

Employee Engagement and Job Performance among Academic Staff in Public Universities in Uganda

EMMANUEL NACHONGA¹, LEON MATAGI², LYDIA EMURON³

1. Makerere University, P. O. Box 7062, Kampala

emmanuel.nachonga@mak.ac.ug,

2. Makerere University,

leon.mataji@mak.ac.ug

3. Kampala International University

P. O. Box 20000, Kampala

lydiaemuron@kiu.ac.ug

(Accepted: 03 December 2022 / Published: 20 December 2022)

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to find out the relationship between employee engagement and job performance among university academic staff. The study, conducted at Makerere University, was guided by questions on the levels of engagement and performance among academic staff. A null hypothesis on the significance of employee engagement and job performance was also stated for investigation. The population of the study was comprised of 485 academic staff from 10 different schools. A sample of 136 respondents was reached using a self-administered questionnaire containing closed-ended items along a Likert scale as well as open-ended questions. Analysis was done using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 by way of sums, means, frequencies, percentages and a bivariate, Pearson correlation coefficient. The findings, based on percentages and in agreement with statements, revealed that both employee engagement and job performance levels were high. There was a positive significant relationship between employee engagement and job performance ($r=.391$, $p<0.05$). The null hypothesis was rejected, meaning that engagement levels impact on performance. The recommendations, basing on the findings, focused on central and section managers developing strategies to heighten engagement levels in order to improve performance. This includes timely disbursement of financial and non-financial rewards, involvement of staff in decision, proper management of performance with reference to acceptable, barrier-free and well-scheduled appraisals as well as the provision of a conducive working environment.

Keywords: *Employee engagement; Job performance; Universities*

Background

Ordinarily, an engaged employee is a real performer. Engagement is an extremely important predictor of employee and, ultimately, organisational performance. Engagement and performance have been variously described. For instance, Kahn(1990) came up with the concept of work engagement and described engaged employees as those who are fully physically, cognitively and emotionally connected with their work roles, work harder through increased levels of discretionary effort and are highly committed. In addition, engaged employees burst with energy, dedicating all their skills and resources to their work. They are emotionally positive, open to new ventures or ideas, productive and willing to proactively go the extra miles by changing their work environment in order to stay engaged. A Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) report identified three core facets of employee engagement and these include: intellectual/ cognitive engagement, which includes thinking intensively about the job and continuous improvements in it, affective/ emotional engagement, which involves having positive feelings about the job and social engagement, which includes one's being ready to discuss matters of improvement in work with co-workers. Individuals with higher levels of engagement may experience this, unlike for those with lower levels of engagement or disengagement.

Employee performance refers to the outcome or contributions employees make to attain specific organisational set goals (Herbert, John, & Lee, 2000). Performance addresses the use of simple outcome-based financial indicators reflecting the fulfillment of the economic goals of the organisation. Employee performance is the ability of an employee to achieve a specified task measured against predetermined standards of accuracy, completeness, cost and speed (Sultan et al., 2012). Additionally, it is the measure of outputs such as loaves of bread vis-à-vis the inputs such as effort, time and energy. It may depend on a number of factors like performance appraisal, motivation, satisfaction, compensation, job security, organisational structure and others (Ali Asghar & Mohtsham Saeed, 2012). Furthermore, Borman and Motowidlo (1997) identified two different aspects of employee performance and these included: task performance, which involves activities that are related to employee's formal role requirements, and contextual performances, which involves activities that are not part of the formal role requirement but are viewed as promoting organisational effectiveness.

Ideally, a highly engaged employee tends to work harder and eventually performs better at their workplace. This is because they experience positive emotions such as happiness, gratitude, joy and enthusiasm, which have better psychological health and, usually, they transfer their engagement to their co-workers(Fredrickson, 2001). As a result of this dedication, employees receive higher ratings from their colleagues on in-role and extra-role performance. This means that there are discretionary behaviours on the part of an employee that are directly believed to promote effective functioning of an organisation without necessarily directly influencing a person's target productivity. Indeed, Bakker, Demerouti and, Verbeke (2004) confirm that highly engaged employees perform well and are willing to go the extra mile to do what is even not part of their role.

A study to establish the effects of fringe benefits and the nature of working conditions under motivation practices on teacher's performance in urban secondary schools in Jinja municipality; found that the state of teachers' performance had a mean of 2.7, indicating that teacher's performance was very low (Nairuba, 2011). This could be as a result of low engagement. The Employer of the Year Awards Survey(2013) conducted by the Federation of Uganda Employers in partnership with the Makerere University School of Psychology, revealed that 6% of the employees were disengaged and 45% were moderately engaged, meaning that the moderately and disengaged employees total

of 51% showed that there were low levels of employee engagement among employees in many organisations in Uganda. This raises a big challenge that needs to be addressed to enhance job performance. For instance, the correlation results of a study to investigate the contribution of training and employee engagement to job performance in Uganda's health sector indicated that there was a significant relationship between employee engagement and employee performance. The study found that the more the employee engaged him or herself, the better the job performance levels (Sendawula et al., 2018).

Engagement has been gaining increasing attention as a key determinant of performance among employees (Macey, Schneider, Barbera, & Young, 2011). Tools, and case examples, Employee Engagement translates best practices, ideas, and concepts into concrete and practical steps that will change the level of engagement in any organization. Explores the meaning of engagement and how engagement differs significantly from other important yet related concepts like satisfaction and commitment. Discusses what it means to create a culture of engagement. Provides a practical presentation deck and talking points managers can use to introduce the concept of engagement in their organization. Addresses issues of work-life balance. Cover; Praise for Employee Engagement; Talent Management Essentials; Title page; copyright; Dedication; Series Editors Preface.xhtml; preface; Acknowledgments; Chapter 1: Engaging Engagement; How Engagement Makes a Difference and What Engagement Is; How an Engaged Workforce Creates Positive Financial Consequences for Organizations; On High Performance Work Environments: Four Principles for Creating an Engaged Workforce; The Remainder of the Book; Chapter 2: The "Feel and Look" of Employee Engagement; The Feel of Engagement; The Look of Engagement: Employee Behavior. Strategically Aligned Engagement Behavior. What About Employee Satisfaction?; Where Does This Take Us?; Chapter 3: The Key to an Engaged Workforce: An Engagement Culture; What is Organizational Culture?; Creating a Culture for Engagement: How People are Valued in Organizations; The Role of Culture in Creating Strategic Employee Engagement; Summary; Chapter 4: Phase 1 of Creating and Executing an Engagement Campaign: Diagnostics and the Engagement Survey; Pre-Survey Diagnostic Activities; The Engagement Survey. Chapter 5: Phase 2 of Creating and Executing an Engagement Campaign: Action Planning and Intervention. Survey Results Interpretation; Survey Results Feedback; Preparing the Organization for Taking Action. 7; How Much Measurable Change is Possible?; Actual Changes That Build and Maintain Engagement; Summary; Chapter 6: Burnout and Disengagement: The Dark Side of Engagement; Disengagement: Early Unmet Expectations at Work; The Nature and Trajectory of Burnout; Effective Coping With Burnout; Additional Stress Factors and Disengagement; Remedies and Interventions. Resistance to Change and Engagement: Another Dark Side of Engagement. How Should Engagement Initiatives be Communicated?; Conclusion; Chapter 7: Talking Points: Introducing or Rethinking Engagement in Your Organization; The Slide Show; Notes; Aut..."; "author": [{"dropping-particle": "", "family": "Macey", "given": "William H.", "non-dropping-particle": "", "parse-names": false, "suffix": ""}, {"dropping-particle": "", "family": "Schneider", "given": "Benjamin.", "non-dropping-particle": "", "parse-names": false, "suffix": ""}, {"dropping-particle": "", "family": "Barbera", "given": "Karen M.", "non-dropping-particle": "", "parse-names": false, "suffix": ""}, {"dropping-particle": "", "family": "Young", "given": "Scott A.", "non-dropping-particle": "", "parse-names": false, "suffix": ""}], "id": "ITEM-1", "issued": {"date-parts": ["2011"]}, "number-of-pages": "353", "publisher": "John Wiley & Sons", "title": "Employee Engagement : Tools for Analysis, Practice, and Competitive Advantage.", "type": "book", "uris": [{"http": "http://www.mendeley.com/documents/?uuid=48baddb5-7e9a-3edc-a84f-3a082f14c430"}], "mendeley": {"formattedCitation": ""

(Macey, Schneider, Barbera, & Young, 2011. From a contextual point of view, employee engagement is a positive fulfilling work-related state of mind that is mainly characterised by three components of vigour, defined by high levels of energy and willingness to invest effort in one's work; dedication, which refers to being deeply involved in one's work and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride and challenge, and absorption, characterised by full concentration in one's work or being immersed in it (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2002).

Makerere University has a well-known history of strikes by academic staff. In 2006, academic staff laid down their tools, citing failure by the government to honour a pledge made in 2004 regarding improvement of staff welfare. In 2007, the university was closed for two months as academic staff demanded better pay. In 2011 and 2014, academic staff held strikes over pension and salary arrears, respectively (New Vision, 2019). Recently, the public university staff formed joint associations, making them engage in joint industrial action. These occurrences called for an investigation of the level of academic staff engagement and performance.

Most organisations today need a strong and high level of employee engagement influence the achievement of organisational goals and effective performance, hence maintaining competitiveness with both local and global markets. This is only possible through identifying the most important and effective drivers of employee engagement that eventually enhance the performance of employees.

The Problem

There has been a persistent wave of strikes by academic staff in public universities over remuneration. This is an area of interest because this outcry over incentives and salaries leaves questions as to whether amidst such grievances, employees of public universities could remain engaged and consequently perform highly. Increased disengagement, characterised by low commitment and; negative emotions, among others, if maintained, will lead to low productivity, higher organisational turnover intent and, counter productive work behaviours such as absenteeism and, in general, poor employee performance.

Purpose of the Study

The study focused on finding out the relationship between employee engagement and job performance among public university academic staff, using Makerere University as the case. Research questions were set to establish the levels of engagement and job performance among Makerere University academic staff. The study hypothesised that employee engagement and job performance were not significantly related.

■ Scope of the study

Geographically, the study occurred among Makerere University Kampala academic staff. The study's duration was three months, and, focused on establishing the relationship between employee engagement and job performance among Makerere University academic staff.

Significance of the Study

Several stakeholders are target beneficiaries of this work. These include senior managers like Vice-Chancellors and their teams, line managers such as principals, deans and heads of departments (HODs) of different schools as well as policy-makers in the university and in government, especially the Ministry of Education and Sports, as well as that of Finance and Public Service. These can use

these findings to identify the reasons why some employees score low on engagement and, eventually, aid them to draft better strategies aimed at improving working conditions.

Researchers and academics could use these findings for reference and further research on related variables, hence using them to build on their literature, and prove or dis-prove other findings, among others. The researchers could be university students or experts in the field of research.

Conceptual Framework

This framework illustrates a one-step relationship between the independent variable, employee engagement (EE), and the dependent variable, job performance (JP), as shown.

Figure 1: A conceptual framework showing the predictive link between employee engagement and job performance.



Employee engagement is an independent variable that directly influences job performance. Engagement is evidenced by vigour, dedication and absorption. Vigour at work, is demonstrated by high energy with which work is done, working long hours, perseverance even when things do not work out and resilience. Dedication is shown by the interest, enthusiasm and pride in the work an employee does. Absorption refers to being immensely preoccupied with one's tasks.

Job performance was described by both in-role and extra-role tasks. In-role performance connotes the ability to work and attendance at work, as well as compliance with the norms and requirements of the job (Kagaari, Munene, & Ntayi, (2010). Extra-role performance is demonstrated by other attributes outside one's tasks such as courtesy and, concern for and interest in fellow employee's challenges that can hinder them from executing assigned work-related responsibilities.

It was conceptualised this study that highly engaged employees easily identify with the organisation or institution they work for, are dedicated to their work, have high vigour as they put much effort and energy into their work, believe in themselves, generate their own feedback and have values that match the organisation's (Bedarkar & Pandita, 2014). They work hard and perform better at their tasks (in-role), as well as aid their co-workers (extra-role), thereby impacting on their individual and organisational performance. Changes in the level of engagement affect the performance levels.

Theoretical Framework

There are many theories that can help explain how employees may get engaged. The study is premised on the understanding that a motivated employee is engaged and can perform. Fredrick Herzberg's (1959) study which revealed two factors: the dissatisfiers or hygiene factors such as organisational policies, administration, relationship with the supervisor, job status, salary as well as fringe benefits, and satisfiers or motivators like having a challenging job that gives responsibility, achievement, growth and recognition, enjoyment, advancement and personal development – underpinned this study. Basing on this theory, the motivators were stressed as being important because their presence increases engagement levels. Employees who value challenging work that gives them responsibility, achievement, enjoyment, personal development and advancement are more likely to be motivated and enthusiastic and engage highly, hence eventually performing much better (Herzberg, 1959).

The theory is backed up by the reinforcement theory that bases itself on the argument that the environment determines people's behaviour through the result of their actions (Skinner, 1971). Reinforcement can be used to explain how people get to be motivated to engage owing to external rewards like incentives in their jobs since it is presumed that motivated employees can get satisfied and engaged at their workplace. For instance, if an employee received a reward for their good effort and achievement such as a promotion, recognition, a scholarship or, a holiday, the same behaviour of working hard may be repeated because there are high chances that one may again receive a reward. Hence the more the reward or reinforcement, the higher the chances of the same actions manifesting.

Review of Related Literature

Employee engagement

Engagement was first presented by early theorists and scholars such as Kahn(1990), May,Gilson and, Harter(2004); as well as Schaufeli and Bakker(2004)sharing between 10 per cent and 25 per cent of their variances; (2), all of whom describe employee engagement as a psychological state experienced by employees in relation to their work with associated behaviours of intellectual, emotional and behavioural dimensions. Furthermore,highly engaged employees dedicate themselves to their work roles, express themselves physically by being there and exerting effort in their role, emotionally by having a positive orientation such as pride and; enthusiasm, cognitively by thinking hard and paying attention during the execution of their tasks and, lastly, behaviourally by engaging in extra-role behaviours and being proactive, among others(Kahn, 1990).

There is always some confusion between employee engagement and organisational engagement. Saks (2006) helped to clear up this confusion by describing organisational engagement as a person's attitude and attachment to his/her company while employee engagement as the extent or degree to which an individual in the organisation is absorbed in the performance of their task. Also, engaged employees have passion and, energy about their work and are more often fully absorbed in it so that their work time passes quickly without them easily realising it (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Employee engagement is a positive fulfilling work-related state of mind characterised the following components: Vigour, which is expressed through having high levels of energy and willingness to work hard or execute daily tasks by investing more effort in one's work, feeling inspired and challenged by it; dedication, which involves being deeply involved in one's work and experiencing a sense of importance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride and challenge; and absorption, which is characterised by full concentration on one's work while feeling happy and engrossed(Willmar, Schaufeli & Bakker, 2002). This is also seen when one has difficulty in detaching oneself from work, time passing quickly and one forgetting everything else around them.

It is also important to note that the concept of employee engagement is broad. Macey and Schneider (2008) identified key elements that have been used to define employee engagement and these include; trait engagement, which involves being conscientious, proactive in personality and having positive emotions; state engagement, which refers to being satisfied, involved and empowered; and behavioural engagement, which manifests through extra-role behaviours, proactiveness and results in role expansion. For instance, Khan (1990), defines personal engagement as the harnessing of individual selves to their work roles physically, cognitively and emotionally during their performance. This contains at least one of the above-mentioned elements.

Employee engagement is a participative process that involves using the entire ability of workers and designed to encourage employee commitment to attain goals and objectives set by their organisations. Employee involvement, participation or taking part in making decisions makes the workplace more democratic in nature, and when employees are empowered, it leads to certain outcomes, such as creativity and innovation, which results in improving performance (Cotton, 1993) life programmes, quality circles, gain-sharing plans, self-directed work teams and employee ownership - with special attention to implementation. The final chapters summarize the success factors for better employee involvement systems. The need for employee involvement -- Empirical research and models of employee involvement -- Quality of work life programs -- Quality circles -- Scanlon plans and other gainsharing plans -- Representative participation -- Job enrichment -- Self-directed work teams -- Employee ownership -- Overall findings and future directions for research."

"author":[{"dropping-particle":"","family":"Cotton","given":"John L.","non-dropping-particle":"","parse-names":false,"suffix":""}], "id":"ITEM-1", "issued":{"date-parts":[["1993"]]}, "number-of-pages":"310", "publisher":"SAGE Publications", "title":"Employee involvement : methods for improving performance and work attitudes", "type":"book"}, "uris":["http://www.mendeley.com/documents/?uuid=d4441b48-9243-3a09-afb6-b79745273cb0"]], "mendeley":{"formattedCitation":"(Cotton, 1993. Furthermore, the Gallup Consulting Organisation (2006) points out three main identifiable categories of employees, and these include: engaged, not engaged and actively disengaged employees (Yuan & Lee, 2011). Engaged employees have a high sense of personal responsibility and; of obligation to what they should do for their organisation, work with passion, are innovative and creative, and feel a strong sense of attachment to their place of work.

On the contrary, disengaged employees demonstrate poor customer service, lack commitment and perform poorly. Their choice to participate is very low, they do not excel and do not care about the success of the organisation they work for. Painfully, such employees are unhappy individuals who try to lure everyone else around them to follow suit. Worse still, they oppose every idea at their workplace, undermine the efforts of their co-workers and are driven by negativity, hence becoming victims of poor performance. For instance, Crabtree most of which are invasive ductal adenocarcinoma with dismal prognosis, cystic lesions of the pancreas are often either benign or low-grade indolent neoplasia. Those that are mucinous, namely, intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasms (IPMNs, in the Gallup report (2013) in the United States, indicates that between 2011 and 2012, non-engaged employees totaled 87% and engaged employees were only 13%. Another survey carried out by CIPD, a consultancy firm, on employee attitude and engagement in Britain, revealed that levels of engagement nationwide were low (Truss & Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, 2006a). Disengaged employees are like a chronic cancer that can slowly affect the success of the entire firm in terms of productivity (Rampersad, 2006; Ayers, 2006). This condition affects both public and private workplaces.

Factors affecting employee engagement

There are many factors that can affect the engagement levels of employees. First, the employee's perception of the job. Employees who hold negative attitudes towards their job tend to reduce their loyalty and customer service provision. Also, personal factors like beliefs, personal health and the wellbeing of individual employees such as lecturers, accountants, teachers and; managers, among others, tend to influence engagement levels (Maloney & Lock, 2008). Second is employee clarity of job expectations. Chances are high that once expectations are clear, employees can engage because

they have positive emotions like happiness as they go about their daily tasks (Hay Group, 2002). It is, therefore, important to clarify expectations. Third, the quality of working relationships with co-workers and supervisors influences engagement levels. In situations where relations with managers are assumed to be distant, this hinders the employee's engagement because they are always worried about their supervisors. If the supervisors are good, supportive, trusting and close to the employees and co-workers, encourage them, care about them and are helpful, engagement is strengthened (May et al., 2004; Ryan & Deci, 2000) autonomy, and relatedness. We discuss the SDT concept of needs as it relates to previous need theories, emphasizing that needs specify the necessary conditions for psychological growth, integrity, and well-being. This concept of needs leads to the hypotheses that different regulatory processes underlying goal pursuits are differentially associated with effective functioning and well-being and also that different goal contents have different relations to the quality of behavior and mental health, specifically because different regulatory processes and different goal contents are associated with differing degrees of need satisfaction. Social contexts and individual differences that support satisfaction of the basic needs facilitate natural growth processes including intrinsically motivated behavior and integration of extrinsic motivations, whereas those that forestall autonomy, competence, or relatedness are associated with poorer motivation, performance, and well-being. We also discuss the relation of the psychological needs to cultural values, evolutionary processes, and other contemporary motivation theories.

,"author":{,"dropping-particle":"","family":"Ryan","given":"Richard M.","non-dropping-particle":"","parse-names":false,"suffix":""},{"dropping-particle":"","family":"Deci","given":"Edward L.","non-dropping-particle":"","parse-names":false,"suffix":""},"container-title":"Psychological Inquiry","id":"ITEM-1","issue":"4","issued":{"date-parts":[["2000"]]},"page":"227-268","title":"The \\'What\' and \\'Why\' of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior","type":"article-journal","volume":"11"},"uris":["http://www.mendeley.com/documents/?uuid=685950d3-6ada-4a7c-a4bd-684203ebb471"]},"mendeley":{"formattedCitation":"(Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Leadership also increases engagement levels in situations where employees are inspired or supported by their supervisors or managers. Transformative leaders, for instance, develop and raise their subordinate's interests so that they can focus for the good of the organisation. They motivate employees to look beyond their own selfish desires for the common good of the organisation. With these kind of leaders, chances are very high that their subordinates will always engage themselves by being dedicated to their work with a lot of energy and passion (Gardner et al., 2005). Remuneration also plays a big role in increasing employees engagement levels and so it is important to know what kind of rewards to use for the different employee category. Additionally, when employees are rewarded, they also work hard to pay back by engaging and consequently performing (Saks, 2006; Hagopian et al., 2009). Training and career development opportunities that are given to employees help equip them with new skills and ideas that adapt to the changing working world, hence improving on service delivery, accuracy and effectiveness in the workplace. This consequently increases competence and confidence in the job. This is a form of reward because employees feel valued and, obviously, are motivated to engage all the more in order to be productive (Adlerfer, 1972).

Lastly, organisational policies, structures and practices have an impact on individual employee engagement levels. For instance, having fair recruitment and selection policies where employees are employed basing on their competence as opposed to other considerations, or having supportive welfare policies in the organisation increases the engagement levels of employees. (Schneider et al. 2009).

Job performance

To describe performance, one has to be specific, considering the differing contexts of each aspect. It must be such as employee performance, work performance, financial performance, organisational performance, productivity, student performance, or individual performance, among others. This study focused on job performance, which is an important factor in the organisation as it exposes the efficiency and effectiveness of teams and individual employees in achieving the set organisational goals. Performance is simply when employees or any individual performing a particular task or set of obligations achieves it and creates a different environment that brings a benefit to the organisation. Performance is also a job-related activity that is expected of an employee and how well those activities are accomplished or completed (Dessler, 2011). It involves the achievement of quantifiable objectives of the organisation (Armstrong, 2006). Armstrong (2000), also cited in Kagaari, Munene and Ntayi (2010), states that job performance is a means of getting better outcomes from the whole Organisation, or the teams or individuals within it by understanding and managing performance within an agreed and designed framework of planned goals, standards and skill requirements.

Performance in the world of employment looks at all forms of workers such as doctors, nurses, teachers and police officers, among others. The World Health Organisation (WHO, 2006), for instance, defines a well-performing workforce as one that operates in ways that are responsive, reasonable, competent and proficient to achieve the paramount outcomes whether organisational, educational, related to security or health, and others. Poor performance among health workers, for instance, can lead to lack of access to quality health care. When it comes to an organisation or institution, poor performance of, for example, teachers, lecturers or employees in general, leads to poor or low outcome in terms of both products and services. Dieleman and Harnmeijer (2006) further argue that performance is a central attitudinal construct in industrial and organisational psychology. It refers to scalable actions, behaviours and outcomes that employees engage in that are linked with and contribute to the achievement of organisational goals. Performance is, according to Chan and Baum (2007), equally a result as well as a qualitative and quantitative measurement of effort to achieve the specific, measurable and attainable set goals.

Performance measurement, on one hand, is a periodical assessment of progress towards short- and long-term objectives and reporting of the results to decision-makers in an attempt to improve performance in such a way that managers find out if the goals and objectives or desired outcomes are being achieved (Kruk & Freedman, 2008). There is growing interest in assessing the performance of health systems in developing countries. This paper proposes a framework for the assessment of health system performance and reviews the literature on indicators currently in use to measure performance using online medical and public health databases. This was complemented by a review of relevant books and reports in the grey literature. The indicators were organized into three categories: effectiveness, equity, and efficiency. Measures of health system effectiveness were improvement in health status, access to and quality of care and, increasingly, patient satisfaction. Measures of equity included access and quality of care for disadvantaged groups together with fair financing, risk protection and accountability. Measures of efficiency were appropriate levels of funding, the cost-effectiveness of interventions, and effective administration. This framework and review of indicators may be helpful to health policy makers interested in assessing the effects of different policies, expenditures, and organizational structures on health outputs and outcomes in developing countries. © 2007 Elsevier Ireland Ltd. All rights reserved.,"author":[{"dropping-particle":"","family":"Kruk","given":"Margaret Elizabeth","non-dropping-particle":"","parse-names":

false,"suffix":"","{"dropping-particle":"","family":"Freedman","given":"Lynn P.,"non-dropping-particle":"","parse-names":false,"suffix":""},"container-title":"Health Policy","id":"ITEM-1","issued":{"date-parts":[["2008"]]},"title":"Assessing health system performance in developing countries: A review of the literature","type":"article"},"uris":["http://www.mendeley.com/documents/?uuid=db24c987-a2ff-3fb6-b8de-bef35047f07b"]},"mendeley":{"formattedCitation":"(Kruk & Freedman, 2008. Performance can be measured using different approaches or techniques that are available. For instance, performance appraisal is one of the most popularly used methods to measure employee performance(Layne, Steinberg, & Steinberg, 2014)evaluation, and credentialing of mental health profes- sionals focus heavily on instilling the knowledge and skills needed for performing evidence-based assessment and treatment. We propose the content of a companion training curriculum in clinical decision-making that reflects the pervasive and indispensable role of causal reasoning in clinical practice. Contents of the proposed curriculum include review and discussion of the following areas: (a. Noe et al. (2008) describe five approaches that could be used to measure the performance of employees and these are the comparative, attribute, behavioural, quality and result approaches. However, for the purpose of this research, only the three related ones are discussed. First is the comparative approach, which measures employee' performance by comparing an individual employee's performance to that of another. In this approach, ranking is used which involves arranging from the highest performer to the lowest. Forced distribution involves putting employees in groups and ranking them. Paired comparison is where supervisors compare every employee with other employees in the work group by giving a score to one and using the score to compare which of the pair performs better. Armstrong (2009) states that the advantage with the comparative approach is that it is useful if an employee's performance needs to be differentiated from that of others, and that it is limited in that it does not measure performance against its absolute standards.

Second is the attribute approach, which involves identifying employees' characteristics that are necessary for organisational success and under this approach employee performance is measured according to those features. The graphic scale is used, where the supervisor rates the employees on a particular trait or characteristic basing on a standard scale. The approach is easy to develop and apply, and it is reliable and valid across a range of jobs. However, this technique may give rise to defensiveness among employees, as performance standards are usually vague and may be interpreted differently by different appraisers (Noe et al. 2008). Last is the behavioural approach, which defines the behaviours necessary for effective performance in a particular job. The supervisors assess performance by identifying the extent to which subordinates have exhibited the required behaviours. The tools used include: critical incidence, a behaviourally anchored rating scale, a behaviour observation scale and organizational behaviour modification (Noe et al., 2008). The advantage of this approach is that it provides employees with specific feedback on their performance and that it is acceptable to both employees and managers, but its weakness is that it assumes there is one best way to do the job (Noe et al., 2008).

Performance management, on the other hand, is an important aspect of bringing about and maintaining performance. It is a kind of process that consists of phases like goal-setting, measurement, assessment, feedback, recording of good results, improvement for bad results and applying sanctions in case of necessity(Kaplan, 2001;Chang, 2006to produce a generally applicable descriptive model. Elements of quality management performance measurement described include: strategic goal setting, operational management, individual appraisal, and reward and recognition

mechanisms. The key to successful performance measurement is ensuring congruence between all operational elements, encompassing employees at all levels in all departments, requiring total management commitment to teamwork, and information systems integrated with those of the customers and the suppliers.”,“author”:[{“dropping-particle”：“”,“family”：“Chang”,“given”：“Hs in Hsin”,“non-dropping-particle”：“”,“parse-names”：false,“suffix”：“”}],“container-title”：“Service Industries Journal”,“id”：“ITEM-1”,“issued”:[{“date-parts”:[{“2006”}]}],“title”：“Development of performance measurement systems in quality management organisations”,“type”：“article-journal”,“uris”:[“http://www.mendeley.com/documents/?uuid=709ac699-c0fd-3841-9e67-1c7352cb9dac”]],“mendeley”:[{“formattedCitation”：“(Chang, 2006; Kasurinen, 2002).Furthermore, Mone and London (2003) emphasise five performance management activities that could enhance engagement and performance and these include; setting performance and development goals, providing ongoing feedback and recognition; managing employee development; conducting mid-and end-year appraisals; and building a climate of trust and empowerment with employees. These are elaborated below.

Employee performance can also be measured using two types of performance, which are process and outcome (Roe, 1999). Process performance involves those particular actions or behaviours which employees exhibit to achieve effective performance or what employees do in their work situations; while outcomes are the products or services that are consistent with organisational goals and objectives, such as customer satisfaction, creativity, innovation and; high productivity, among others, which can be viewed at the individual, team and organizational levels. Furthermore, process performance can be measured in three ways, which the study basically used to measure employee performance of the academic staff. First is task or in-role performance, which involves finding out those activities done by workers that are directly related to the employees’ formal role requirements or duties specified in the job description that bring about the achievement of organisational goals and objectives (Fleishman, 1967)often in applied contexts , under numerous task and environmental lPortions of this article appeared also in E. A. Fleishman, Development of a behavior taxonomy for describing human tasks: a correlational-experimental approach.”,“author”:[{“dropping-parti cle”：“”,“family”：“Fleishman”,“given”：“Edwin A.”,“non-dropping-particle”：“”,“parse-names”：fals e,“suffix”：“”}],“container-title”：“Human Factors: The Journal of Human Factors and Ergonomics Society”,“id”：“ITEM-1”,“issued”:[{“date-parts”:[{“1967”}]}],“title”：“Performance Assessment Based on an Empirically Derived Task Taxonomy”,“type”：“article-journal”,“uris”:[“http://www.mendeley. com/documents/?uuid=bef239d6-0a27-3a08-bbf2-de5f18037a5a”]],“mendeley”:[{“formattedCitation ”：“(Fleishman, 1967. For example, a lecturer has to fulfil all the requirements of the job that the status of a lecturer entails (Goodman & Svyantek, 1999). Second is contextual or extra-role performance, which entails those activities or behaviours that are not directly part of the formal role requirements of an employee but are essential in promoting organisational effectiveness (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). An example is, an employee helping others with heavy workloads. These behaviours are usually referred to as Organisational citizenship behaviours (OCB). Also, altruism of OCB or extra-role behaviours (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983b). Counter productive work behaviour (CPWB) refers to acts against organisational goals such as taking undeserved work breaks and putting little effort into one’s job, among others (Fox & Spector, 1999)dispositional, and a□ective antecedents of counterproductive work behaviors. A model based on the organizational frustration±aggression work of Spector and colleagues was tested using structural equa-tion modeling and zero-order correlational analysis. As expected, a positive relationship was found between employees’ experience

of situational constraints (events frustrating their achievement of organizational and personal goals; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983) "type": "article-journal", "volume": "68", "uris": [{"http": "//www.mendeley.com/documents/?uuid=fd010de4-fbd2-4c39-8471-7c2364eaa714"}], "mendeley": {"formattedCitation": "(Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983a).

Besides employee engagement, performance is influenced by a number of internal and external factors which Woods (2014), as cited in Tarus (2014), affirms includes personal issues, job stability, motivation to succeed, working conditions, job training and performance feedback. Furthermore, poor performance can result from many factors, such as low pay, low recognition, negative emotions or personality. An engaged workplace encourages commitment, energy and productivity from all those involved and this helps improve business performance (Business Link, 2010) and so managers must drive engagement by ensuring that there is good feedback, rewards and recognition to improve performance as an outcome (Mone & London, 2018). Additionally, Krivank (1999), as cited in Tarus (2014), argues that for an employee to exceed performance expectations, they should have the requisite knowledge, skills, ability, motivation, standards and feedback. Koontz (1990) elaborates that employee performance can be increased through proper pay systems, which are either financial, such as salaries, bonuses, wages and allowances, or non-financial, such as recognition, training, medical care, meals and housing, among other incentives. Harzing (2004), further argues that performance involves links to the organisation's strategy, the setting of individual performance goals, providing regular feedback on the progress made on these goals, providing opportunities for improving performance and, lastly, linking results and rewards, meaning that performing employees who obviously achieve goals must be rewarded to enhance their morale.

Cropanzano and Mitchel (2005) carried out a study on social exchange and their findings revealed that when employers and employees abide by the rule of social exchange, there will always be a trusting and loyal relationship between them. This simply means that social exchange plays around action and reaction in a more reciprocal relationship. For instance, if an employee performs better or has achieved a good performance appraisal, a reward or some form of appreciation is expected, and this increases the chances of the individual performing more. Therefore, performance will always be maintained and increased as long as action and reaction are maintained or rewards are maintained from both sides of the employment relationship.

Employee engagement and job performance

Many studies have revealed positive and negative linkages between engagement and job performance among both employees and students. For instance, Marciano (2011), argues that employee engagement predicts employee outcomes and, therefore, performance. Engaged employees want to win and perform a task in the best possible way by taking their time and doing things right. A survey of Greek employees working in fast food restaurants supports this. The participants were asked to fill in a diary booklet for five consecutive days, and the results showed that highly engaged employees performed better on a daily basis, and that the higher the employee's level of daily engagement, the higher the achievement of the objective on financial returns and therefore, performance. They found that job and personal resources also independently or jointly predict work engagement and have particularly positive impacts on engagement.

When job demands are high, engagement, in turn, positively affects job performance (Xanthopoulou et al., 2009a). This means that engagement predicts employee performance. Contrary to the above view, Halbesleben and Wheeler; (2008b), in their studies, found that there was no strong

relationship between engagement and performance. They collected data from 587 employees in the United States, representing a wide variety of industries and occupations. The results showed that work engagement had a significant semi-partial correlation with self-rated, supervisor-rated and co-worker-rated performance. This meant that work engagement had a relatively small effect on employee performance, meaning that the goals set increase the engagement levels of employees, who become highly optimistic at work and, eventually, this high level of optimism leads to higher levels of individual performance. This is an advantage to the organisation or institution at large.

There is also an indirect relationship that has been observed by some studies. For instance, Medlin and Green (2009) employee engagement, workplace optimism, and individual performance constructs. Goal setting is hypothesized as positively impacting employee engagement, employee engagement as positively impacting workplace optimism, and workplace optimism as positively impacting individual performance. Data collected from a sample of 426 full- and part-time employees are analyzed following a structural equation modeling methodology. The measurement and structural models fit the data relatively well. Goal setting positively impacts employee engagement, employee engagement positively impacts optimism, and optimism positively impacts individual performance, as hypothesized. Results indicate that formal, structured goal setting processes lead to higher levels of employee engagement, that higher levels of engagement lead to improved workplace optimism, and that improved optimism in turn leads to higher levels of individual performance. The paper provides empirical support for the implementation of management programs that foster goal setting, employee engagement, and workplace optimism for the purpose of enhancing the performance levels of individual employees.

,"author":{"dropping-particle":"","family":"Medlin","given":"Bobby","non-dropping-particle":"","parse-names":false,"suffix":""},{"dropping-particle":"","family":"Green","given":"Kenneth W.","non-dropping-particle":"","parse-names":false,"suffix":""}], "container-title":"Industrial Management and Data Systems", "id":"ITEM-1", "issue":"7", "issued":{"date-parts":[["2009"]]}, "page":"943-956", "title":"Enhancing performance through goal setting, engagement, and optimism", "type":"article-journal", "volume":"109", "uris":["http://www.mendeley.com/documents/?uuid=f5417934-daab-4d41-9e84-951c14f1a259"]], "mendeley":{"formattedCitation":"(Medlin & Green, 2009, conducted a study to investigate the relationship among goal-setting, work engagement, optimism and individual performance among 426 full- and part-time employees in the Southern United States. The results revealed that goal-setting had a positive impact on work engagement (standardized coefficient (SC)=.58, t=11.04, p<.01) and work engagement had a positive impact on workplace optimism (SC=.65, t=11.17, p<.01) which, eventually, impacted positively on performance (SC=.77, t=13.05, p<.01).

The concept of engagement has gained interest among both organisational practitioners and the scholars. Engaged employees have been found to be instrumental to organisational support since they actively perform their roles better, consequently being productive (Quinones, Van Den Broeck, & De Witte, 2013). Smith et al., (1983b) also affirm that such employees are known to be engaged in extra-role behaviours and, therefore, make an extra contribution to an organisation without having it incur extra costs in compensation. Chan Min Kim¹ and Seung Won Park (2015) add that engaged employees are able to produce quality products and this ensures that organisational products and services appeal to the market. Employees who put a lot of emotional energy into work roles contribute to the achievement of organisational goals in a number of related ways (Kahn, 1990). Those who invest emotional energy into their roles enhance performance through the promotion of increased connections among co-workers in the struggle to achieve organisational goals (Ashforth &

Humphrey, 1995) research has generally neglected the impact of everyday emotions on organizational life. Further, organizational scholars and practitioners frequently appear to assume that emotionality is the antithesis of rationality and, thus, frequently hold a pejorative view of emotion. This has led to four institutionalized mechanisms for regulating the experience and expression of emotion in the workplace: (1. Investment of emotional energy also helps individuals meet the emotional demands of their roles in a way that results in more complete and authentic performance. Further, engaged employees have been shown to achieve higher levels of job performance/work performance and in-role performance. For instance, in a study carried out to examine the relationship between work engagement and performance and the moderating role of conscientiousness among 144 employees in the Netherlands, Bakker, Demerouti and Cooper (2012) reported that work engagement was positively related to contextual performance ($b=.40$, $t=2.54$, $p<0.5$) and task performance ($b=.45$, $t=2.94$, $p<.01$). Furthermore, adaptive and proactive behaviours at work and role performance are outcomes of high levels of engagement (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008).

Harter et al. (2009), in a meta-analysis study, reported that engagement was related to the nine performance measures used in organisations whose employees displayed high levels of engagement or who were actively disengaged. Anitha (2014) supports this reporting that there is a strong significant relationship between employee engagement and performance. Kirk-Brown and Van Dijk, (2011) the current study examined the relationship between work engagement, perceptions of psychological safety at work and the performance of organisational citizenship behaviours for employees with chronic illness ($N = 92$) also investigated the relationship between work engagement and performance among 604 employees in Australia, of whom 92 had chronic illnesses, and the results showed that work engagement had a positive relationship with performance for both groups. In another meta-analysis study conducted by Halbesleben and Wheeler (2008a), it was found that engaged employees displayed higher commitment to their jobs as well as the organisation, improved health and higher levels of job performance. Engaged employees, according to Truss of the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (2006b), are passionate, totally immersed in their work, energetic, committed and completely dedicated. The more engaged they become, the better they perform (Macey et al., 2011) tools, and case examples, Employee Engagement translates best practices, ideas, and concepts into concrete and practical steps that will change the level of engagement in any organization. Explores the meaning of engagement and how engagement differs significantly from other important yet related concepts like satisfaction and commitment Discusses what it means to create a culture of engagement Provides a practical presentation deck and talking points managers can use to introduce the concept of engagement in their organization Addresses issues of work-life balance. Cover; Praise for Employee Engagement; Talent Management Essentials; Title page; copyright; Dedication; Series Editors Preface.xhtml; preface; Acknowledgments; Chapter 1: Engaging Engagement; How Engagement Makes a Difference and What Engagement Is; How an Engaged Workforce Creates Positive Financial Consequences for Organizations; On High Performance Work Environments: Four Principles for Creating an Engaged Workforce; The Remainder of the Book; Chapter 2: The “Feel and Look” of Employee Engagement; The Feel of Engagement; The Look of Engagement: Employee Behavior. Strategically Aligned Engagement Behavior What About Employee Satisfaction?; Where Does This Take Us?; Chapter 3: The Key to an Engaged Workforce: An Engagement Culture; What is Organizational Culture?; Creating a Culture for Engagement: How People are Valued in Organizations; The Role of Culture in Creating Strategic Employee Engagement; Summary; Chapter 4: Phase 1 of Creating and Executing an Engagement Campaign:

Diagnostics and the Engagement Survey; Pre-Survey Diagnostic Activities; The Engagement Survey. Chapter 5: Phase 2 of Creating and Executing an Engagement Campaign: Action Planning and Intervention Survey Results Interpretation; Survey Results Feedback; Preparing the Organization for Taking Action; How Much Measurable Change is Possible?; Actual Changes That Build and Maintain Engagement; Summary; Chapter 6: Burnout and Disengagement: The Dark Side of Engagement; Disengagement: Early Unmet Expectations at Work; The Nature and Trajectory of Burnout; Effective Coping With Burnout; Additional Stress Factors and Disengagement; Remedies and Interventions. Resistance to Change and Engagement: Another Dark Side of Engagement How Should Engagement Initiatives be Communicated?; Conclusion; Chapter 7: Talking Points: Introducing or Rethinking Engagement in Your Organization; The Slide Show; Notes; Aut..."; "author": [{"dropping-particle": "", "family": "Macey", "given": "William H.", "non-dropping-particle": "", "parse-names": false, "suffix": ""}, {"dropping-particle": "", "family": "Schneider", "given": "Benjamin.", "non-dropping-particle": "", "parse-names": false, "suffix": ""}, {"dropping-particle": "", "family": "Barbera", "given": "Karen M.", "non-dropping-particle": "", "parse-names": false, "suffix": ""}, {"dropping-particle": "", "family": "Young", "given": "Scott A.", "non-dropping-particle": "", "parse-names": false, "suffix": ""}], "id": "ITEM-1", "issued": {"date-parts": [[2011]]}, "number-of-pages": 353, "publisher": "John Wiley & Sons", "title": "Employee Engagement : Tools for Analysis, Practice, and Competitive Advantage.", "type": "book", "uris": ["http://www.mendeley.com/documents/?uuid=48baddb5-7e9a-3edc-a84f-3a082f14c430"]], "mendeley": {"formattedCitation": "(Macey et al., 2011). In fact, a decline in engagement levels, as reported by Mone et al., (2011), can have an effect on productivity, customer service and performance at both individual and organizational levels.

In conducted by Joo and Mclean (2006), as cited by Shmailan (2016), on 7,959 business units in 38 countries, it was revealed that the outcomes of satisfaction, profitability, lower turnover of staff and reduced work mishaps were due to higher satisfied and engaged staff. A similar study to examine the crossover of daily work engagement revealed that daily work engagement was positively significantly related to daily task performance for both actors ($r=.55$, $p<.01$) and partners ($r=.48$, $p<.01$). This means that an increase in engagement leads to an increase on daily task performance. Engagement is, therefore, an important aspect of the employer-employee relationship that should be sought by both parties.

Reasons why engaged employees perform

From the aforementioned revelations, it is important to summarise reasons why engaged employees attained desirable performance. There are four reasons why engaged workers perform better than their non-engaged co-workers or colleagues. First and foremost, engaged employees often experience positive emotions, including gratitude, joy, happiness and enthusiasm. These positive emotions broaden an employee's thoughts, implying, as Fredrickson (2001) put it, that they constantly work on their personal attributes. Secondly, engaged workers experience better health because of their positive disposition, implying that they can focus and dedicate all their skills and energy resources to their work without the disruption resulting from absenteeism. Thirdly engaged employees create their own job and personal resources. Lastly, engaged employees transfer their engagement to others in their immediate environment or surrounding since in most organisations, performance is a result of a combined collaborative effort and engagement of one person may be transferred to others and indirectly improve team performance (Xanthopoulou et al., 2009a).

High performance in the 21st century demands innovation, flexibility and speed. Therefore, employers need to engage their employees, especially by giving those opportunities to participate, be free and to trust. Additionally, performance data from the best companies in the United States shows that objectives are more easily met when employees are fully engaged (Martel, 2003).

It is on the basis of the importance of these two variables that the study set out to investigate the level of and relationship between engagement and job performance in public universities in Uganda, using Makerere University, the biggest, most highly rated and oldest in the country.

Methodology

Research design

A correlation research design was used and deemed fit since the aim of the study was to establish the cause-and-effect relationship between employee engagement and job performance. Additionally, a quantitative research approach was utilized with a questionnaire because it involved testing the levels of variables and predicting relationships between variables.

Population and sample size

The population of the study comprised all Makerere University academic staff from the. The sample size, comprised of 214 academic staff, was obtained using the Krejcie and Morgan, 1970) sample size table and this was sampled randomly.

Data collection

The study used a self-administered questionnaire with closed-ended statements or items along a 5-point Likert scale starting from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) that were filled by the respondents. The aim was to establish the relationship and levels between employee engagement, expressed by responses on vigour, dedication as well as absorption and job performance, from items demonstrating in-role and extra-role job performance. The tool also had open-ended questions to solicit the free opinion of respondents on other factors that affect both engagement and the performance of academic staff.

Quality control

Content validity was achieved by having the supervisor check the questionnaire to verify if the items exactly measured the variables employee engagement and job performance as intended. Furthermore, adequate time was used to gather enough literature review that was used to support the questionnaire formulation. Reliability, on the other hand, was managed by ensuring that the statements were in line with the study objectives and that there was consistency in explaining the items, purpose and objectives of the study for better understanding to all respondents.

Data analysis

Analysis was done using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21, descriptive statistics such as frequencies, mean score to determine the strength and level of each variable as well as percentages. The hypothesis was tested using Pearson correlation coefficient.

Limitations to the study

The response rate was initially low but this was solved through creating a good rapport with the respondents, giving a proper explanation of the purpose and objectives of the study as well as

the advantages of the findings to the institution, and making consistent follow-up to remind the respondents that they had to complete the questionnaires properly. The timing for the collection of data, in the morning hours, was also crucial since most academic staff would spare some time to complete the questionnaire.

Presentation of Results

Respondent's background information

The background information or sample characteristics of the respondents were mainly on their sex, marital status, job status, age, period of service, religious affiliation and levels of education, which are presented in the table below.

Table 1: Background information of the respondents

Variables	Levels	Number (N)	Percentage (%)
Sex	Male	90	66.2
	Female	46	33.8
Marital status	Married	104	83.8
	Single	22	16.2
Job status	Assistant lecturer	50	36.8
	Lecturer	56	41.2
	Senior lecturer	16	11.8
	Associate professor	6	4.4
	Professor	8	5.9
Age	20–30	18	13.2
	31–40	42	30.9
	41– 50	46	33.8
	51– 60	22	16.2
	61 years and above	8	5.9
Highest level of education	Masters	52	38.2
	PhD	84	61.8
Period of service in the institution	1–5	26	19.1
	6–10	30	22.1
	11–15	34	25.0
	16–20	24	17.6
	21 years above	22	16.2
Religious affiliation	Catholic	22	31.1
	Anglican	29	39.7
	Pentecostal	16	21.9
	Muslim	4	5.5
	Others	2	2.7

According to Table.1 above, findings show that there were more male respondents (66.2%) as compared to the females (33.8%). The majority of the respondents were married (83.8%) and only a

small number (16.2%) were single. It was also found that the majority (41.2%) of the respondents were Lecturers, followed by Assistant Lecturers (36.8%), Senior Lecturers (11.8%), Professors (5.9%) and then Associate Professors (4.4%). The majority (33.8%) of the respondents fell within the age bracket of 41–50, followed by 30.9% of the respondents in the age bracket of 31–40 years. Those between the ages of 51 and 60 were 16.2%, while 13.2% were between 20 and 30. Only 5.9% were over 61 years of age. When it came to educational levels, it was found that the majority of the respondents (61.8%) were PhD holders while only 38.2% were holding a master's degree. This result validates the findings because academic staff from the level of Lecture must be PhD holders.

When it came to years the respondents had spent serving in the institution, it turned out 25.0% had served between 11 and 15 years, followed by 22.1% between 6 and 10 years, 19.1% between 1 and 5 years, 17.6% between 16 and 20 years and only 16.2% for over 21 years and above. For academic staff in Makerere University, there is a specified amount of time one must spend between the ranks, hence the variation in the period served.

Lastly, the majority of the respondents did not give an answer to the item on religious affiliation. For those who responded, the findings revealed that the majority (39.7%) were Anglicans, followed by Catholics, who were 31.1%, then Pentecostals, who stood at 21.9%, Muslims, who constituted 5.5% and others who did not specify accounted for 2.7%.

Employee engagement

The study aimed at finding out the levels of employee engagement among the respondents with the expectations that it would be either high or low. It is important to note that when it came to analysing the levels of employee engagement, the total frequencies and percentages for those who strongly disagreed and the ones who disagreed were put together as well as for those who agreed and strongly agreed, thus leaving three columns for analysis of “disagreed”, “not sure” and “agreed”. Analysis was based on the three components of vigour, absorption and dedication, as presented in the table below.

Table 2: Levels of employee engagement

Items		Disagree		Not sure		Agree	
Vigour		N	%	N	%	N	%
1	When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work	2	1.5	8	5.9	126	92.7
2	At my work I feel bursting with energy	24	17.6	24	25.0	78	57.4
3	At my work I always persevere even when things don't go well	8	5.8	18	13.2	114	83.9
4	I can continue working for very long periods of time	18	13.2	10	7.4	108	79.4
5	At my job I am very resilient mentally	6	4.4	12	8.8	116	85.3
6	During duty work, I feel very strong and vigorous	8	5.9	30	22.1	98	72
Dedication							
7	My job is very challenging	20	14.7	18	13.2	98	72
8	I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose	8	5.9	8	5.9	120	88.3
9	My job inspires me and gives me hope	6	4.4	10	7.4	120	88.2
10	I am enthusiastic about my job	0	0	10	7.4	126	92.6
11	I am proud of the work that I do	4	2.9	4	2.9	128	94.1

Items		Disagree		Not sure		Agree	
Absorption							
12	Time flies when I am working, I just realise it is past time	10	7.4	16	11.8	110	80.8
13	When I am working, I forget everything else around me	56	41.2	28	20.6	52	38.3
14	I get carried away when I am working	38	27.9	32	23.5	66	48.6
15	It is difficult for me to detach myself from my job	22	16.1	14	10.3	100	73.5
16	I am immersed in my work	8	5.8	26	19.1	102	75
17	I feel happy when I am working intensely	16	11.8	20	14.7	98	72.1
18	I love doing my work in that I just realise time has gone	12	8.8	26	19.1	96	70.6

Vigour: From observations in Table 2 above, it was discovered that when the respondents were asked to rate themselves on whether when they got up in the morning, they felt like going to work, the majority (92.7%) highly agreed, while 5.9% were not sure and only 1.5% disagreed. This meant that on this particular item, the respondents were highly engaged with vigour to go to work whenever they woke up. The research findings further revealed that while at work, 57.4% agreed that they felt bursting with energy, some (25.0%) were not sure if they felt the same and only 17.6% disagreed with the statement. Additionally, 83.9% highly agreed that they persevered even when things did not go well, 13.2% were not sure, while only 5.8% disagreed. Interestingly, 79.4% agreed that they could continue working for very long periods of time, while 13.2% disagreed and only 7.4% were not sure if they could continue working for very long periods of time. The findings further revealed that 85.3% of the respondents were highly resilient mentally, 8.8% were not sure and only 4.4% disagreed. Also, during duty work, 72% of the respondents agreed that they felt vigorous and strong, while 22.1% were not sure, leaving only 5.9% in disagreement

From the six items of vigour, most of the respondents were in agreement, starting from 55.3% as the lowest and going up to 92.7% as the highest. The highest percentage for disagreement with the items was 17.6% and the lowest was 1.5%, leaving engagement on the vigour component high.

Dedication: When asked if their job was challenging, 72% agreed, 13.2% were not sure and only 9% disagreed. Additionally, 88.2% agreed that their job inspired them and gave them hope, 7.4% were not sure and only 4.4% disagreed, meaning that to them, their job neither inspired them nor gave them hope. Asked if they were enthusiastic about their job, 92.6% agreed that they were, 7.4% were not sure and no one disagreed. The majority of the respondents (94.1%) were proud of the work that they did, while 2.9% were not sure. Additionally, 88.3% strongly agreed that they found the work that they did full of meaning and purpose, while 5.9% were not sure and the same number disagreed.

Regarding dedication, the highest percentage who agreed with the items was 94.1% and the lowest 72%, while in connection with disagreement, the highest was 9% and the lowest zero, meaning that the academic staff were high on dedication, at an average of 86%.

Absorption: Regarding the absorption items, in connection with the item that has to do with forgetting everything else around one during work, the majority of the respondents (41.2%) disagreed that they could not forget everything else around them while 38.3% agreed that during work, they could forget everything else around them, and only 20.6% were not sure. When asked if time just flew and they just realised it was past time, 80.8% agreed, 11.8% were not sure and only 7.4% disagreed with the statement. Furthermore, 48.6% agreed that they got carried away when

working, while 23.5% were not sure and 27.9% disagreed. In addition, 73.5% highly agreed that it was difficult for them to detach themselves from their job but 16.1% disagreed and only 10.3% were not sure. Whereas 75% agreed that they got immersed in their work, 19.1% were not sure and 5.8% disagreed. Those who felt happy when working intensely were 72.1%, with 14.7% not being sure and 11.8% disagreeing. The findings further revealed that 70.6% agreed that they loved doing their work in that they just realised that time had gone. Those not sure were 19.1% and only 8.8% disagreed. Regarding absorption, the highest percentage in agreement was 80.8% and the lowest 38.3%, while the highest who disagreed accounted for 41.2% and the lowest 5.8%, meaning that the respondents were slightly low on absorption.

Job performance

The second objective that the study sought to find out was the levels of employee performance, which were analysed using in-role and extra-role performance item frequencies and percentages, as represented in the table below.

Table 3: Levels of employee performance

Items		Disagree		Not sure		Agree	
Extra-role performance (ER)		N	%	N	%	N	J.R., %
1	I help other colleagues who are absent from duty	20	14.7	14	10.3	102	75
2	I take time to listen to co-workers' problems and worries	4	2.9	24	17.6	108	79.4
3	I take a personal interest in other employees	20	14.7	34	25.0	82	60.3
4	I go out of the way to help new employees	10	7.4	30	22.1	96	70.6
5	I give advanced notice when unable to come to work	32	23.5	20	14.7	84	61.7
In-role performance (IR)							
6	My attendance at work is always above the norm	6	4.4	20	14.7	110	80.9
7	I tend to take undeserved work breaks (R)	100	73.5	20	14.7	16	11.8
8	I obey informal rules created to maintain order during duty	6	4.4	24	17.6	106	77.9
9	I fulfill all the requirements of my job	4	2.9	14	10.3	118	86.8
10	I have the skills and expertise to perform my job-related tasks	0	0	0	0	136	100
11	I can manage more tasks than those typically assigned to me	14	10.3	10	7.4	112	82.3
12	I feel I appear suitable for a higher-level role than the one I do	8	5.8	28	20.6	100	73.6
13	I have the required skills in all areas of my job	2	1.5	10	7.4	124	91.2
14	I perform well in my overall job by carrying out tasks as expected	0	0	2	1.5	134	98.5

It is important to note that the levels of performance among employees were measured using in-role/task performance items, which were nine (9), and extra-role/contextual performance items, which were five (5).

Extra-role performance

When the respondents were asked if they helped other colleagues who were absent from duty, 75% agreed that they did, while 14.7% disagreed, and only 10.3% were not sure whether they helped or not. Furthermore, 79.4% agreed that they took time to listen to co-workers' problems and worries. Only 2.9% disagreed and the remaining 17.6% were not sure. Additionally, 60.3% agreed that they took a personal interest in other employees, 25.0% were not sure, while only 14.7% disagreed with

the statement. The majority (70.6%) of the respondents agreed that they went out of their way to help new employees, though 22.1% were not sure and only 7.4% disagreed. Further findings revealed that 61.7% of the respondents agreed to giving advance notice when unable to go to work, 14.7% were not sure, while 23.5% disagreed with the statement.

In summary, the percentages for agreement were slightly high, with an average of 69%, compared to those who disagreed, meaning that when it came to extra-role performance, the respondents scored moderately high.

In-role performance

Of the respondents, 80.9% agreed that their attendance at work was always above the norm while 4.4% disagreed and 14.7% were not sure. Furthermore, when it came to taking underserved work breaks, 73.5% disagreed, meaning that they took deserved work breaks. Only 11.8% agreed and 14.7% were not sure of taking undeserved work breaks. With regard to obeying informal rules created to maintain order during duty, 77.9% agreed, while only (4.4%) disagreed with the statement, leaving only (17.6%) who were not sure of their rating. The findings further revealed that 86.8% highly agreed to fulfilling all the requirements of their job, 2.9% disagreed and 10.3% were not sure about that. All the respondents (100%) highly agreed that they had the skills and expertise to perform their job-related tasks. In addition, 82.3% agreed that they could manage more tasks in their job than if only one was typically assigned to them, 10.3% disagreed, while (7.4%) were not sure. Also, 73.6% agreed that they felt suitable for a higher-level role than the one they were holding while only 5.8% disagreed. Furthermore, 91.0% of the staff agreed that they had the required skills in all areas of their job and 98.5% stated that they performed well in their overall job by carrying out tasks as expected.

In conclusion, therefore, the levels of agreement on extra-role performance were high, as evidenced by an average of 78.1% agreeing with all the inquired upon aspects. Furthermore, the respondents scored higher on in-role performance compared to extra-role performance as evidenced by the average responses on agreement respectively.

Employee engagement and job performance

The main objective of the study was to find out if employee engagement and performance were significantly related among Makerere University academic staff and this was confirmed by testing the hypothesis using Pearson coefficient correlation and results are represented in the table below.

Table 4: Correlation between employee engagement and job performance

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Vigour engagement	.628						
2. Dedication engagement	.571**	.776					
3. Absorption engagement	.586**	.440**	.717				
4. Overall engagement	.843**	.728**	.889**	.840			
5. Extra-role performance	.218*	.174*	.131	.199*	.668		
6. In-role performance	.341**	.323**	.308**	.384**	.155	.700	
7. Overall performance	.373**	.333**	.297**	.391**	.719**	.798**	.706

***Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*

Bold diagonals are the reliability coefficients.

Using Pearson correlation coefficient, the results showed that in-role performance is significantly related with all components of engagement ($r=.341$, $p<.01$ for vigour; $r=.323$, $p<.01$ for dedication and $r=.308$, $p<.01$ for absorption). On the other hand, only two of the components of engagement are significantly correlated with those of extra-role performance ($r=.218$, $p<.05$ for vigour; and $r=.174$, $p<.05$ for dedication). There was no significant correlation between absorption engagement and extra-role performance. Overall, there was a significant positive relationship between employee engagement and job performance ($r=.391$, $p<.01$). The null hypothesis (H_0) which stated that "Employee engagement and performance are not significantly related" was rejected and it was concluded that employee engagement and performance are positively and significantly related.

Other factors influencing job performance

Effective performance is a very important outcome in any organisation. Therefore, the study also sought to find out from employees' perspective at least two factors that cause poor performance among academic staff in public universities, and many reasons were listed. The outstanding reasons were remuneration, motivation, working environment, multi-skilling, supervision, student-staff ratio, hash administrative policies and lack of regular performance appraisal.

Submissions on remuneration and motivation ranged from delayed or late payment of staff salaries and allowances, recognition issues, a poor rewarding system, delayed promotions and lack of additional institutional training. A conducive working environment was another predictor of effective performance that was mentioned. Inadequate facilities/infrastructure, such as small office space, poor interpersonal relationships at work, little or no facilitation in areas with poor internet connectivity, lack of a public address system for lecture rooms and funding for research, among others, greatly hinder high performance. Multi-tasking was another factor that was identified. This has to do with one's ability to perform many tasks at a time. This is good but it can lead to errors and wastage of time at some point. Poor performance is due to having several other jobs outside that take up a significant amount of one's time and yet pay better, but impose conflicting demands such as the need to regularly be away to do consultancy work, as opposed to lecturing.

Supervision was yet another factor that the respondents indicated as contributing to poor performance. Poor supervision leads to low performance levels, burnout and conflict. The respondents claimed that some supervisors were authoritarian, disrespected those they supervised, were egoistic and offered little help to those they supervised. It is important to have supervision provided by good supervisors who are tolerant, flexible and fair, who give feedback and communicate effectively.

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

Discussion

Employee engagement

The first research question was: "What are the levels of employee engagement among Makerere University academic staff?"

The findings revealed that the majority of the respondents scored high on engagement, as illustrated by the frequencies and percentages in agreement with the items, specifically on all the three components of vigour, dedication and absorption. However, absorption was slightly low. The majority agreed that they were enthusiastic about their job, a very good indicator of dedication, while most also agreed that they were immersed in their work, which was a good indicator of being

absorbed. Furthermore, only three items scored less than expected, and the rest were above average, indicating a high level of engagement. Furthermore, the findings revealed that they were proud of the work that they did, which meant that chances were high that they would keep engaged both physically and emotionally. The reason for such findings could be that the academic staff have passion for the work they do and have positive emotions hence are dedicated, absorbed and have a lot of energy or vigour to perform their tasks, and that there could be some level of satisfaction despite some challenges that do exist.

The findings with regard to engagement are in line with the arguments of other scholars (Macey & Schneider, 2019; Ologbo & Sofian, 2013; Koffman, 2002), who have pointed out that engaged employees have passion and energy about their work and are more absorbed in that they just realise time has passed. Also, engaged employees take pride in the work they do and will always put in extra time to get tasks completed to a good standard or as expected, are aware of the business context and work with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organisation. The findings are also in line with those by Schaufeli et al. (2008), who point out that engaged employees are energetic and connected with their work activities and feel they are capable of accomplishing these duties properly. The findings are, however, contrary to the Gallup report (2013), as cited in Karanges et al (2014), which found that 11% of employees were engaged worldwide in their jobs, 62% were not engaged and only 27% were actively disengaged. The study findings are also not in line with those of Blessings and White (2011), as cited in Shmailan (2016), who conducted a study in India in 2010 to determine the levels of employee engagement, and the results revealed that younger employees were less engaged while banking employees were low on engagement.

From the foregoing results, therefore, the research question which focused on levels of employee engagement was adequately answered. Levels of engagement are high among the academic staff at Makerere University.

Job performance

The second research question stated: “What are the levels of job performance among Makerere University academic staff?”

The findings of the study revealed that, overall, extra-role and in-role performance was high, with in-role performance being slightly higher, as seen in the frequencies, percentages as well as correlation results. Only one item scored below 50% in agreement, i.e. regarding taking underserved work breaks, where the majority disagreed with the statement. This is a good indicator that academic staffs only take deserved work breaks, hence eliminating issues of unexplained absenteeism from work. Furthermore, the findings revealed that all the respondents agreed that they had the skills and expertise to perform their job-related tasks. Also, they agreed that they helped their colleagues who were absent from duty, which was a good indicator of extra-role behaviour and performance. The reason for these findings could be that the respondents are proud of the work they do and have the required skills, expertise and cognitive ability to perform their duties. Furthermore, they could be having a high degree of autonomy in planning how to implement their duties. Other scholars (Banks, 2006; Harter, Schmidt, & Keyes, 2002) agree with these findings in that they associate performance with low absenteeism, hence fulfilling all their daily duties. Also, in line with these findings are Bedarkar & Pandita, (2014) who argued that engaged employees extend their engagement to others by offering extra help to achieve their tasks. Engaged employees perform and will always seek to help others which improves on team performance.

Employees' levels of performance were fairly high and this meant that the academic staff were performing their responsibilities normally and to the best of their expectations. Therefore, this research question was equally answered.

Employee engagement and job performance

The null hypothesis (Ho) states that employee engagement and job performance are not significantly related.

The findings revealed that, overall, there was a significant relationship between employee engagement and job performance ($r=.391$, $p<.01$). This meant that the scores in one variable, engagement, influence or affect the other variable, performance. These findings are not in line with most of the research findings by other researchers because several studies have related work engagement to both task and contextual performance (Bakker et al., 2004) burnout, and (other-ratings of. The findings are in agreement with those by Halbesleben and Wheeler, (2008b), whose results showed that work engagement had a significant semi-partial correlation with self-rated, supervisor, rated and co-worker rated performance. This meant that work engagement had a relatively small effect on employee performance.

In support of these research findings, other scholars (Chughtai & Buckley, 2011) it seeks to investigate the mediating role of learning goal orientation in the relationship between work engagement and two forms of performance: in-role job performance and innovative work behaviour. Design/methodology/approach: Data for this cross sectional survey study were collected from 168 research scientists drawn from six Irish science research centres. Structural equation modelling was used to test the research hypotheses. Findings: The results suggest that both trust in supervisor and trust propensity were positively and significantly related to work engagement. Additionally, results indicate that learning goal orientation partially mediated the effects of work engagement on in-role job performance and innovative work behaviour. Research limitations/implications: This research was limited by two main factors: the cross-sectional research design, and use of self-reported questionnaire data. Limitations aside, this study provides evidence that a climate of trust can fuel work engagement, which in turn, is likely to promote learning, innovation and performance. Originality/value: This paper extends the developing engagement literature in two ways. First, it empirically establishes an association between two facets of trust and work engagement. Second, it highlights the role of learning goal orientation in explaining the linkage between work engagement and job performance. (PsycINFO Database Record (c; Demerouti & Cropanzano, 2010) argued that the link between employee engagement and performance is not straightforward or clear but rather complex in the sense that various mechanisms may account for the relationship between the two variables. Furthermore, Demerouti (2006) adds that personality traits such as goal directedness and conscientiousness may be instrumental in qualifying the relationship between work engagement and job performance. Even Kirk-Brown and Van Dijk (2011) the current study examined the relationship between work engagement, perceptions of psychological safety at work and the performance of organisational citizenship behaviours for employees with chronic illness (N = 92 are in agreement with these findings. They investigated the relationship between work engagement and performance among 604 employees in Australia and, of these, 92 had chronic illnesses. Their findings show that work engagement has a positive relationship with performance for both groups, meaning that engaged employees always perform better.

Sendawula, et al., (2018) also found in their study that there was a significant positive relationship between employee engagement and performance, implying that a positive change in employee's engagement leads to a positive change in job performance. Similar results indicating a positive significant correlation between work engagement and in-role performance were obtained from Jackson's (2014) study, only differing in the fact that even the results of extra-role performance and engagement were positively significant.

In conclusion, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis that employee engagement and job performance are significantly related accepted.

Other factors influencing engagement and job performance

The findings revealed that the majority of the respondents pointed out that pay, motivation and remuneration greatly influence performance in that their absence leads to poor performance and their presence increases performance. This is supported by other researchers (Hagopian et al. 2009, Hughes et al., 2002; Kamery, 2004; Ekerman, 2006), who found that the amount of remuneration provided, ways in which employees are paid, and the provision of other incentives, motivate employees and increase their performance levels. Furthermore, the World Health Organisation (WHO, 2006) argues that health workers, for instance, must be paid reasonably well for the work they do.

The quality of supervision was the second outstanding factor that the respondents pointed out as also greatly leading to poor productivity. This is in line with Rowe et al.'s (2005) argument that supportive supervision greatly impacts on performance and, when combined with appraisal feedback, greatly improves productivity. Additionally, the styles of supervision used by employers helps in reducing conflict, increases confidence and, consequently, increase performance levels (Gallup, 2003; Hagopian et al., 2009). For example, good supervision in Ghana brought about great change in staff motivation and performance in both public hospitals and quasi-autonomous hospitals (Dovlo, 1998).

Lastly, a good working environment promotes satisfaction and comfort and, consequently, encourages performance because there is absence of physical stress, and facilities as well as other job-enabling necessities are present. These are in agreement with Ngethe Iravo and Namusunge's (2012) findings.

Conclusion

The results of this study contributed to the existing literature in that the levels of engagement among academic staff were reported to be high. Engagement is an important factor in an organisation because highly engaged employees always contribute significantly to the success of the organisation and ensures that the employees are always enthusiastic and have the passion to do their job/tasks. Therefore, engagement strategies should always be put at the core of every employers' plan if the set goals and objectives are to be met.

Secondly, having a productive or performing workforce is equally a good indicator of a competitive organisation. The results of the study indicated that academic staff responded "fairly high" on job performance, which is good for the university. Therefore, it is always important for the administration to involve individual employees in setting goals and objectives so as to maintain high performance and that there is good, timely and reasonable feedback with the aid of an acceptable performance appraisal.

Recommendations

From the findings in the study, the following recommendations were deemed necessary;

The central university administration, school deans and principals should develop new strategies for maintaining the engagement levels while focusing on the most urgently needed resources, such as early and timely payment of salaries and arrears and appropriate recognition. They should also avoid delays in promotions and ensure that academic staff offices have good, reasonable furniture and enough space to work, among others.

Furthermore, the university administration needs to not only engage staff heads like heads of departments, deans and principals, but also individual staff to give their opinions on certain university policies, especially if they regard issues that touch them individually, because the heads may not express their challenges as well as the staff would. Soliciting employees' voice in matters of policy formation would go a long way in improving communication between management and academic staff which would, in turn, enhance engagement and, therefore, performance.

Good and effective performance is an important desired end goal for every organisation. Section heads, on behalf of the administration, should coordinate the formulation of an appropriate, acceptable, transparent and well-scheduled performance appraisal exercise that eventually gives timely feedback on areas achieved and those that need improvement. Appropriate and timely feedback from appraisals or one-to-one evaluation is important. This helps in the designing of better strategies to tackle the identified obstacles to performance.

The issue of staff-student ratios is not an easy one to find an immediate solution to, especially considering that most students prefer public universities. There is need to at least install durable loud speakers, especially in lecture rooms that accommodate big numbers of students, so as to aid students' ability to get clear and audible explanations. This would greatly impact on the understanding of particular concepts that are explained during lecture sessions.

The stakeholders in the Human Resource Department, heads of department, school deans and principals should always develop and approve new engagement strategies that will strongly aid in influencing performance at all levels. Engagement of employees solely depends on their levels of satisfaction with the existing policies, their working environment, the reward and recognition policy, timely pay of salaries and incentives. If these are properly done, employees will feel comfortable, hence engaging the more and eventually maintaining their performance levels.

References

- Aktouf, O. (1992). Management and theories of organisations in the 1990s: Toward a critical radical humanism? *Academy of Management Review*, 17(3), 407–431. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1992.4281975>
- Alfes, K. (2010). *Creating an engaged workforce. Findings from the Kingston Employee Engagement Consortium Project*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0950069032000097424>
- Ali Asghar, M., & Mohtsham Saeed, M. (2012). Examining the relationship between training, motivation and employees job performance –The moderating role of person job fit. *J. Basic. Appl. Sci. Res*, 2(12), 12177–12183. Retrieved from www.textroad.com
- Angela, G. (2014). *Effects of training on employee performance: A case study of United Nations support office for the African Union Mission in Somalia*.

- Armstrong(2000).*Performance management:Key strategies and practical guidance*.London: Kogan Page
- Armstrong, M. (2006). Competition in two-sided markets. *RANDJournal of Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-2171.2006.tb00037.x>
- Armstrong(2009).*Armstrongs handbook of human resources management practice* (11th edn). London and Philadelphia:Kogan Page
- Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1995). Emotion in the workplace: A reappraisal. *Human Relations*, 48(2), 97–125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679504800201>
- Ayers, K.E. (2006). *Engagement is not enough*. Integro Leadership Institute LLC.
- Bakker, A.B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 8–21. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Bakker, A.B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(3), 309. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940910939313>
- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43(1), 83–104. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20004>
- Bakker, A.B., Schaufeli, W.B., Leiter & Toon, M.P., & Taris, W.W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 187–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802393649>
- Banks, M. (2006). How one federal agency harnessed employee engagement as a tool for transformation. *Journal of Organisational Excellence*, 24(4), 97–102. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe>
- Bedarkar, M., & Pandita, D. (2014). A study on the drivers of employee engagement impacting employee performance. *Procedure, Social and Behavioural Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.174>
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*,10(2), 99–109. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_3
- Chan, J.K.L., & Baum, T. (2007). Motivation factors of ecotourists in ecolodge accommodation: The push and pull factors. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941660701761027>.
- Chang, H. H. (2006). Development of performance measurement systems in quality management organisations. *Service Industries Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642060600898286>
- ChanMin Kim, Seung Won Park, J.C.. & Learning, H.L. (2015). International Forum of Educational Technology & Society: From motivation to engagement : The role of effort regulation of virtual high school students in mathematics courses.Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article: *From Motivation to Eng.* 18(4).
- Noe, R.A., Hollenbeck, J.R., Gerhat, B. & Wright, P. M. (2008). *Human resource management: Gaining a competitive(6th edn.)*. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill
- Chughtai, A.A., & Buckley, F. (2011). Work engagement: Antecedents, the mediating role of learning goal orientation and job performance. *Career Development International*, 16(7), 684–705. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620431111187290>
- Cotton, J. L. (1993). *Employee involvement : Methods for improving performance and work attitudes*. SAGE Publications.
- Demerouti, E., & Cropanzano, R. (2010). *From thought to action : Employee work engagement and job performance* (pp. 147–163). Psychology Press.
- Demerouti, E. (2006). Job characteristics, flow, and performance: The moderating role of conscientiousness. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(3), 266–280. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.11.3.266>
- Dieleman, M., & Harnmeijer, J. W. (2006). *Improving-health-worker-performance:In search of promising practices*. (September).
- Dovlo, D, Sagoe, K, Ntow, S & Wellington, E. (1998). *Ghana case study: Staff performance management in reforming health systems*. Available from: <http://www.liv.ac.uk/lstm/research/documents/ghana.pdf> .

- Ekerman, G. (2006). *Job enrichment and staff motivation. Human resource management*(pp. 183-191). Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman (Pvt) Ltd.
- Employee of the Year Award Survey (2013).[http // www.jobs.co.ug /how-engaged-are-your-employees](http://www.jobs.co.ug/how-engaged-are-your-employees).The writer is the Executive Director Federation of Uganda Employers.
- Fleishman, E. A. (1967). Performance assessment based on an empirically derived task taxonomy. *Human Factors: The Journal of Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872086700900408>
- Fox, S., & Spector, P.E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 20(6), 915–931. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(199911\)20:6<915::AID-JOB918>3.0.CO;2-6](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199911)20:6<915::AID-JOB918>3.0.CO;2-6)
- Frank Cateeuw, J., Eileen Flynn, J., & James Vonderhost, J. (2007). Employee engagement: Boosting productivity in turbulent times
- Frederick Herzberg. (1959).*The hygiene motivation theory*. Chartered Management Institute, 1–2. Retrieved from [https://www.managers.org.uk/~media/CampusResources/Frederick Herzberg-The hygiene motivation theory.ashx](https://www.managers.org.uk/~media/CampusResources/FrederickHerzberg-Thehygienemotivationtheory.ashx)
- Gallup (2013). Worldwide, 13% of employees are engaged at work. Gallup. *State of the Global Workplace*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11605-007-0348-z>
- Gallup (2013) *State of the global workplace:Employee engagement insights for business leaders worldwide*.Gallup Inc.
- Gardner,W.L.,Avolio,B.J.,Luthans,F.,May,D.R., &Walumbwa,F.(2005). Can you see the real me: A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development.*Leadership Quarterly*,16(3):343– 72
- Glavas, A. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and employee engagement: Enabling employees to employ more of their whole selves at work. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 796. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00796>
- Goodman, S.A., & Svyantek, D.J. (1999). Person organisation fit and contextual performance: Do shared values matter. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 55(2), 254–275. <https://doi.org/10.1006/JVBE.1998.1682>
- 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), 83–96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760903509606>
- Hagopian, A., Zuyderduin, A., Kyobutungi, N., & Yumkella, F. (2009). Job satisfaction and morale in the Ugandan health workforce. *Health Affairs*, 28(5), w863; w875.
- Halbesleben, J.R.B., & Wheeler, A.R. (2008b). The relative roles of engagement and embeddedness in predicting job performance and intention to leave. *Work and Stress*, 22(3), 242–256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802383962>
- Harter, J.K., Frank Schmidt, G. L., Killham, E. A., & Sangeeta Agrawal, G. (2009). Q 12 ® meta-analysis: The Relationship between engagement at work and organizational outcomes.
- Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268–279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268>
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F.L., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2002). *Well-being in the workplace and its relationship to business outcomes a review of the gallup studies*.<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2003-04013-009>
- Harzing, Anne-Wil, & Van Ruysseveldt, Joris. (2004). *International human resource management*. SAGE Publications: London.
- Hobfoll, S.E., Johnson, R. J., Ennis, N., & Jackson, A. P. (2003). Resource loss, resource gain, and emotional outcomes among inner city women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(3), 632–643. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.3.632>
- Hughes R.L., Ginnett, R.C., &Curphy, G.J. (2002). *Leadership, enhancing the lessons of experience*. New York, McGraw-Hill/Irwin

- Jackson, L.J. (2014). *The work engagement and job performance relationship: Exploring the mediating effect of trait emotional intelligence*. 60. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/4467
- Jeung, C.W. (2011). The concept of employee engagement: a comprehensive review from a positive organisational behaviour perspective. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/piq.20110>
- Joo, B. K.B., & Mclean, G.N. (2006). Best employer studies: A conceptual model from a literature review and a case study. *Human Resource Development Review*, 5(2), 228–257. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484306287515>
- Kagaari, J., Munene, J.C., & Ntayi, J.M. (2010). Performance management practices, employee attitudes and managed performance. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 24(6), 507–530. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541011067683>
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256287>
- Kamery, R. H. (2004). Motivational techniques for positive reinforcement: A review. *Allied Academies International Conference*, 8 (2), 91–96.
- Kaplan, R. S. (2001). Strategic leadership and management in nonprofit organisations: Theory and practice. *Non-Profit Management and Leadership*, 11(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.20024>
- Karanges, E., Beatson, A., Johnston, K., & Lings, I. (2014). *Optimizing employee engagement with internal communication: A social exchange perspective*. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.722.2694&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Kasurinen, T. (2002). Exploring management accounting change: The case of balanced scorecard implementation. *Management Accounting Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1006/mare.2002.0191>
- Kerr, S., & Landauer, S. (2011). *Using stretch goals to promote organisational effectiveness and personal growth: General Electric and Goldman Sachs*. Academy of Management Executive. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2004.15268739>
- Kirk-Brown, A., & Van Dijk, P. (2011). Safe to engage: Chronic illness and organisational citizenship behaviours at work. *International Journal of Disability Management*, 6(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1375/jdmr.6.1.1>
- Koffman, C. (2002). Building a highly engaged workforce: How great managers inspire virtuoso performance. *Gallup Management Journal*.
- Koontz, H. (1990). *Essentials of management*. New York: The Free Press
- Krejcie, R. V, & Morgan, D. W. (1970). *Determining sample size for research activities*. 38, 607–610.
- Krivanek, S. (1999, November 12). *Factors affecting job performance: How to know if training is the answer, Part I*. <http://www.techrepublic.com/article/factors-affecting-job-performance-how-to-know-if-training-is-the-answer-part-i>
- Kruk, M.E., & Freedman, L. P. (2008). Assessing health system performance in developing countries: A review of the literature. *Health Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2007.09.003>
- Larry J. Williams., S. E. A. (1991). *Job satisfaction and organisational commitment as predictors of organisational citizenship and in-role Behaviours*, 17(03), 601–617.
- Layne, C.M., Steinberg, J. R., & Steinberg, A. M. (2014). Causal reasoning skills training for mental health practitioners: Promoting sound clinical judgment in evidence-based practice. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 8(4), 292–302. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000037>
- London, M.(2003). *Job feedback*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410608871>
- Lutwama, G. W. (2011). *The performance of health workers in decentralised services in Uganda*. Retrieved from http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/4866/thesis_lutwama_gw.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organisational Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x>
- Macey, W. H., Schneider, B., Barbera, K. M., & Young, S. A. (2011). *Employee engagement: Tools for analysis, practice, and competitive advantage*. Retrieved from [https://books.google.co.ug/books?hl=en&lr=&id=WnHem5pWQvUC&oi=fnd&pg=PT5&dq=Macey,W.H.,Schneider,B.,Barbera,K.,+%26+Young+S.A.\(2009\).Employee+engagement:Tools+for+analysis,practice+and+competitive+advantage.London,England:Blackwell.&ots=wVWy5aLVjQ&sig=YDP2VjqwffPpwHcZk7JmmY_9Tg&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.co.ug/books?hl=en&lr=&id=WnHem5pWQvUC&oi=fnd&pg=PT5&dq=Macey,W.H.,Schneider,B.,Barbera,K.,+%26+Young+S.A.(2009).Employee+engagement:Tools+for+analysis,practice+and+competitive+advantage.London,England:Blackwell.&ots=wVWy5aLVjQ&sig=YDP2VjqwffPpwHcZk7JmmY_9Tg&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false)
- Marciano, P. L. (2011). Carrots and sticks don't work. *Business Book Summaries*, 1–10. Retrieved from <http://content.ebscohost.com/ContentServer.aspx?T=P&P=AN&K=58040911&S=R&D=qbh&EbscoContent=dGJyMNHr7ESeqLQ4v%2BvIOLCmr0qeprFSsaq4S7OWxWXS&ContentCustomer=dGJyMOzpr1Cvpq5KuePfgeyx44Dt6fIA%5Cnhttp://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=qbh&AN=58040>
- Martel, L. (2003). *Finding and keeping high performers : Best practices from 25 best companies*, 27–43. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ert.10072>
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2008). *Early predictors of job burnout and engagement*, 93(3), 498–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.3.498>
- May, D.R., Gilson, R.L., & Harter, L.M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317904322915892>
- Medlin, B., & Green, K. W. (2009). Enhancing performance through goal setting, engagement, and optimism. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 109(7), 943–956. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02635570910982292>
- Mone, E., Eisinger, C., Guggenheim, K., Price, B., & Stine, C. (2011). *Performance management at the wheel : Driving employee engagement in organisations*. 11050. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-011-9222-9>
- Mone, E. M., & London, M. (2018). *Employee engagement through effective performance management*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315626529>
- Nairuba, J. (2011). *Motivational practices and teachers performance in Jinja municipality secondary schools*. (A masters, Bugema University).
- Nduru, M. N. (2014). *An investigation into the effects of lack of employee engagement*. 1–60.
- Ng'ethe J.M., Iravo, M.E., Namusonge, G.S. (2012) Determinants of academic staff retention in public universities in Kenya: Empiricalreview.*International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(13), 205 – 212.
- Quiñones, M., Van Den Broeck, A., & De Witte, H. (2013). Do job resources affect work engagement via psychological empowerment? A mediation analysis. *Revista de Psicología Del Trabajo y de Las Organizaciones*, 29, 127–134. <https://doi.org/10.5093/tr2013a18>
- Rampersad, H. (2006). Self-examination as the road to sustaining employee engagement and personal happiness. *Performance Improvement*, 45(8), 18–25.
- Roe, R. A. (1999). Work performance: A multiple regulation perspective. In C. L. Cooper I. and T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organisational psychology* (vol. 14, pp. 231–335).
- Rothbard, N.P., & Patil, S. V. (2012). Being there: Work engagement and positive organisational scholarship. In *The Oxford handbook of positive organisational scholarship*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199734610.013.0005>
- Rowe, A.K., de Savigny, D., Lanata, C.F.& Vitoria, C.G. (2005). How can we achieve and maintain high quality performance of health workers in low-resource settings? *The Lancet*, 366 (9490),1026–1035.

- Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behaviour. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- Saks, A.M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619.
- Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2008). A cross-national study of work engagement as a mediator between job resources and proactive behaviour. 5192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190701763982>
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A.B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
- Schaufeli, W.B., Taris, T.W., & Van Rhenen, W. (2008) Workaholism, burnout and work engagement: Three of a kind of three different kinds of employee well-being. *Applied Psychology*, 57(2) 173–203.
- Seijts, G., & Crim, D. (2006). What engages employees the most or, the ten C’s of employee engagement. *Ivey Business Journal*, 23(April), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1306/D42695F3-2B26-11D7-8648000102C1865D>
- Sendawula et al. (2018). Training, employee engagement and employee performance : Evidence from Uganda ’ s health sector. *Cogent Business & Management*, 5(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2018.1470891>
- Sendawula, K., Kimuli, S.N., Bananuka, J., & Muganga, G. N. (2018). Training , employee engagement and employee performance : Evidence from Uganda’s health sector training, employee engagement and employee performance: Evidence from Uganda ’ s health sector. *Cogent Business & Management*, 5(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2018.1470891>
- Shmailan, A. S. Bin. (2016). The relationship between job satisfaction, job performance and employee engagement: An explorative study. *Issues in Business Management and Economics*, 4(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.15739/IBME.16.001>
- Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human Resource Development Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484309353560>
- Smith, C.A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983a). Organisational citizenship behaviour: *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653–663. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books?id=wXiHCgAAQBAJ&pg=PA199&dq=organ+podsakoff+mackenzie+organisational+citizenship&hl=en&sa=X&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=organ+podsakoff+mackenzie+organisational+citizenship&f=false
- Sultana, A., Irum, S., Ahmed, K., & Mehmood. (2012). Impact of training on employee performance: A study of telecommunication sector in Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(6), 646– 661.
- Tarus, J. (2014). Perceived relationship between employee engagement and employee performance at East African Portland Cement Company Limited (October).
- WHO. (2006). Working together for health. *The World Health Report 2006*. *World Health*, 19(3), 237. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-5-67>
- Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., Vicente, G-R., & Bakker, and A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1023%2FA%3A1015630930326.pdf>
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 74 (3), 235–244-. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.11.003>
- Yuan, C.-K., & Lee, C.-Y. (2011). Exploration of a construct model linking leadership types, organisation culture, employees performance and leadership. *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 25(5), 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.534>