagement influences on employee performance. The study is based on exploratory--descriptive research design, with a structured questionnaire is, essentially, verbally administered, predetermined questions asked, with little or no variation and with no scope for follow-up questions to responses. A sample of 50 employees had been selected to represent Jerash University

Keywords: Job performance, Job engagement, Physical engagement, Emotional engagement, Cognitive engagement.

1. INTRODUCTION

As employees' behavior is a crucial factor for organizational success, the question on what we will gain from the engagement of employees in their work and boost their implication in the innovation process is central for companies. For companies and countries to remain competitive, one of the imperatives is to innovate (Van Hootegem, 2012). The companies' workforce is an essential partner in each innovation process. They are the sources of ideas, responsible for the implementation or can render innovation attempts futile when dissatisfied.

1.1 Operational Definitions

Job performance: Job performance relates to the act of doing a job. Job performance is a means to reach a goal or set of goals within a job, role, or organization (Campbell, 1990), but not the actual consequences of the acts performed within a job. Campbell (1990) affirms that job performance is not a single action but rather a "complex activity" (p. 704). Performance in a job is strictly a behavior and a separate entity from the outcomes of a particular job which relate to success and productivity.

Job engagement: Job engagement is a workplace approach resulting in the right conditions for all members of an organization to give of their best each day, committed to their organization's goals and values, motivated to contribute to organizational success, with an enhanced sense of their own well-being. **Employee engagement** is based on trust, integrity, two way commitment and communication between an organization and its members. It is an approach that increases the chances of business success, contributing to organizational and individual performance, productivity and well-being. It can be measured. It varies from poor to great. It can be nurtured and dramatically increased; it can lose and be thrown away.

1.2 State Of Problem

This research introduces the emerging concept of job engagement: a positive, fulfilling, affective-motivational state of work-related well-being that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. Although there are different views of job engagement, most scholars agree that engaged employees have high levels of energy and identify strongly with their work. Research on engagement has investigated how engagement differs from related concepts (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational commitment), and has focused on the most important predictors of job engagement. These studies have revealed that engagement is a unique concept that is best predicted by job engagement caused by job autonomy, social support and coaching, performance feedback, opportunities to learn and to develop task variety, responsibility, transformational leadership, and value fit. Moreover, the first studies have shown that job engagement is predictive of job performance and client satisfaction. The research presents an overview of the concept of job engagement, and offers a brief conclusion about best of related subjects.

1.3 Study Objectives

The goals of this study were to identify an agreed-upon definition of engagement, to investigate its uniqueness, and to clarify some related concepts

- To which extent the Job Engagement in Jarash private university is existed
- To detect the importance of Job Engagement in raising the quality of employee's performance.

1.4 The Importance Of Study

People who are engaged in their jobs, those who are enthusiastic and involved in their day to day work tend to do better work. This statement makes intuitive sense to most people and is our basic premise in this study.

- 1- The study contributes to determine the functional levels of the job engagement in the organization
- 2-The study could benefit the stakeholders of exploiting job engagement in achieving the goals of the organization more effectively.

1.5 Hypothesis

- 1 There is a relationship between Physical engagement and employee performance.
- 2 There is no relationship between Emotional engagement and employee performance.
- 3 There is a positive relationship between Cognitive engagement and employee performance.
- 4 Employees' job engagement has positive influences on their job performance.

1.6 Methodology

The study is based on exploratory descriptive research design, There are structured questionnaire will be followed: Structured questionnaire is, essentially, verbally administrated, predetermined questions will be asked, with little or no variation and with no scope for follow-up questions to responses order to ask questions that are likely to yield as much information about the case study to address the aims of the research . A sample of 50 employees had been selected to represent Jarash University.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Employees are one of the most important assets of an organization, and with more advanced industries and specific services, high quality skills are required more, especially at a time when human resource market has become more competitive as a result of globalization.

To compete effectively, companies not only must recruit the top talent, but must inspire employees to apply their full capabilities to their work .thus modern organizations expect their employees to be proactive and show initiative, take responsibility for their own professional development, and to be committed to high quality performance standards. They need employees who feel energetic and dedicated – i.e., who are engaged with their work, job engagement can make a true difference for employees and may offer organizations a competitive advantage (Bakker & Leiter, 2011).

2.2 Job Engagement

Employee engagement is the extent to which employees feel passionate about their jobs, are committed to the organization, and put discretionary effort into their work, and Engaged workers feel positively about their situation, but beyond mere satisfaction they are motivated to expend energy on a task. (Inceoglu & Warr, 2012).

Job engagement has been referred to as a developing positive phenomenon in the realm of positive psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000).

Recent studies illustrated that Job engagement is an experiential state; it is a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (lu & guy,2014). Vigor is described as 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. And absorption is characterized by being deeply engrossed in one's work to such an extent that one may have difficulty detaching from it (Xanthopoulou, D., et al., 2009).

From the perspective of Kahn, job engagement is best described as a multidimensional motivational concept reflecting the simultaneous investment of an individual's physical, cognitive, and emotional energy in active, full work performance. (kahn,1990)

2.3 Characteristics Of Engaged People.

Job engagement is a positive, affective-motivational state of fulfillment that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption.

(Schaufeli et al 2001) and those who engaged with their works characterized by;

- Are active agents.

- Believe in themselves.
 - Generate their own positive feedback.
 - Have values that match with the organization.
 - Sometimes feel tired, but satisfied.
 - Are also engaged outside work.
 - Engagement is caused by...
 - Job autonomy.
 - Social support and coaching.
 - Performance feedback.
 - opportunities to learn and to develop.
 - Task variety.
 - Responsibility.
 - Transformational leadership.
 - Value fit.
 - Organizational justice.
- AND RELATED TO ; *Engagement is related to ...*
- Emotional stability.
 - Extraversion.
 - Conscientiousness.
 - Optimism.
 - Self-esteem (organization based).
 - Achievement striving.
 - Self-efficacy.
 - Flexibility, adaptability.
 - Adaptive perfectionism (e.g. personal standards).
 - MEANS THAT ; *Engagement is related to ...*
 - Very low levels anxiety and depression.
 - Excellent perceived physical health.
 - Low levels of burnout.
 - Positive emotions.
 - Reactivity of the HPA (Hypothalamic-Pituitary-Adrenal) –axis
 - Quick recovery after yesterday’s effort. (Schaufeli,2011).

2.4 Job Engagement And Organizational Commitment

Employee engagement and organizational commitments are critical organizational requirements as organizations face globalization and recovering from the global recession. Engagements at work, employee and organizational commitment have been areas of interest among many researchers and they have received huge recognitions among scholars and studies.

Organizational commitment is defined as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization and can be characterized by a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values, willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization and a strong desire to maintain membership of the organization” (Mowday, and steer, 1982).

2.5 Affected And Affected By?

2.5.1 Job Engagement & Job Performance

Here we define job performance as the aggregated value to an organization of the set of behaviors that an employee contributes both directly and indirectly to organizational goals (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Campbell, 1990).

We chose a behavioral conceptualization of job performance because Engagement is a concept that reflects human agency, and thus it is appropriate to focus on consequences that are largely under an employee’s volitional control. Moreover, because behavioral

Performance has multiple dimensions; this perspective can provide insight into the specific types of employee behaviors that transmit the effects of engagement to more “objective” outcomes, such as productivity, efficiency, and quality.

2.5.2 Job Engagement And Job Satisfaction

Employees who are engaged in their work are fully connected with their work roles. They are bursting with energy, dedicated to their work, and immersed in their work activities. The studies showed that job and personal

resources are the main predictors of engagement. These resources gain their salience in the context of high job demands. Engaged workers are more open to new information, more productive, and more willing to go the extra mile. Moreover, engaged workers proactively change their work environment in order to stay engaged. The findings of previous studies are integrated in an overall model that can be used to develop work engagement and advance job performance in today's workplace.

Employee Satisfaction only indicates how happy or content your employees are. It does not address their level of motivation, involvement, or emotional commitment. For some employees, being satisfied means collecting a paycheck while doing as little work as possible.

Measuring employee satisfaction and making changes to increase employee satisfaction will not necessarily lead to increased performance. In fact, the conditions that make many employees "satisfied" with their jobs are likely to frustrate high performing employees. Top performers want to be challenged and to challenge the status. They embrace change, seek out ways to improve, and want all employees to be held accountable for delivering results. By contrast, low performing employees often cling to the status quo, resist change, and avoid accountability whenever possible.

2.6 Job Engagement And Personality

Given that job engagement is associated with identifiable personality features as well as with certain job characteristics, it is important to consider their possible mode of combination. First, are certain personality traits independently associated with job engagement over and above job feature. (Xanthopoulou, et al 2009) reported personal features in terms of combined optimism, self-efficacy and organization-based self-esteem.

Second, might job and personality variables *interact* with each other, such that personality traits moderate the association between particular job features and worker engagement?

In practical terms, the paper has emphasized that engagement within an organization or work-group is in part a function of the characteristics of employees selected for membership. Thus, in addition to possible enhancement of engagement from improved job design, typical engagement levels can be increased through personnel selection procedures that focus on the identification of emotional stability and activated forms of extraversion and conscientiousness. In addition, information about those traits can be valuable in the development of job engagement through person-focused task assignments and the setting of targets that build on specific individuals' own strengths and energies. (Inceoglu and Warr, 2012).

2.7 Job Performance.

As stated previously, the overarching purpose of this research is to provide insight into the role that engagement plays in relationships with job performance. Here we define job performance as the aggregated value to an organization of the set of behaviors that an employee contributes both directly and indirectly to organizational goals (Borman, Motowidlo, 1993), (Campbell, 1990). In other word is the way employees perform their work. (Pritchard et al., 1992). On a very general level job performance can be defined as "all the behaviors' employees engage in while at work". (Jex 2002 p. 88).

2.7.1 The Dimension Of Job Performance.

Historically, there have been three approaches to define the dimensions of job performance. (Milkovich et al 1991 p. 48):

1. As a function of outcomes.

Performance outcomes represent a subset of valued learning outcomes that will be measured in the performance task. Performance outcomes are written so that they can be applied across courses and topics/units of study within the discipline. Outcomes may include enduring understandings, essential skills, or habits of mind.

2. As a function of behavior.

The manner in which a thing acts under specified conditions or circumstances, or in relationship to other things (behaviour as defined by the Oxford English Dictionary).

Gilbert (1998) said that performance has two aspects — behavior being the means and its consequence being the end.

As Pinker notes (1997), behavior itself did not evolve, what evolved was the mind. Behavior is the outcome of an internal struggle among many mental models that are defined by other people's behavior. That is, what we perceive defines what we believe. And this belief or perception is what guides our behavior. However, belief is strongly influenced by what we are thinking, what we know, and the surrounding environment at the time.

3. As a function of personal traits.

Large-scale research using data from tens of thousands of employees (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991) on the relationship between Big Five (Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Neuroticism) personality traits and job performance has found that certain personality traits significantly predict job performance. Such findings provide evidence that supports the use of personality in employee selection.

2.8 Job Performance And Job Engagement.

The overarching purpose of this research is to provide insight into the role that engagement plays in relationships with job performance. Here we define job performance as the aggregated value to an organization of the set of behaviors that an employee contributes both directly and indirectly to organizational goals (Borman, Motowidlo, 1993). We chose a behavioral conceptualization of job performance because engagement is a concept that reflects human authorization.

Moreover, because behavioral performance has multiple dimensions, this perspective can provide insight into the specific types of employee behaviors that transmit the effects of engagement to more “objective” outcomes, such as productivity, efficiency, and quality. (Campbell, 1990)

At a general level, 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 (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995), (Kahn, 1990). 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 (Goffman, 1961), (Hochschild, 1983), (Kahn, 1990).

2.9 The Three Energies Of Engagement To Job Performance.

First, investment of physical energy into work roles contributes to organizational goals because it facilitates the accomplishment of organizationally valued behaviors at increased levels of effort over extended periods of time (Kahn, 1990, 1992). (Katz & Kahn, 1978), (Brown and Leigh, 1996).

Second, investment of cognitive energy into work roles contributes to organizational goals because it promotes behavior that is more vigilant, attentive, and focused (Kahn, 1990). (Weick and Roberts, 1993) used the term “heedfulness” as a label for behaviors that possess this same set of characteristics.

Finally, investments of emotional energy into work roles contribute to organizational goals in a number of related ways (Kahn, 1990). Those who invest emotional energy into their roles enhance performance through the promotion of increased connection among coworkers in pursuit of organizational goals (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995). Investments of emotional energies also help individuals meet the emotional demands of their roles in a way that results in more complete and authentic performance (Kahn, 1990, 1992).

2.10 Previous Studies

2.10.1 The role of engagement and supervisor coaching in linking future work self salience to job performance. (Lin and others, 2016)

Recent research suggests that the salience of a future work self has a considerable impact on future-oriented activities such as skill development, career planning, career networking, and job searching. However, little is known as to whether, how, and under what conditions a more salient future work self may influence concomitant work outcomes such as job performance. Drawing on self-regulation theory, we argue that future work self salience (FWSS) affects job performance via its influence on engagement, with this influence amplified as a function of supervisor coaching. Using multi-source and lagged data collected from employees (N = 441), their direct supervisors (N = 98), and archival records in an insurance company, we found that engagement mediated the relationships between FWSS and both supervisor-rated and archival sales performance. Furthermore, the relationships FWSS has with employee engagement and sales performance, as well as the indirect effects of FWSS on two performance indicators, were stronger for employees exposed to higher levels of supervisor coaching

2.10.2 Relational job characteristics and nurses' affective organizational commitment: the mediating role of work engagement. (Santos and others, 2016)

Aim To study work engagement as a mediator of the associations between relational job characteristics and nurses' affective commitment to the hospital. Background Earlier research has shown that work engagement mediates the relationship between job resources and affective organizational commitment. However, relational job characteristics, which may be job resources, have not been studied or examined in relation to work engagement and affective organizational commitment in the nursing profession. Design this study uses a correlational survey design and an online survey for data collection. Method Data for this correlational study were collected by survey over months (2013) from a sample of 335 hospital nurses. Measures included Portuguese translations of the Relational Job Characteristics' Psychological Effects Scale, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale and the Affective Organizational Commitment Scale. Results Data analysis supports a full mediation model where relational job characteristics explained affective commitment to the hospital through nurses' work engagement. Conclusions Relational job characteristics contribute to nurses' work engagement, which in turn contributes to affective organizational commitment .

2.10.3 Ageism in the Workplace: The Role of Psychosocial Factors in Predicting Job Satisfaction, Commitment, and Engagement (Macdonald, Levy, 2016)

This study investigated understudied psychosocial factors (age identity, aging anxiety, perceived age discrimination, perceived social support at work, and work centrality) that may buffer or hinder job satisfaction,

commitment, and engagement. Identity variables, both age identity and work centrality, as well as perceived social support at work, were found to be positively associated with job satisfaction, commitment, and engagement, while both perceived age discrimination and anxiety about aging were negatively associated with these three job longevity variables. Using an age diverse national sample of workers (n = 800) from a wide range of occupations and socioeconomic backgrounds in the United States the results suggest that psychosocial factors such as age identity, work centrality, and perceived social support could be targeted to improve job satisfaction, commitment, and engagement, while it would be beneficial for organizational policies to continue to focus on reducing age discrimination as well as reducing anxiety about aging in the workplace.

2.10.4 Exploring the relationship between service orientation, employee engagement and perceived leadership style: a study of managers in the private service sector organizations in India (Popli, Rizvi, 2015)

The aim of this paper is to explore the relationship between leadership, employee engagement and service orientation, specific to the private service sector organizations in India. The paper also explores the ability of leadership style and engagement to predict service orientation in the given cross section. Design/methodology/approach -- The paper has used a single cross-sectional descriptive design. Purposive sampling has been used to identify respondents who are managers in the private service sector organisations in India. A valid sample size of 106 has been used for the analysis. Instruments used for perceived leadership style are as follows: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X short form); Employee Engagement E3 (DDI) and Service Orientation (Frimpong and Wilson, 2012). Findings -- Service orientation is found to be strongly correlated to employee engagement and employee engagement is a strong predictor of service orientation. The other relationships which are significant and moderately correlated are that of transformational leadership and employee engagement and also of transformational leadership and service orientation.

2.10.5 The relationship of leader psychological capital and follower psychological capital, job engagement and job performance: a multilevel mediating perspective. (Chen, Shu-Ling, 2015)

This study examines the relationships between leader psychological capital, follower psychological capital, job engagement and job performance (task performance and contextual performance). Data were collected in three phases from multiple sources involving 60 leaders and 319 followers from a large telecom company in Taiwan. Hierarchical linear modeling results revealed that leaders' psychological capital was positively related to their job engagement through the mediation of followers' psychological capital. Furthermore, the results indicated that job engagement mediates the relationship between followers' psychological capital and their job performance (task performance and contextual performance). We discuss the implications and limitations of these findings and directions for future research .

2.10.6 Leader-member exchange, work engagement, and job performance. (Breevaart and others, 2015)

The purpose of this study is to examine the process through which leader-member exchange (LMX) is related to followers' job performance. Integrating the literature on LMX theory and resource theories, the authors hypothesized that the positive relationship between LMX and employee job performance is sequentially mediated by job resources (autonomy, developmental opportunities, and social support) and employee work engagement. This study examines LMX as a more distal predictor of employee job performance and examines a sequential underlying mechanism to explain this relationship. Furthermore, this paper explicitly examined job resources as a mediator in the relationship between LMX and employee job performance.

2.10.7 Merit Pay Fairness, Leader-Member Exchange, and Job Engagement: Evidence From Mainland China. (Meng, Wu, 2015)

In this article, the authors theoretically propose that the perceived fairness of merit pay substantially influences leader-member exchange (LMX) and which in turn influences job engagement. Data from 581 Chinese compulsory school teachers show that the perceived procedural fairness of merit pay policy significantly and positively affects LMX and job engagement. That LMX partially mediates the relationship between procedural fairness perception and job engagement. The results indicate that procedural fairness plays more important role to motivate the public service employees in the merit pay implementation than the distributive fairness. The emphasis of procedural fairness may reflect the respect and dignity of the individual, which therefore promote teachers' acceptance of leadership management styles and further stimulate greater job engagement among employees.

2.10.8 How emotional labor and ethical leadership affect job engagement for Chinese public servants (Xiaojun, Mary, 2014)

This study explores three elements that contribute to responsiveness—emotional labor, job engagement, and ethical leadership. Three findings emerge: First, in terms of workers and their expression of work-related emotion, authentic emotive expression relates positively with job engagement. Second, ethical leadership moderates the relationship between pretending and job engagement, in that higher levels of ethical leadership lessen the negative influence of pretense in emotive expression. Third, ethical leadership does not affect the relationship between authentic emotive expression and job engagement. The sample surveyed are government

employees in China.

2.10.9 Work engagement, psychological contract breach and job satisfaction (Bruce A, Zeynep Y, 2014)

This study extends both Social Exchange Theory and the Job Demands–Resources model by examining the link between psychological contract breach (PCB) and work engagement, and by integrating job satisfaction into this exchange relationship. We argue that PCB reflects employees’ feelings of resource loss, and that these feelings impact work engagement through their impact on job satisfaction. Study results suggest that the negative effect of PCB on work engagement is mediated by job satisfaction.

2.10.10 Factors Contributing to Job Engagement in Ugandan Nurses and Midwives (Pauline and others, 2012)

The study try to understanding what factors play a role in enhancing nurses’ job engagement might help health care and training institutions develop interventions to enable nurses learn methods to help retain their job engagement. and were conducted in 2010, with a purposive sample of 15 nurses and midwives

2.10.11 Job engagement: antecedents and effects on job performance. (Jeffrey A, Eean R, 2010)

This study conceptualized engagement as the investment of an individual’s complete self into a role, provides a more comprehensive explanation of relationships with performance than do well-known concepts that reflect narrower aspects of the individual’s self. Results of a study of 245 firefighters and their supervisors supported our hypotheses that engagement mediates relationships between value congruence, perceived organizational support, and core self-evaluations, and two job performance dimensions: task performance and organizational citizenship behavior. Job involvement, job satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation were included as mediators but did not exceed engagement in explaining relationships among the antecedents and performance.

2.10.12 Staff Engagement: It Starts With the Leader. (Kerfoot, 2007)

The article offers information on how to attain an effective staff engagement in the U.S. According to the author, manager leadership is essential in achieving staff engagement which needs constant performance guidance and recovery times to guarantee that staff are going to follow and maintain a level of engagement that is exciting and fulfilling. The author stresses that engagement can be realized if self care and respect is observed to attain favorable results

3. Analysis And Discription

3.1 Description of the Sample’s Demographic Variables

The following tables show the sample characteristic distribution according to some demographic variables.

Table 3.1 Gender

Demographic variable	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	2	15.4%
	Female	11	84.6%

Table (3.1) shows that most of the sample's participants were females, their frequency was (11) participants, with a percentage of (84.6%), but the males' frequency was (2) participants, with a percentage of (15.4%) of the sample.

Table 3.2 Ages

Demographic variable	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Age	20-29	5	38.5%
	30-39	0	0%
	40-49	7	53.8%
	More than 50	1	7.7%

Table (3.2) indicates that the number of sample's participants who were in their third decade was (5) participants and their percentage was (38.5%); who were in their fifth decade was (7) participants and their percentage was (53.8%); and who was older than that was (1) and his percentage was (7.7%).

Table 3.3 Education level

Demographic variable	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Education level	Ph.D.	1	7.7%
	Masters	3	23.1%
	Bachelor	5	38.5%
	Higher Diploma	0	0%
	Diploma	4	30.8%

As shown in table (3.3), only (1) participant of the sample has Ph.D. level with a percentage of (7.7%). Whereas, (3) participants have master degree with a percentage of (23.1%); (5) participants who have Bachelor's degree with a percentage of (38.5%); and (4) participants who have Diploma degree with a percentage of (30.8%).

Table 3.4 Work experience

Demographic variable	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Work experience	Less than 5 years	5	38.5%
	5-10	2	15.4%
	11-15	0	0%
	More than 15	6	46.2%

In table (3.4), (5) participants of the targeted sample have less than 5 years work experience and their percentage was (38.5%); the highest percentage was for the (6) participants who have more than 15 years work experience with a percentage of (46.2%). Only (2) participants have 5-10 years work experience with a percentage of (15.4%).

Table 3.5 Job Title

Demographic variable	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Job Title	Manager	2	69.2%
	Department President	2	15.4%
	Employee	9	15.2%

Table (3.5) shows that *most of* the participants were employees with a frequency of (9) participants and their percentage was (69.2%); while there were (2) participants with the title of both; manager and department president, their percentage was (15.2%).

Table 3.6 Marital status

Demographic variable	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Marital status	Single	6	46.2%
	Married	7	53.8%

Table (3.6) indicates that the larger category of the sample's members were married and their number was (7) with a percentage of (53.8%) while the number of single members was (6) and their percentage was (46.2%).

3.2 Description of the Research's Dimensions

To describe the research statements, the descriptive mean was calculated for the responses of the targeted sample, the questionnaire has had a five-point *Likert Scale*:

- 1 → Strongly Disagree
- 2 → Disagree
- 3 → Moderately Agree
- 4 → Agree
- 5 → Strongly Agree

We proposed a parameter to classify the responses by depending on the descriptive mean for each, as follow:

- $1 \leq \text{Mean} < 2.5$: Sample's participants **disagree**.
- $2.5 \leq \text{Mean} < 3.5$: Sample's participants **moderately agree**.
- $3.5 \leq \text{Mean} \leq 5$: Sample's participants **agree** with our proposal.

▪ Dimension One: Physical Engagement Assessment

Table 3.7 Descriptive means and standard deviations for Physical Engagement assessment part (n=13)

#	Statements		Low	Middle	High	Average	Standard deviation	Level
1	I try to do my best to perform well on my job.	Frequency	0	0	13	5	0	Agree
		Percent	0%	0%	100%			
2	I strive as hard as I can to complete my job even in my break times	Frequency	0	3	10	4.1538	0.80064	Agree
		Percent	0%	23.1%	76.9%			
3	I didn't do anything irrelevant to my tasks	Frequency	0	2	11	4.3846	0.76795	Agree
		Percent	0%	15.4%	84.6%			
4	I exert a lot of energy on my job which impacts my performance.	Frequency	0	0	13	5	0	Agree
		Percent	0%	0%	100%			
		Percent	0%	9.625%	90.375%			
General Average						4.6346	Agree	

From table (3.7), the following can be noted:

The mean ranges from (4.1538) to (5), the highest mean is for the item "", while the lowest mean is for the item "".

The general mean is (4.6346), which indicates that the sample's participants *agree* with the **PHYSICAL ENGAGEMENT** assessment dimension.

▪ Dimension Two: Emotional Engagement Assessment

Table 3.8 Descriptive means and standard deviations for emotional engagement assessment part (n=13)

#	Statements		Low	Middle	High	Average	Standard deviation	Level
1	I am enthusiastic in my job.	Frequency	0	0	13	4.6923	0.48038	Agree
		Percent	0%	0%	100%			
2	I am proud of my job which increases my intention to do my effectively and efficiently	Frequency	0	1	12	4.6154	0.65044	Agree
		Percent	0%	7.7%	92.3%			
3	I feel positive toward my job.	Frequency	0	2	11	4.5385	0.77625	Agree
		Percent	%	15.4%	84.6%			
4	I feel energetic at my job.	Frequency	0	0	13	4.8462	0.37553	Agree
		Percent	0%	0%	100%			
		Percent	0%	5.775%	94.225%			
General Average						4.6731	Agree	

From table (3.8) the following can be noted:

The highest mean is (4.8462) was for the statement "", whereas the lowest mean is (4.5385), for the statement "".

The mean of averages equals (4.6731), and it indicates that the sample's members *agree* with the *EMOTIONAL ENGAGEMENT* assessment dimension.

▪ **Dimension Three: Cognitive Engagement Assessment**

Table 3.9 Descriptive means and standard deviations for cognitive engagement assessment part (N=13)

#	Statements		Low	Middle	High	Average	Standard deviation	Level
1	I pay a lot of attention to my tasks and job.	Frequency	0	0	13	4.7692	0.43853	Agree
		Percent	0%	0%	100%			
2	I am absorbed my time to do my job effectively.	Frequency	0	0	13	4.5385	0.51887	Agree
		Percent	0%	0%	100%			
3	I do concentrate on my job.	Frequency	0	0	13	4.6923	0.48038	Agree
		Percent	0%	0%	100%			
4	I do increase my cognitive field of anything related to my job.	Frequency	0	0	13	4.6154	0.50637	Agree
		Percent	0%	0%	100%			
		Percent	0%	0%	100%			
General Average						4.65385	Agree	

From table (3.9) many notes can be shown:

The mean ranges between (4.5385) and (4.7692), where the lowest mean refers to "", whereas the highest mean refers to "".

The average of averages equals (4.65385), and it indicates that the sample's members *agree* with the *COGNITIVE ENGAGEMENT* assessment dimension.

▪ **Dimension Four: Performance Assessment**

Table 3.10 Descriptive means and standard deviations for performance assessment part (N=13)

#	Statements		Low	Middle	High	Average	Standard deviation	Level
1	A power of job engagement give me a feeling of personal accomplishment and high performance	Frequency	0	0	13	4.7692	0.43853	Agree
		Percent	0%	0%	100%			
2	On my job, I have clearly defined quality goals which motivate me to have high performance.	Frequency	0	1	12	4.3846	0.65044	Agree
		Percent	0%	7.7%	92.3%			
3	The level of job engagement influences my involvement in decisions that affect your work performance	Frequency	0	1	12	4.5385	0.66023	Agree
		Percent	0%	7.7%	92.3%			
4	The level of engagement affects your opportunity to get a better job in this company according to your high performance.	Frequency	0	0	13	4.6154	0.50637	Agree
		Percent	0%	0%	100%			
		Percent	0%	3.85%	96.15%			
General Average						4.5694	Agree	

Table (3.10) shows the following:

The range of means was between (4.3846) and (4.7692), where the lowest mean is referring to "", and the highest mean is referring to "".

The mean of averages equals (4.5694), and it indicates that the sample's members *agree* with the *PERFORMANCE* assessment dimension.

3.3 Hypotheses Testing

The main question we are going to test is:

Is there a positive influence of *Employees' Job Engagement and Performance*?

The above question was formulated in one main hypothesis:

H₁: There is a positive relationship between *Employees' Job Engagement* and *Performance*.

This hypothesis can be divided into three sub-hypotheses:

1. **H_{1.1}:** There is a relationship between *Employees' Physical Engagement* and *Performance*.
2. **H_{1.2}:** There is no relationship between *Employees' Emotional Engagement* and *Performance*.
3. **H_{1.3}:** There is a positive relationship between *Employees' Cognitive Engagement* and *Performance*.

To answer the above hypotheses, **simple and multiple regressions** were used and the following tables show the results.

1. **H₁:** There is a relationship between *Employees' Physical Engagement* and *Performance*.

Table 3.11 Model Summary of the impact of employees' physical engagement on performance

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.111 ^a	.012	-.077-	.41552
a. Predictors: (Constant), AVE.PH				

Table 3.12 ANOVA^b of the impact of employees' physical engagement on performance

ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.024	1	0.024	.138	.717 ^a
	Residual	1.899	11	.173		
	Total	1.923	12			
a. Predictors: (Constant), AVE.PH						
b. Dependent Variable: AVE.PE						

Table 3.13 Coefficients of the impact of employees' physical engagement on performance

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.956	1.676		2.360	.038
	AVE.PH	.134	.361	.111	.717	.717
a. Dependent Variable: AVE.PE						

As shown in table (3.13):

- P-Value is (0.717), which indicates than there is no significant relationship between employees' physical engagement and performance. So, the hypothesis is rejected.

2. H₁: There is no a relationship between *Employees' Emotional Engagement* and *Performance*.

Table 3.14 Model Summary of the impact of employees' emotional engagement on performance

Model Summary ^b				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.712 ^a	.507	.462	.29357
a. Predictors: (Constant), AVE.EM				

Table 3.15 ANOVA^b of the impact of employees' emotional engagement on performance

ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.975	1	.975	11.313	.006 ^a
	Residual	.948	11	.086		
	Total	1.923	12			
a. Predictors: (Constant), AVE.EM						
b. Dependent Variable: AVE.PE						

Table 3.16 Coefficients of the impact of employees' emotional engagement on performance

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.083	.746		2.792	.018
	AVE.EM	.534	.159	.712	3.364	.006
a. Dependent Variable: AVE.PE						

From table (3.16) some points can be noted:

- P-Value equals (0.006), which indicates a significant relationship between employees' emotional engagement and performance.
- The simple regression (R) coefficient for the impact of employees' emotional engagement on performance is (0.534), which indicates a **positive relationship**.
- So, the hypothesis is rejected.

3. H₁: There is a positive relationship between *Employees' Cognitive Engagement* and *Performance*.

Table 3.17 Model Summary of the impact of employees' cognitive engagement on performance

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.261 ^a	.068	-.016-	.40361
a. Predictors: (Constant), AVE.CO				

Table 3.18 ANOVA^b of the impact of employees' cognitive engagement on performance

ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.131	1	.131	.805	.389 ^a
	Residual	1.792	11	.163		
	Total	1.923	12			
a. Predictors: (Constant), AVE.CO						
b. Dependent Variable: AVE.PE						

Table 3.19 Coefficients of the impact of employees' cognitive engagement on performance

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.281	1.448		2.266	.045
	AVE.CO	.278	.310	.261	.897	.389

a. Dependent Variable: AVE.PE

We can note the following from table (3.19):

- P-Value equals (0.389), which indicates that there is no significant relationship between employees' cognitive engagement and performance. Thus, the hypothesis is rejected.

▪ **The Main Hypothesis:**

H₁: There is a positive relationship between *Employees' Job Engagement and Performance*.

Table 3.20 Model Summary of the impact of employees' job engagement and performance

Model Summary ^b				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.600 ^a	.360	.302	.33450

a. Predictors: (Constant), AVE.E

Table 3.21 ANOVA^b of the impact of employees' job engagement and performance

ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.692	1	.692	6.187	.030 ^a
	Residual	1.231	11	.112		
	Total	1.923	12			

a. Predictors: (Constant), AVE.E
 b. Dependent Variable: AVE.PE

Table 3.22 Coefficients of the impact of employees' job engagement and performance

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.673	1.572		.428	.677
	AVE.E	.839	.337	.600	2.487	.030

a. Dependent Variable: AVE.PE

As it is shown in table (3.22):

- P-Value equals (0.030), which indicates a **significant relationship** between employees' job engagement and performance.

- The multiple regression (R) coefficient for the relationship between employees' job engagement and performance is (.839), **so the relationship is positive**.

- The hypothesis is accepted.

REFERENCES

- Arnold B. Bakker, An Evidence-Based Model of Work Engagement. Erasmus University Rotterdam, Institute of Psychology, Department of Work and Organizational Psychology, Woudestein, T12-47.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. 1995. Emotion in the workplace: A reappraisal. *Human Relations*, 48: 97–125.
- Bakker, A. B., Albrecht, S. L., & Leiter, M. P. (2011). Key questions regarding work engagement. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20, 4-28.
- Barrick, M., & Mount, M. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations*: 71–98. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bruce A. Rayton, Zeynep Y. Yalabik, School of Management, University of Bath, Bath, UK, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2014, Vol. 25, No. 17, 2382–2400, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.876440>.
- Breevaart, Kimberley, Bakker, Arnold B. Demerouti, Evangelia. van den Heuvel, Machteld, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 2015, Vol. 30 Issue 7, p754-770. 17p
- Brown, S. P., & Leigh, T. W. 1996. A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81: 358–368.
- Campbell, J. P. 1990. Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, vol. 1 (2nd ed.): 687–732. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press
- Chen, Shu-Ling, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Oct2015, Vol. 26 Issue 18, p2349-2365. 17p. 1 Diagram, 2 Charts.
- Dunnette, MD, Hough, LM. (1991). *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, vol. 1 (2nd ed.): P 687–732.
- Gilbert, T. (1998). A Leisurely Look at Worthy Performance. The 1998 ASTD Training and Performance Yearbook. Woods, J. & Gortada, J. (editors). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goffman, E. 1961. *Encounters: Two studies in the sociology of interaction*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Hochschild, A. R. 1983. *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Inceoglu, Ilke, Warr, Peter. (2012). Personality and Job Engagement, *Journal of Personnel Psychology*.
- Jeffrey A. Lepine, Eean R. Crawford, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 53, No. 3, 617–635. California State University San Marcos, 2010.
- Jex, S.M. (2002) *Organizational Psychology: A Scientist-Practitioner Approach*. John Wiley & Sons, New York
- Kahn, W (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 692-724.
- Kahn, W. A. 1992. To be fully there: Psychological presence at work. *Human Relations*, 45: 321–349
- Karlene, Kerfoot, articles, *Urologic Nursing*. Oct2007, Vol. 27 Issue 5, p451-452. 2p.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. 1978. *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Lin, Weipeng, Wang, Lei, Bamberger, Peter A. Zhang, Qi4, Wang, Haifeng. Guo, Wencai. Shi, Jing. Zhang, Tao, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. Feb2016, Vol. 92, p145-156. 12p.
- Lu, Xiaojun and Guy, Mary E. (2014). How Emotional Labor and Ethical leadership affect job engagement for Chinese public servants, *public personal management*, vol 43.
- Macdonald, Jamie L. Levy, Sheri R, *Journal of Social Issues*. Mar2016, Vol. 72 Issue 1, p169-190. 22p. 5 Charts.
- Meng, Fanrong .Wu, Jiannan, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. Mar2015, Vol. 35 Issue 1, p47-69. 23p.
- Michael S. Christian, S Adela S. Garza and Jerel E. Slaughter. (2011). *Work Engagement: A Quantitative Review and of its relations with task and contextual performance*, *personnel psychology*, V 64.
- Michelle R. Simpson. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*. Volume 46, Issue 7, July 2009, Pages 1012–1024.
- Milkovich, G.T.; Wigdor, A.K. (1991) *Pay for Performance: Evaluating Performance Appraisal and Merit Pay*. National Academy Press, Washington
- Mowday, R.T., L.W. Porter, and R.M. Steers, 1982, *Employee-Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism and Turnover*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Pauline Bakibinga. Hege Forbech Vinje. MauriceMittelmark, *International Scholarly Research Network*, ISRN Public Health, Volume 2012, Article ID 372573, 9 pages.
- Pinker, Steven (1997). *How the Mind Works*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company
- Popli, Sapna. Rizvi, Irfan A, *Journal of Services Marketing*. 2015, Vol. 29 Issue 1, p59-70. 12p.

- Pritchard, R. D. (1992) 'Organizational Productivity', in M. D. Dunnette and L. M. Hough (eds), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 3 (2nd ed.). Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, pp. 443-471.
- Santos, Alda. Chambel, Maria José. Castanheira, Filipa, *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. Feb2016, Vol. 72 Issue 2, p294-305. 12p. 3 Charts.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66, 701-716.
- Seligman, M.E.P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American psychologist*, 55(1), 5-14.
- Van Hootegem, G. (2012). Workplace innovation strategies in Europe – Challenges and opportunities for competitiveness (Vol. 2). Presented at the International Wellbeing at Work Conference, Manchester.
- Weick, K. E., & Roberts, K. H. 1993. Collective mind in organizations: Heedful interrelating on flight decks. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38: 357–381
- Xiaojun Lu'. Mary E.Gu, *Public Personnel Management*, 2014. Vol. 43(1) 3-24.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74, 235-244.