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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present research was to examine the relationship between employee engagement and job performance in the context of Private Sector Universities of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. It examines the moderating role of human resource practices for the purpose to test the strength of the relationship of employee engagement and job performance. The study specifically focuses upon three human resource practices as moderators. They include: employee’s perception about training, compensation and performance appraisal. Moreover, employee engagement was taken as independent variable, and job performance dimensions (contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive work behavior) were taken as dependent variables.

The study followed a survey design and was conducted in the Private Sector Universities of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa. Simple random sampling with a formula of finite population was used to select a sample size of 293 academic staff serving at ten Private Sector Universities. Both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were applied to analyze the data. Findings suggest that employee engagement is vital to employees and indeed influence employees’ job performance of academic staff in the Private Sector Universities. Whereas, training, compensation and performance appraisal have a moderating effect on the relationship between employee engagement and job performance. To improve employee’s job performance in Private Sector Universities of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa, it is recommended that the Universities must pay more attention to its employees’ engagement and human resources practices, so that they can achieve the individual as well as organizational strategic objectives.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Education plays an essential role in modifying the attitude and behavior of human beings. It brings a change in the society and enables human being to adopt the changing environment of the world (Shami, 1999). In addition, education also shows an important role in the development of the economy of a country. In this regard, research, innovative endeavors and new ideas are generated through higher education. The teaching faculty of universities play an important role in such activities, and therefore, higher education institutes need effective human resource management (Qureshi & Ramay, 2006).

Human resource (HR) practices not only shape the behavior of employees but guide them to work according to the objectives of an organization (Guest, 2002). These HR practices are formalized management tools that are used to improve the employees' performance and productivity (Ahmad & Schroeder, 2003). Focusing upon human resource practices such as training and motivation of employees through incentives compensation and abilities (performance appraisal) enhances both individual and organizational performance (Harel & Tzafrir, 1996). These are the procedures used to attract, improve, encourage and maintain personnel to confirm the effective execution and the endurance of employees, as well as of organization (Schuler & Jackson, 1987). Delery and Doty (1996) state that human resource practices are cliques of organizational reliable procedures and policies deliberated and employed for the purpose to properly utilize organization’s human capital so as to achieve organizational objectives. In brief, human resource practices is a
set of specific activities such as formal policies and philosophies required by an organization to manage its employees in assisting the improvement of firm specific employees abilities, yielding multifaceted social relation and in producing organization’s understanding to retain competitive advantage, as well as, to attract, develop, motivate and maintain those employees who work effectively and efficiently for operation and existence of the organization (Huselid, 1995; Pfeffer, 1998; Huang, 2000; Teseema & Soeters, 2006; Shahzad, Bashir & Ramay, 2008; Paauwe & Boon, 2009).

Fombrun, Tichy and Devanna (1984) state that training, compensation and performance appraisal are the key human resource variables needed for improving performance of employees to achieve both individual and organizational objectives. Universities are capital intensive organizations, in which training, compensation and performance appraisal practices play an important role in keeping hold of highly skilled and competent teaching faculty (Shami, 1999). Human resource management policies related to training, compensation and appraisal are central in the literature on Human resource management, and similar factors have been reported by several other researchers such as Wright, Gardener and Moynihan (2003), Tesseema and Soeters (2006), and Guest, (2002).

Sonnetag, Dormann and Demerouti (2010) suggest that the engagement level of employees decline as the time passes or the activities and tasks go on changing. This decline in engagement level signals that activities are not going well and the human resource managers need to interact in order to improve the overall job performance of employees (Wright, Garden & Moynihan, 2003; Tesseema & Soeters, 2006; Rurkkhum & Bartlett, 2012). It suggests that the existing relationship between employee engagement
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and job performance needs to be strengthened by applying various human resource management practices.

Moderating variables are important in organizational/social research where the researchers want to determine the correlation between two variables. Researchers look out for the effects of moderating variables in analyzing the results of their study, because moderating variables have the potential to affect research outcomes (Sulea et al., 2012). For example, in the research study at hand, an effort has been made to study the effects of compensation, training and performance appraisal (HR-practices) on correlation between employee engagement and job performance. Although less engaged employees generally correlate with low job performance levels, these HR-practices moderate the strength of the correlation between the independent and dependent variables (Ahmad & Schroeder, 2003). Thus, with effective HR-practices e.g. performance appraisal, an employee performs his/her duties in a highly committed manner which ultimately affects the job performance of that individual (Singh, 2004).

In Pakistan, in all organizations, including universities, human resource requires an assessment of present and anticipated needs of the organization compared with present and future predicted resources (Tessema & Soeters, 2006). The things an employer must consider of his/her employees are: Number of employees, skills, commitment, involvement, engagement job satisfaction and job performance. The skills, abilities & knowledge possessed by employees help them in performing their current job duties effectively and in their growth in the organization (Qureshi & Ramay, 2006). Few research studies conducted in developed and developing countries have used HR-practices as
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moderator for identifying and analyzing the strength or otherwise of the relationship between independent and dependent variables (Singh, 2004). Scholars have tried to focus upon the HR-practices as important pillars of human resource management, for example, training, compensation and performance appraisal with the same intensity to achieve even better organizational goals. It includes digging out the total effect of the relationship between employees’ engagement and job performance moderated by the said selective HR-practices.

1.2 Research Gap

In developed countries, the employee engagement and job performance has been tested with the help of both individual and organizational level outcomes. The individual level outcomes were linked to the job attitudes, satisfaction and commitment with an organization (Saks, 2006; Hakanen et al., 2006), organizational citizenship behavior (Bakker & Bal, 2010), health and wellness outcomes (Crawfort et al., 2010), turnover intentions (Shaufeli & Bakker, 2004), organizational commitment, job involvement and satisfaction (Newman & Harrison, 2008; Macey & Schneider, 2008), creativity, in-role and contextual performance, (Bakker & Demorouti, 2008), and task performance and contextual performance (Christian et al., 2011). The organizational-level results are related with turnover, customer satisfaction, profitability, safety, productivity and shareholder returns (Harter et al., 2002; Welbourne, 2006; Truss, Soane, Edwards, Wisdom, Croll, & Burnett, 2006). In Pakistan employee engagement is studied in relationship with organization citizenship behavior (Rasheed, Khan & Ramzan, 2013). But in Pakistan the association between employee engagement and job performance is so far remained unexplored. A number of studies have tested employee engagement and job performance
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relationship but none of the studies has taken training, compensation and performance appraisal as moderating variables. The present study will be carried on to fill the gap for employee engagement and job performance relationship with in the context of Pakistan and test the moderating role of HR-practices for the said association.

1.3 Problem Statement

Empirical studies revealed that employee engagement is related with overall individual as well as organizational performance (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes 2002; Wellins & Concelman 2004; Flemming, Coffman & Harter 2005; Richman 2006; Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Gebauer, Lowman & Gordon 2008; Demerouti & Cropanzano, 2010). Studies have suggested that employee engagement is related with job performance with respect to in-role performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior (Lee & Allen, 2002; Dalal, Lam, Weiss, Welch & Hulin, 2009; Rich, Lepine & Crawford, 2010; Christian, Garza & Slaughter, 2011). According to Sonnentag, Dormann and Demerouti (2010) the level of engagement of employee declines with passage of time indicates that management needs to interact for the purpose to improve the employee performance. In this regard, HR-practices particularly training, compensation and performance appraisal seems particularly important to improve job performance of employees. Hence, the study in hand for the proposed relation of employee engagement and job performance, the moderating role of training, compensation and performance appraisal will be investigated.
The Moderating Role of HR Practices

1.4 Research Questions

The present research intended to study the association between employee engagement and performance in the presence of moderating role of human resource practices. Precisely, the research questions focused by the study are:

1. What is the association between employee engagement and job performance dimensions in teaching faculty working in Private Sector Universities of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan?

2. Does training moderate the association between employee engagement and job performance dimensions?

3. Does performance appraisal moderate the association between employee engagement and job performance dimensions?

4. Does compensation moderate the association between employee engagement and job performance dimensions?

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The sub objectives of the study are

1. To investigate the relationship between employee engagement and performance measure through contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive work behavior

2. To test the prediction of contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive behavior (criterion variable) on the basis of employee engagement (predictor variable)
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3. To measure the moderating role of HR-practices (Training, Performance Appraisal and Compensation) for the association between employee engagement and job performance (contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive work behavior)

1.6 Significance of the Study

Addressing the prevailing knowledge gap related to the potential moderating role of the HR-practices on employee engagement and job performance link, this research has to explore the significance of employee engagement for job performance in the context of academic staff of Private Sector Universities of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. This research has to highlight the significance of the HR-practices in interacting or strengthening the relationship between EE and job performance. The present study has both academic and practical importance. The worth of this research can be specified by the following points:

- The current research is identifying all the features of selective HR-practices in Pakistan in general and Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa in particular with an objective of creating a general view of the contemporary situation so that futuristic thinking could be triggered rationally and in an informed manner.

- This research is a unique contribution to knowledge on the efforts about highlighting the potential HR-practices that may affect the relationship between employees engagement and performance particularly in the developing countries like Pakistan.
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- The study explored and tested the prevailing theory related with employee engagement and performance on the basis of new culture contexts like Pakistan. Pakistan has totally diverse cultural background related to Western countries, where the perception of employee engagement and job performance were developed. Native research was required to highlight the moderating role of HR-practices in a particular work context on the association of engagement and job performance- so as to create a sound knowledge related to these new concepts in developing countries like Pakistan.

- This research was an effort to support authorities of the Private Sector Universities in the Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa province, Pakistan to have local research available for their assistance in maintaining and enhancing the employee engagement-performance relationship through the moderating role of HR-practices.

- The existing research intended for carrying into black-in-white all the existing scenes and situations in Pakistan in broad and Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa in precise with an objective of generating a general opinion of the current position for the purpose of future planning and restructuring the present condition of the Private Sector Universities in a rational manner.

- The research model and the outcomes of this study will offer guidance for the future researchers to extend the theoretical framework and outcomes produced by the present research.

1.7 Organization of the Thesis

This research thesis is structured in comprehensive order elaborating the exertions of researchers by the earnest person who reads. The details are as under:
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- Chapter 1 highlights the research study by providing a background, problem statement, scope of the study, study questions and research significance of the study model about the moderating impact of human resource practices on association of employee engagement and job performance relationship of academic staff in Private Sector Universities of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa.

- Chapter 2 covers the existing literature review on target topic leading to extracting the relevant variables, corresponding attributes of each variables and the relationship between the variables to develop operationalization of variables into measurements based on the work cluster of existing researchers. It also includes theoretical framework and hypothesis developed based on the literature.

- Chapter 3 describes the research methodology used in conducting this study. It comprises of pilot study, research design, research approach, population, sample, data gathering methods and statistical analysis procedures.

- Chapter 4 provides the fact about the empirical consequences with their descriptive results and the consequences of hypothesis testing. This section demonstrates the tables of demographic categorizations and descriptive statistics for variables used in this research for developing theoretical model. The rest of the chapter presents the correlation amongst the independent and dependent variables and the prediction of job performance through simple and step-wise regression analysis.

- Chapter 5 incorporates the discussion for putting the results of the existing study with the present structure of information on the assumed issue in the present research. In addition, implications of the study, recommendations, limitation of
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study, future prospects for the research based on present study obtained from analysis and conclusion.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The present study is based on three main research variables, namely, employee engagement, HR-practices including training, performance appraisal and compensation, and job performance dimensions- consisting of contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive work behavior. These are elaborated one by one in the following portion in the light of previous relevant studies conducted by various researchers. Next theoretical background of the research framework, theoretical definitions and operational definitions, theoretical framework and hypotheses are presented.

2.1.1 Concept of employee engagement.

In modern organizations, employees play a role of ambassador at all points of time. Their performance has an important role in achieving organizational objectives by using maximum energy and minimum resources. In Industrial Psychology and Organizational Behavior, the performance of employees is realized through employee’s emotional and rational commitment, dedication, giving values to other’s feelings and obeying organizational rules and regulations (Richman, 2006; Shuck & Willard, 2010). This positive attitude and motivation are directed towards higher level of performance and is usually called employee engagement (Rich, Lepine & Crawford, 2010).
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Employee engagement remained a subject of interest for academicians and practitioners since 1990s; they have explained it in numerous ways- as it is considered as a multi-faceted construct. According to Saks (2006), few academic research works have been carried out on this multi-dimensional concept. Macey and Schneider (2008) specify that employee engagement is sometime defined based on psychological state, or sometime behavioral. While on other occasions, it is defined as a disposition or attitude towards work. Macey and Schneider (2008) classify the employee’s engagement in three areas: the first feature area was the trait engagement that was the inclination to perceive the world from a specific point of view; that was revealed in the second area of "state commitment" of the individual; the third factor is that of the "compromise behavior" (which is exercising flexible effort). These three factors division of employee engagement was criticized by Newman and Harrison (2008). They elaborated that dividing the concept of employee engagement into separate aspects such as state, trait and behavior reduces it to redundant concept telling employees only about individual attitude towards their job. These three constructs are the defining features of engagement and are also the important three behaviors present in an employee (Newman & Harrison, 2008).

In previous literature, the notion of engagement was viewed in different ways. Harter et al., (2002) state that employees’ engrossment, satisfaction and eagerness for work greatly contribute to employees’ engagement. Schaufeli and Bakker (2010) further added that employee engagement is a psychological state which goes along with behavior investment of personal energy. Whereas Albrecht (2010) remarks that employee engagement is work associated psychological position- comprises of employees’ sincere well for adding to the accomplishments of an organization. Similarly, Kahn (1990) views
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employee engagement in the form of personal engagement as the attaching of employees to own work physically, cognitively and emotionally while performing a specific role.

Employee engagement can also be considered as self-motivated, positive attitude, committed and feeling responsible to improve a specific performance to benefit individuals and organization as a whole (Willins & Concelman, 2004; Robinson, Perryman & Hayday 2004; Flemming, Coffman & Harter, 2005). Therefore, it is the composition of traits, state, behavioral, work and organization situations that assist both state and behavioral engagement (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Riggio, 2015).

Employee engagement is also a self-possessed behavior of an employee, influencing individuals’ attitude, intentions and behavior level results, following towards organizational level outcomes. They are always both physically and psychologically available when subjugating and accomplishing an organizational role (Kahn, 2010). At the emotional and intellectual commitment, employees feel positive about the organization and initiated relevant activities for achieving goals (Baumruk, 2004; Richman, 2006; Cook, 2012). Thus, engagement is an employee’s cognitive, emotional and behavioral state of in-role or extra-role containing innovative and adaptive performance focusing on initiating activities for fostering changes in the organization (Shuck & Wollard, 2010; Macey & Schneider, 2008).

Maslach and Leiter (1997) --the two researchers in the area of job burnout literature-- claimed that employee engagement is a positive opposition to burnout i.e. both the constructs are positive and negative parameters of a single field. Engagement is
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categorized by energy, involvement and efficacy, that reveals through counterparts of
burnout dimensions; exhaustion is the direct opposite of energy, cynicism opposing
involvement and efficacy conflicts and lack of achievement. Consequently, it refers to
individuals --being low on burnout-- are certainly higher on engagement and vice versa.

Maslach et al., (2001) further describe engagement as the exact opponent of
burnout. Burnout is a response to prolonged job-related stress, categorized by emotional
exhaustion consists of feelings of anxiety, principally prolonged tiredness stems from
overworking, and cynicism consists of pessimistic or sarcasm attitude to work. Burnout is
also characterized by loosing of interest for performing one’s own work, and
ineffectiveness marked by reduced spirits of skill, positive attainment, and success
mutually in self-work as well as organization. Employee engagement is described in terms
of other elements such as energy- as opposed to exhaustion, involvement- as opposed to
cynicism, and efficacy- as opposed to ineffectiveness.

Saks (2006) specifies that both academicians and practitioners incline to accept the
fact that the results of engagement are positively linked with business outcome. Their
stance is also supported by Harter et al., (2002). Saks (2006), by referring to the definition
offered by Kahn (1990), suggests that the engagement of employees is the combination of
cognitive, emotional and behavioral components. Saks extended the stated notion that
engagement usually seems in burnout literature.

Attridge (2009), Slåtten and Mehmetoglu (2011) and Schaufeli (2014) state that
operational and mostly used definition of employee engagement in academic research is
provided by Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonza, & Bakker (2002) and Schaufeli &Bakker (2004),
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who specify that employee engagement as the contrary experience of burnout and both the concepts are multidimensional concepts and are opposites of each other. The term Burnout is categorized by mixture of exhaustion that is low stimulation, cynicism and low identification, while employee engagement is described by vigor that is high stimulation, dedication and high identification. In addition to this, burnout also includes reduce efficacy, while employee engagement includes absorption. Therefore, employee engagement is the positive, fulfilling, work associated state of mind that is described by vigor, dedication and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Vigor is the high ranks of vitality and emotional flexibility, whereas, functioning, readiness to devote energy in own task and diligence are also in expression of complications. Dedication is categorized via an intellect of connotation, devotion, eagerness, zeal, motivation, egotism, and defies accomplishing a specific task. Absorption is categorized by attentiveness, concentration, and fascination and auspiciously absorbed in one’s profession- whereby time moves promptly and one worries by detaching oneself from job.

Schaufeli (2012) and Schaufeli & Salanova (2014) confirm that most of the academic researchers used Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) to measure engagement, which is a brief, valid, and reliable questionnaire of engagement. Therefore, employee engagement for this research study was also measured by employee engagement through UWES, developed in Schaufeli et al., (2002). UWES scale encompasses three elements that are vigor, dedication and absorption. Zhang, Yiwen and GanYiqun (2005) and Schaufeli (2012) illustrate that UWES justifies a great degree of validity, consistency and reliability. In the current study, the researcher used employee engagement as an
independent variable and operationalized employee engagement on the basis of Schaufeli et al., (2002) concept that contained vigor, dedication and absorption.

2.1.1.1 Historical perspective of employee engagement.

Kahn (1990) was the first researcher who formally coined the term 'personal engagement'. Kahn (1990) observed and interviewed employees including financial professionals and summer camp counselors at the time of employee’s engagement and disengagement at work. He concluded in order that to discourage disengagement and encourage engagement, an employee needed three psychological conditions. The first condition was 'psychological meaningfulness', that determines as to how much autonomy and sense of ownership an employee has to perform his role which ultimately provides opportunity for employee’s competence, growth and learning. The second condition was the 'psychological safety', which refers to the state of feeling safe and able to express themselves without fear of the negative effects on self-regard, or professional status. The third condition was 'psychological availability', that is the employees’ intellect of physical, emotional and psychological availability for performing a particular task. If employees’ needs are satisfied, they will be psychologically and physically available when subjugating and accomplishing an organizational role. Kahn (1992) suggests that meaning of psychological presence in work is “when fully present, people feel joined with someone outside themselves; they experience themselves as accessible to people or tasks, as reserves to be drawn on” (p. 326). It remained unreasoning to consider the workers as to be entirely present at job, until they sensed the elementary needs of meaningfulness, safety, and availability that are not achieved due to the outcome of their capability. The edifice of Kahn (1990) employee engagement is shown in the following schematic diagram:
May et al., (2004) revisited employee engagement theory of Kahn (1990) and conclude that psychological circumstances of meaningfulness, safety and availability were significantly linked with employee engagement. In addition to these factors, their studies also determine that role fit and job enrichment are the significant determinants of safety. Resources were significant predictors of availability and meaningfulness and having strongest relationship with employee’s engagement. On the other hand, adherence to subordinates and cooperative supervisor relationships were insignificant predictors of safety, as well as, involvement in external activities was inversely related to psychological availability. Findings of May et al., (2004) supported the fact that both meaningful and cherished work are associated with engagement.

Harter et al., (2002) in meta-analysis of literature founded on 7939 business units consisted of thirty-six corporations linked employee satisfaction and engagement to the results of the business units such as satisfaction, turnover, productivity and profit. The results established that employee engagement is significantly attached with meaningful business outcome. The study further elaborated that satisfaction and engagement were
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significantly interconnected with client satisfaction, productivity, profitability, and safety consequences.

Maslach et al., (2001) specify that employee engagement is the exact reverse of burnout. Burnout appears as a response to prolonged job-related stress. It is categorized by emotional exhaustion that often includes feelings of stress and prolonged tiredness resulted from overtasking. It also contains cynicism i.e. pessimistic or sarcasm attitude to work in overall and loosing of interest for performing one’s own work and ineffectiveness having reduced spirits of skill, positive attainment and success mutually in self-job along with organizational job. On the contrary, Employee engagement is marked by energy, involvement and efficacy. In brief, six factors of job have been linked to job engagement of burnout. They include: amount of work, social and community assistance, compensations, control, acknowledgement of work, perceived impartiality and standards.

Saks (2006) believes that individuals contribute to organization through their level of engagement. In a research conducted on 102 subjects who were working in diverse occupations and organizations, people reflected a meaningful change in both job and organization engagement. Perceived organization support was found significantly associated to both job and organization engagement.

Rich et al., (2010) in a study of engagement antecedence and effects on performance found that employee engagement mediates connection amongst value, perceived organizational support, congruence, and core self-evaluations, as well as, with two important job performance dimensions- comprising of task and contextual performance. Halbesleben and Wheeler (2008) in their study of multi-sector United States
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based sample supported this argument and confirmed a positive linking amongst employee engagement and task performance.

Bakker et al., (2007) in a survey of 805 Finnish teachers, who were employed in elementary, vocational and secondary schools, determined that performance of the students in the shape of misbehavior is negatively related with employee engagement of the teachers. The teacher’s behavioral components such as supervision support, innovativeness, and appreciation as well as organizational climate were the essential factors that guided teachers to handle the demanding collaborations with students- hence improved students’ performance (Bakker et al., 2007)

Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) used a sample of 1698 employees who belonged to four different occupations including employees of insurance, safety service, occupational health, pension and fund company, and employees of home care organization for determining link between burnout and engagement. Burnout was checked through Maslach Burnout Inventory-- General Survey (Schaufeli & Dierndonck, 2000), which included exhaustion, cynicism and professional efficacy. Engagement was measured through UWES adopted from Schaufeli et al., (2002) that encompasses vigor, dedication and absorption. Their results confirm negative association between burnout and engagement.

Schaufeli, Bakker and Salanova (2006) observed different employees of several occupations and propose that engagement is a unique construct having its own characteristics such as vigor, dedication and absorption. Burnout is similar to engagement in characteristics- as both are stable and non-transient state which slightly increase with age. Furthermore, entrepreneurs, teachers, managers, artists, farmers, sales persons were
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found highly engaged with their role performance, while, on the other hand, blue-collar
worker, painters, food processing workers, police officers, home care staff and retail
workers were found low in engagement with jobs. The model developed is shown in the
following diagram:

Figure 2. 2 A Model of Engagement Established by Schaufeli et al., (2006)

Source: Schaufeli, Bakker and Salanova (2006)

Kahn (1992) suggests that high engagement levels direct towards both positive
results for individuals and organizational level outcomes. Individual level engagement
enhances quality and experience of an employee for performing a particular job, whereas,
organizational level engagement improves growth and output of an organization. Schaufeli
et al., (2002) term engagement as “a more persistent and pervasive affective cognitive state
that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior” (P. 74).
However, employees, who are highly engaged, have full energy and passion for their job
and are usually fully absorbed in their job, where time flies (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008).

In addition to the studies mentioned in previous section, several other studies have
also been conducted upon the drivers of engagement. Kahn (1990) was the first to find that
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meaningfulness, safety and availability were three psychological conditions which affect the behavior of people who were personally engage in performing their jobs. This level of personal engagement varies from setting to setting according to the people perception about benefits and the security or guarantees and the availability of resources expected by an employee. Kahn (1990) observed that people willing to engage more in meaningful jobs, where they sense worthy, valuable, appreciated and in return the employee invest their self and exerting energies into a job which is challenging and offering autonomy, ownership, clearly defined goals, creativity, rewards, equality and having intellect of sharing experience with peers, colleagues and clients. Lockwood (2007) found that organization having a meaningfulness culture embraces more engaged employees. Kahn’s meaningfulness of job was supported by May et al., (2004) who state that job fit and job enrichment are significantly predictors of meaningfulness at work. Kahn (1990) further elaborates that psychological safety is also an important determinant of personal engagement. An environment where employees feel safe, reliable, foreseeable and vibrant in relation to behavior lead them to high level of engagement. In addition to psychological meaningfulness and psychological safety, psychological availability is also an important driver of engagement (Kahn, 1990). Availability means that employees were more or less available to place themselves into role performance. It includes offering of physical energy (strength and readiness) and emotional energy for engaging at work.

2.1.1.2 Employee engagement versus other constructs

The following portion covers a comparison among employee engagement and other similar constructs used in human resource management context.
2.2 Job Satisfaction Versus Employee Engagement

Locke (1976) mentions that job satisfaction is an emotional construct. It arises from appraisal of employees’ job or experience. Maslach et al., (2001) state that it does not include the individual association to the work but only consider work as a base for satisfaction and happiness. It is an optimistic thinking, feelings, attitude, and a degree of preference of a worker has about his/her job (Weiss, 2002; Riggio & Porter, 2003; Muchinsky, 2003).

Macey and Schneider (2008) elaborate in their empirical study that employee engagement and job satisfaction are not the same constructs. In their view, satisfaction is the spirit of energy, eagerness and positive affections which becomes important aspects of engagement. MacLeod and Clarke (2009) discuss that both the terms have a contrast in their analytical power over consequences. Similarly, job satisfaction does not clarify direction of employee’s behavior.

2.3 Job Involvement versus Employee Engagement

Job involvement contrasts with engagement as it focuses on the cognition, engagement, emotions and behaviors. It also related with how the individual employs themselves during performing a job. Csikszentmihalyi (1975) asserts that employees in a stream of experience require no external rewards and motivation- as the job itself presents constant challenges. It is a psychological awareness with a job and significance of employee to one’s self-image (Kanungo, 1998; Muchinsky, 2003; Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005). May et al., (2004) elaborated that involvement is dissimilar from employee engagement, as it is related with how a person employs himself in the performance of his task and mostly focused on the cognitions, while employee engagement
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along with cognitions also embraces emotions and behaviors. Macey and Schneider (2008) concludes that job involvement is an aspect and part of engagement, but not similar to it.

2.4 Commitment Versus Employee Engagement

Commitment is “an employee’s feelings and attitudes about the entire organization” (Riggio and Porter, 2003, p. 225). Engagement is a sage beyond commitment (Robinson et al., 2004). In academic research, the commitment and engagement have been identified as two different constructs. Maslach, Schaufeli and Leiter (2001) state that commitment is employee's faithfulness with organization where he works, whereas engagement focuses on work itself. Saks (2006) differentiates both commitment and employee engagement by putting that commitment deals with person’s attitude and level of affection with entire organization, whereas, engagement is the level to which work is focused and engrossed in their role performance.

2.5 Organizational Citizenship Behavior Versus Employee Engagement

Organ (1988) proposes that organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is a discretionary behavior of an employee and is indirectly recognized by formal reward system in order to promote proper performance of an organization. Robinson et al., (2004) specified that OCB is not exactly similar to employee engagement. According to Saks (2006) OCB is an extra role, voluntary and informal behavior guiding toward help of co-workers and overall organization, while engagement is one’s formal role in performing organization’s tasks. EE is related with a worker’s main duties during job, whereas organizational citizenship behavior is basically dealing with extra role behavior outer employee’s own extent of obligations (Shuck & Wollard, 2010)
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Employee engagement is a “two-way nature” and some reveal characteristics of both OCB and Employee commitment (Robinson, Perryman & Hayday, 2004). However, Williams and Anderson (1991) contradict this two-way statement. According to them, it is not similar to either. Engaged employees are actively engaged in their task and also have business awareness; neither OCB nor employee commitment behavior reveals these qualities. They further state that OCB performance is an outcome of rational behavior with all employees and impartiality in organizational policies and practices. Saks (2006) believes that OCB is a voluntarily behaviors and is not part of someone’s work necessities whereas formal role performed by employee is an engaged employment and hence is not encompassed in the worker’s job description going for an extra role behavior.

2.1.2 Concept of Job Performance

The job performance of an employee is an individual behavior effectiveness that contributes towards organization objectives and comprises of task and contextual performance (Motowidlo, 2003; Duyar, Ras & Pearson, 2015). It is effected by various factors, such as experience of a specific job is related to task performance and personality type of an employee is associated to contextual performance (Motowidlo et al., 1994). In addition, job performance is also affected by employee’s natural or acquired abilities, skills and motivation to perform a job effectively. Britt and Jex (2008) assessed job performance through financial progress, expected behavior and task related activities. Hence, job performance is an essential issue of human resource management and has a long history of its evaluation. According to Bernardin and Beatty (1984), performance is the achieved result of work or complete designated tasks at a particular time period and the result associated with a specified activity or job function (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984).
The Moderating Role of HR Practices

Historically, performance was considered the result of work achievement, but for measuring of results, no suitable standard was found as the work results are usually controllable factors. Consequently, researchers have begun to connect both performance and behavior from the viewpoint of the behavior in order to foresee and explain performance. Murphy (1989) was the first to remark that performance is a substitute of behavior, which is a cluster of behaviors connected to the achievement of organizational objectives and behavior of employees actually they do (Murphy, 1989). Wall et al., (2004) argued that job performance plays a vital role in defining organizational performance.

In areas of human resource management, organizational and industrial psychology, job performance is defined in various ways. But despite of its many definitions, it is vital to organizational outcomes and success. Campbell (1990) puts that job performance is an individual level outcome performed by an individual person itself. Kane and Lawler (1975) assert that job performance is the record of results of employees performing a specific job for a designated time period. This record of the result is kept for the purpose of employees’ promotions, increments, rewards and punishments. Job performance is used to measure the quality and quantity of individuals or groups achievements after performing a specific job (Martine, Schermerhorn & Larson, 1989).

Job performance can be studied from two perspectives i.e. behavioral and outcome, which are undertaken by employees to contribute towards organizational goals (Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000). The behavioral aspect is the action of employees while performing their duty, the action itself. The job performance is an action of an individual and it cannot be observed directly but it embraces precise behavior such as customer
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relationship, teaching to students, computer programming, and amassing parts of an artifact (Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000; Harari, Reaves & Viswesvaran, 2016). Only actions can be considered as performance, which are goal-oriented behaviors of employees to perform a job well (Campbell, 1990; Campbell et al., 1993). In other words, job performance is the actions or behaviors relevant to organizational goals, which include task or in-role behavior, contextual or extra-role behavior and counterproductive work behaviors of employees that add to or take away from organizational goals (Campbell, 1990; Hunt, 1996; Spector & Fox, 2010). Organ (1988) proposes that job performance also includes other constructs such as non-productivity and extra-role behavior dimensions like cooperation, helping, co-workers and superiors and generalized tendencies toward compliance with organization goals. Organ (1988) concluded that contextual performance behavior is an important component for measuring job performance of an employee within organization.

Traditionally, job performance was only restricted to task related behaviors. According to Borman and Motowidlo (1997), job performance is “the effectiveness with which job incumbents to perform activities that contributes to the organizational technical core” (p. 99). Borman and Motowidlo (1997) argue that job performance is an essential multi-dimensional concept in organizational psychology and organizational behavior. Campbell et al., (1993) overstate job performance by way of a multi-dimensional phenomenon, consists of many features such as skills, motivation, declarative knowledge, and procedural knowledge (Waldman & Spangler, 1989).
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Motowidlo, Borman and Schmitt (1997) confirm that job performance is a role of employees’ work behaviors, which is necessary- as it forms the social, organizational and psychological settings that work as the facilitator for job function and practices. Dalal (2005) challenges the narrow view of job performance. He remarks that job performance is a multi-dimensional construct- including task performance, contextual performance and CWB (Campbell, 1990; Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Many empirical evidences signifying that task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behaviors are essential dimensions of job performance. These components are empirically distinct and most extensively studied determinants of job performance (Sackett, 2002; Dalal, 2005; Sackett, et al., 2006). They together offer a comparatively broad accounting of the concept of the whole performance” (Dalal, Baysinger, Brummel & LeBreton, 2012).

Due to the common consensus, the job performance is considered to be consisted of three main dimensions like task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior (Williams & Anderson, 1991, Campbell, McCloy, Oppler, & Sager, 1993; Campbell, 1999; Motowidlo, 2003; Spector & Fox, 2010; Dalal et al., 2012). Therefore, in the view of the previous studies, the three dimensions of performance including task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior were considered important components of performance in the present study.

2.1.2.1 Task performance or in-role behavior.

Task performance is a goal focused behaviors in the individual’s control that upkeep organizational objectives. Task performance includes both physical behaviors and mental processes leading to employee behaviors (McShane & Glinow, 2005). Similarly
task performance is the achievement of tasks mentioned in employee’s job description (Murphy, 1989). In addition, core technical ability, overall soldiering, expertise, job-related task aptitude and non-job specific task proficiency are also considered as vital components of in-role behavior (Campbell et al., 1993; Campbell, 1990). According to Rotundo and Sackett (2000), task performance not only includes the behaviors or activities which are identified as portion of job description but it also includes activities and behaviors which add intently or unintendedly the creation of things or the rendering of services. It is the individual’s proficiency in which an employee performs jobs that contribute towards the organizations’ ‘technical core” (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993).

In task performance, employees perform their job and meet the expectations of an organization by demonstrating their proficiency and capability and are positively linked with organization’s technical core, accomplished by guiding, helping and sustaining its technical requirements (Harrison et al., 2006). It also permits effective and efficient operations of an organization (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997).

Task performance is related to job description which is required to fulfill the contract between employee and employer. Borman and Motowidlo (1993) elaborated that task performance is the expertise with which an employee execute task mentioned in his job description and contributes directly to the technical core such as executing a part of an organizational technical process or providing an organization with required materials or services. The technical core in manufacturing organizations were considered as a set of activities to convert raw materials into products and add directly to the technical core of an organization (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). While raw materials in stock process and finish
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form and its distribution or support services provided by managers or accountants indirectly contributing towards technical core. Both behaviors and activities which add to technical core directly or indirectly are considered as task performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). These behaviors or activities were formally considered as components of a job description and add to the technical core. Therefore, task or in-role performance is the ability of employees to execute the actions acknowledged as an important component of the employee’s job description and which is required to perform a specific task (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993).

In the current study, the task performance has been used as a dependent variable. An important dimension of job performance and has been measured on the basis of Goodman and Svyantek’s (1999) Scale, comprises of 9-items, measured by 5 – point Likert Scale.

2.1.2.2 Contextual performance or extra-role behavior.

Contextual performance refers to the voluntary, optimistic job behaviors that goes beyond task behaviors (Spector & Fox, 2002). Organizations cannot get their competitive advantages unless they don’t have employees who go beyond their formally required job description (Parker, Williams & Turner, 2006). Contextual performance is a cluster of behaviors which supports the organizational performance ultimately by supporting the social, organizational and psychological settings of an organization and is not formally portion of job description.

Becker and Kernan (2003) confirm that contextual performance is an extra role behavior or discretionary behavior, allied with the support of other workers in an organization. Podsakoff et al., (2000) determined that contextual performance is a pro-
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social organizational behavior associated to refining the welfare of employees or groups
within the organization. George and Jones (1997) view contextual behavior as a voluntary
behavior of an employee contributing towards organizational effectiveness and called it
organizational spontaneity.

Contextual performance refers to an employee’s behavior following organizational
rules and policies, going an extra mile, serving and collaborating with others, sharing
information with colleagues, peers and supervisors for solving problems related to a job
(Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). The more preemptive opinion about contextual
performance contains notions like personal initiative, categorized as own initiative with
smart attitude to perform and working for an extra effort to accomplish a specific work
(Frese et al., 1996; Parker, Williams & Turner, 2006). It does not only consist of similar
behaviors but is a multidimensional concept (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Van Scotter et
al., (1996) explain contextual performance from two perspectives. The first one is the
interpersonal facilitation, which is supporting, helping and assisting co-workers’ activities.
The second one is job dedication, which is an employee self-disciplined hard work,
motivation, enthusiasm and obeying of rules to upkeep organizational objectives.

Contextual performance is sometimes used as a synonym for OCB (Bateman et al.,
1983). Organ (1988) coined the term "OCB" as an extra-role behavior by indicating that it
is a discretionary behavior, where one willingly goes above and beyond his job description
and always tries to contribute positively to effectiveness of its organization. Borman and
Motowildo (1993) described organization citizenship behavior as a contextual performance
and similar to extra-role behavior of job performance (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Borman
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& Motowidlo, 1993). According to Graham (1991), contextual performance or organization citizenship behavior can be classified into the following three sub categories:

- Organizational obedience is accommodating dogmas, instructions, guidelines, procedures and rules developed by top-level management.
- Organizational loyalty is giving importance to organizational objectives over individual objectives and recognizing organizational leadership.
- Organizational participation is taking active part in various organizational activities.

This contextual performance concept was supported by Robbins (2001). He remarks, “the discretionary behavior that is not part of an employee’s formal job requirements, but that nevertheless promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (p. 21).

Organ (1988) elaborated five factors model of contextual performance comprising of:

- Altruism is facilitating new associates and guiding them in order to enhance individual as well as group performance (Werner, 2007).
- Courtesy is proper communication of information on appropriate time like advance notices and reminders in order to avoid time wasting and improve organization performance (Werner, 2007).
- Conscientiousness is proper utilization of time and performing jobs by going further than expectations, so as to increase efficiency of individuals and groups (Tayyab, 2005).
- Civic virtue is serving and voluntarily attending communities’ activities to properly applaud awareness of the organization (Allison & Dryer, 2001).
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- Sportsmanship is to avoid complaining and irritating to properly utilize time by an employee on productive activities within organization. (Allison et al, 2001)

In addition to the above mentioned factors, Organ (1990) added two more constructs that is peacekeeping e.g. negotiation for avoiding disputes within organization and cheerleading e.g. taking things positively and responding softly to them. According to Bettercourt, Gwinner, and Meuter (2001), contextual behavior in service oriented organizations can be measured through participation, loyalty, and service delivery of employees. Loyalty is employees’ faithfulness to organization over inspiring its benefits and status to foreigners. Employee participation is their readiness and the dearth to involve in the expansion and supremacy of the companies and service delivery is their hardworking role performance in the organization.

In this study, contextual performance was taken as a significant dimension of job performance and measured on the basis of Goodman and Svyantek’s (1999) Scale, consisting of 9-items measured by 5-point Likert Scale.

2.1.2.3 Counterproductive work behavior.

Counterproductive work behavior is a voluntary behavior that focuses at damaging the organization and teasing its employees (Robinson & O’Leary-Kelly, 1998; Aamodt, 2015). The austerity of such behavior vary from trivial such as intentionally coming late to work, working slowly and wasting of resources to foremost such as sabotage and violence at work (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Such types of behaviors are detrimental to organization (Spector & Fox, 2002). Counterproductive work behaviors go against the objectives and goals of organization (Fida, Paciello, Tramontano, Fontaine, Barbaranelli & Farnese2015).
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Counterproductive work behavior is a damaging or detrimental behavior and are described in terms of numerous features by various researchers such as anger (Neuman & Baron, 1997), deviation (Hollinger, 1986; Robinson & Bennett, 1995), theft (Greenberg, 1990), retaliation (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), impoliteness (Andersson & Pearson, 1999), bullying (Rayner, Hoel & Cooper, 2001), sabotage (Ambrose et al., 2002), mobbing (Zapf & Einarsen, 2005), envy (Khan, Peretti & Quratulain, 2009), workplace violence (Kelloway et al., 2006; Barling et al., 2009), service sabotage (Harris et al., 2002), negative emotions (Krischer, Penney & Hunter, 2010), protest (Kelloway et al., 2010) and dissatisfaction (Fatima et al., 2012; Muafi, 2011). Besides, counterproductive work behavior can also be injustice (Fatima et al., 2012) and abusive supervision (Shoss et al., 2013). All these constructs are counterproductive work behavior in nature. Counterproductive work behavior is therefore, the combination of various behaviors which are opposed to required behaviors and can damage organizations, supervisor clients, peers and customers and usually put stability at threat (Spector & Fox, 2005; Sackett, 2002; Martinko et al., 2002).

Counterproductive work behavior is a deviant behavior and can occur at interpersonal level and organizational level. At interpersonal level, it shows behaviors such as verbal abuse, aggression, gossips, nepotism and favoritism. At organizational level, it includes absenteeism, withdrawal and misuse of owners’ assets and property. Such behaviors at interpersonal and organizational level severely affect both employees and organizational performance (Robinson & Bennette, 1995; Galperin, 2002; Sackett, 2002; Chang & Smithikrai 2010).
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2.1.3 Association between Employee Engagement and Job Performance

Employee job performance is considered as a leading path to the success of an organization. In their respective studies, Lockwood (2007) reveals that employee job performance can be increased by concentrating on nurturing of employee engagement as a reason of higher performance. According to Campbell (1990), performance is a behavior (employees’ actions) and it is ultimately related to organizational goals- either in negative or positive way. Like a behavior, performance can also be as a segment of the job or separate than the given obligations.

Encouraging employee engagement enhances employee performance. Empirical results indicate that existence of higher level of engagement increases performance and productivity of organization (Little & Little, 2006; Lockwood, 2007). In the similar way, Bakker and Demerouti, (2008) state that employee engagement is connected to various performance related results such as contextual performance, task performance and creativity. Engaged employees shift their engagement to the fellow co-workers, thus consequently increases the performance of the group as a whole. The engaged employees tend to perform better to increase the overall job performance. In another study, the researchers examine that engaged employees practice positive emotions i.e. joy, happiness and enthusiasm, well physical and psychological health, meet job demands and attain their work objectives, and transfer engagement to others (Bakker & Leiter, 2010).

Employee performance is not only measured by output produced, but also by the effectiveness with which they are loyal, faithful, and their participation for the purpose of organization’s supremacy and proper service delivery (Bettercourt et al., 2001). Grounded
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upon the analysis of many theories suggested that engagement directs greater performance as an outcome of variety of mechanisms (de Waal, 2004; Demerouti & Cropanzano, 2010; Haid & Sims, 2009; Kular, Gatenby, Rees, Soane, & Truss, 2008).

Baumruk (2004) states that performance factors, like retention of employees, customer loyalty, safety, productivity and profitability can be enhanced by employee engagement. As engaged employees are loyal to their organization and less likely to quit for another organization— as they think about their organization and utilize extra efforts towards the accomplishment of their organizational objectives. Employees are more likely to be expected to work better in a rapid pace, engrossed on the client experience, confirming that customers are satisfied and profits are maximized (Baumruk, 2004).

Similarly, Demerouti & Cropanzano (2010) remark that in this modern world of economic ambiguity, engaging employees is crucial for endurance and success of an organization. Employee engagement plays as an emerging techniques of thinking over human resource management. It is the employee inclination, involvement, satisfaction and enthusiasm of efforts on a particular task (Harter et al., 2002; Frank, Finnegan & Taylor, 2004).

According to Lockwood (2007), employee engagement has been revealed to have influence on job performance. There are moderate correlations between engagement and performance (Lockwood, 2007). Employees engaged with their jobs and employer, are motivated beyond their personal factors and are more productive than their disengaged counterparts. They work more efficiently and generate maximum productivity (Lockwood, 2007).
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The perception of employees about their organization also affects the level of engagement. The organizations may clearly communicate success, performance of organization and particularly to search ways to socialize stories of superior performance (Demerouti & Cropanzano, 2010). The concise, comprehensive, concrete and well planned message supports employees to recognize the relationship between their performance and success- as well as it also enables them to support the overall organizational performance and lead them to improved engagement level. Engaged employees have a profound and extensive linkage that workers have with an organization that outcomes in an inclination to go extra mile what is expectable of them to support their organization thrive (Gebauer, Lowman, & Gordon, 2008). Kahn (1990) notes that engagement is the assigning of an organization’s connections to individual job roles that is individual work and represent themselves physically, emotionally, and passionately in performing their jobs. There are many aspects which represent an individual as engaged employee. Therefore, employee engagement is a variable getting attention of researchers and is a key determent of employee job performance. Focusing on the employee engagement will move towards high levels of individual job performance and overall organizational performance. Therefore, on the basis of the above literature it is contended that performance can be increased by concentrating on employee engagement as a proximal consequence and basic determining factor of job performance.

Bakker et al., (2004) observe association between job characteristics, burnout, task and contextual performance in a sample of 146 employees of several different sectors. A link between engagement, task performance and contextual performance ratings was established. A significant positive affiliation in engagement and performance was found
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and it was proved that highly engaged employees perform their job well besides they are willing to go for obeying their formal job requirements. Bakker et al., (2006) support Bakker et al., (2004) results within a sample of secretaries and they confirm a significant positive link between employee engagement, task performance and contextual performance.

Salanova et al., (2005) conducted a survey of one hundred and fourteen service units including fifty-eight hotel front desks and fifty-six restaurants. They analyzed it through structural equation modeling. Their results support that resources of an organization and engagement forecasted service position, that ultimately predict employee job performance. Schaufeli, Taris, and Bakker, (2006) conducted a survey within a Dutch sample across a broad range of occupations regarding work-connected welfare specially engagement and workholism through a 60-item questionnaire. Engagement was evaluated by a 9-item version of UWES in relationship to task performance and contextual performance. Schaufeli et al., (2006) established positive link between engagement, task and contextual performance. They further elaborated that engagement can be called good workholism. According to self-reported performance, engagement seems to be good as it is an indicator of well-being and therefore having strong positive relationship with job performance. In other words, Shimazu, Schaufeli, Kamiyama and Kawakami (2015) conclude that engagement has significant positive effects on welfare and performance of employees. The organization must encourage engagement and discourage workaholism.

Bakker and Demerouti (2008) studied a mixed of previous quantities and qualitative research related to engagement antecedents and consequences. They found that engaged employees are more resourceful, productive and enthusiastic to go for an extra mile.
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Bakker et al., (2008) determined that there are few main motives for engaged employees to perform superior. The first motive is positive emotions (Schaufeli & Rhenen, 2006). Positive emotions include: joy, interest, and happiness, sensitivity to opportunities, helpful to peers, confidence, optimism and contentment. Such emotions are the building blocks of an employee’s personal resources (i.e. physical), rational resources, social and psychological resources and creates one’s a broad and flexible mindset that enhances job performance (Cropanzano & Wright, 2001; Fredrickson, 2001). The second motive is good health. A healthy engaged employee is always positive and enjoys the job, reports less psychosomatic complaints (headaches, chest pain) and is in good position to perform high (Schaufeli & Van Rhenen, 2006; Demerouti et al., 2001; Hakanen et al., 2006). The third motive behind engaged employees to perform better is the ability to mobilize job resources including social support from associates, self-sufficiency and create their assurance, self-efficacy, and organization-based self-esteem, where by experiencing their positive emotions and ability (Fredrickson & Joiner 2002; Xanthopoulou et al., 2007; Llorens, et al., 2006; Salanova, Bakker & Llorens, 2006). The fourth reason is that engaged employees perform better due to crossover of engagement. Such employees transfer their learning (bad or good) to colleagues and affect each other with work engagement, due to which they perform well (Westman, 2001, Barsade, 2002). Engaged employees perform well and generate their specific resources. Consequently, they are boosted to show positive engagement and confidently highlight both task performance and contextual performance (Christian et al., 2011).

Halbesleben and Wheeler, (2008) investigated the roles of embeddedness and employee engagement in determining performance and turnover intentions for a total 587
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employees working in various organizations situated in the United States. They conclude that embeddedness and engagement both contribute distinctive change with task performance.

Bakker and Demerouti (2009) in a study of the association of working couples’ engagement (men and women) and job performance used a sample of 525 Dutch workers. The study set up that engagement of men was positively associated with task and contextual performance.

Bakker and Bal (2010) established a connection amongst weekly engagement, resources and employee performance. A sample of fifty-four teachers was enquired to fulfill a weekly survey for the five successive weeks and were examined by multi-level analysis. The study reveals that Week-wise engagement has positive connection with weekly job performance i.e. task and contextual performance.

Gorgievski, Bakker, and Schaufeli (2010), studied engagement, workaholism and performance relationship for sample of 1900 workers and 262 entrepreneurial employees in Netherland. The engagement was measured through self-assessed UWES-9 item scale, and performance was evaluated through Goodman and Svyantek’s (1999), including task performance and contextual performance scale. Engagement was found positively linked with innovativeness, task and contextual performance. Whereas wokaholism was positively associated to contextual performance, while negatively linked with innovativeness.

Balducci, Fraccaroli, and Schaufeli (2010) analyzed the engagement and work performance of both Italian and Dutch white-collar employees, who were working in
different organizations and in a sample of 2871 employees, a positive connection was concluded between engagement and work performance.

Kirk-Brown and Dijik (2011) explored the engagement and performance link in the presence of mediating role of psychological safety. Their participants included 604 employees’ sample in Australia. A positive link was revealed between engagement and performance. Chughtai and Buckley (2011) studied mediating character of learning, goal orientation amongst engagement and task performance and innovative work behavior of a sample of 168 research scientists who were belonging to six different Irish research centers. A significant relationship was concluded between engagement and task, and contextual performance.

Suleaet et al., (2012) investigated the role of engagement as mediator amongst job characteristics, counterproductive work behavior and contextual behaviors. By conducting their study on a sample of 258 employees belonging to the three Romanian organizations, they conclude that engagement is negatively related with the counterproductive work behavior. Borman et al., (2001) conducted their study on the association between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior by taking a sample of 507 employees. The data for employee engagement was collected through a scale developed by Salanova, Agut and Peiro (2005) and Schaufeli, et al., (2006). The data for contextual performance was gathered through self-rated scale adopted from Dalal et al., (2009). Whereas, data for counterproductive work behavior was collected by a scale adopted from Organ and Konovsky (1989). The results confirmed that there is a negative link between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior.
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Based on the previous findings, it is hypothesized in the current study that there is a positive connection amongst employee engagement, task performance and contextual performance, while negative relationship is hypothesized between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior.

2.1.4 Concept of Human Resource Practices

Human resource practices are casual methods incorporated in managing people within organization (Armstrong & Taylor, 2014). It plays an essential role in every field of life such as corporate, financial, educational, political, information technology, publishing sectors as well as in non-profit and human right organizations. Besides that, it also plays a significant part in enhancing an employee performance and ensures that the goals of the organization are achieved in effective and efficient way, along with organization strategic objectives. Human resource practices are also specifically associated with management of personnel within organization by following organizational systems and rules (Collings & Wood, 2009). In organizations, human resource department perform a variety of activities (Huselid, 1995; Huang, 2000; Pfeffer, 1998; Tessema & Soeters, 2006; Shahzad, Bashir & Ramay, 2008; Paauwe & Boon, 2009). These activities include individual’s security, careful hiring, maximum incentives in relation to performance, self-managed teams, widespread training, drop in status training and disseminating information (Pfeffer’s, 1998).

Redman and Mathews (1998) in a survey of quality of service and implication of HRM theory determine that cautious recruitment, selection, employees’ retentions, training and development, team work, careful performance assessment and compensating quality
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Based rewards are the key HR-practices to improve the individual as well as the organization’s quality of services. Huslid (1995) states that HR is a combination of eleven practices, which may be adopted by an organization. These are: employee managing participation, rewards, performance evaluation, grievance procedures, job design, attitude valuation, recruitment process, information sharing, promotion standards and training.


HR-practices are used to develop employee’s talents, enhance their mutual cooperation and communication, and promote an organizational development and employees working in an organization. According to Huslid (1995) employee performance is based on ability and motivation of employees, such as an organization willing to achieve high performance, and the organization must pay more attention to improve HR-practices. Effective management of firm’s personnel could produce and enhance knowledge,
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enthusiasm, collaboration and assurance causing a foundation of persistent competitive improvement for the organization (Harter et al., 2002).

HR-practices shape an attitude and behavior of employee leading an organization to achieve its competitive advantage (Huslid, 1995). Effective HR-practices referred to the implementation of a cluster of internal procedures and practices that guide employees to ensure their contribution consistent with organizational objectives (Delery & Doty, 1996). According to Shahnawaz and Juyal (2006), human resource practices directly affect the behavior of employees working in an organization and leads to sustainable competitive advantage.

Snell, Morris and Bohlander (2015) propose that HR-practices is a function of observing and monitoring workers’ performance, encourage and engage people in making decision, appraisal of the employee’s performance and compensate the best performers in acknowledgement of their services (Huselid, 1995; MacDuffie, 1995; Delery & Doty, 1996). HR-practices encourage a strong organizational climate and thus improve organization performance (MacDuffie, 1995). Similarly, Becker and Gerhart, (1996) postulate that HR-practices helps to promote internal development and career path for employees and influence employee’s attitude and behaviors towards organization objectives. HR-practices not only advances the abilities, skills and knowledge of workers, but equally inspire the employees to continue with the company, and encourage workers to become more loyal and dedicated to the organization.

Traditionally, the aim of HR-practices was to reduce the cost (Baker & Gerhart, 1996), but with the passage of time, more additional research was conducted into the behavior of employees. The researchers started believing that human resource management
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is all about procedures of managing people which makes a difference (Colakoglu, Lepak & Hong, 2006). Many researchers have defined HR as a bundle of practices but none of them have agreed on the superlative HR-practices (Paauwe & Boselie, 2005; Boselie, Dietz &Boon, 2005). According to Chenveret and Trembely (2009), HR-practices vary from organization to organization and are usually adopted according to the business strategy. An organization adopts those HR-practices which are related to the nature of business strategy and other HR-practices, as well as, external environmental factors (Boxell & Purcell, 2000; Lim & Ling, 2012).

From the above discussions, it has been observed that HR-practices is a multidimensional concept and the most common practices among others are recruitment, performance appraisal, training and compensation (Huslid 1995; Pfeffer, 1998; Demo et al., 2012). On the basis of the above discussion it is suggested that training, compensation and performance are the three important human resource practices and directly contribute towards employee performance within an organization. Therefore, in the present study, according to the organizational requirements, the researcher has only selected the main three practices, namely: training, compensation and performance appraisal which are explained as under:

2.1.4.1 Training.

Employee training is an important HR-practice within an organization. Training and career progression have been mentioned as two of the most essential issues affecting employees’ engagement level and job performance in an organization (Gebauer, Lowman & Gordon, 2008). Training is a practice of educating new or current employees for enhancement of the elementary skills they require to perform a job. It represents a
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scheduled effort through an organization to facilitate personnel learning of job connected deeds. Lynch and Black (1995) puts that training increases the performance of the employees. The same stance is also supported by Barrett and O’ Connell (2001). Ballot, Gerard, Fakhfakh, and Taymaz, (2006) also prove that training improves productivity performance.

Noe(2006 ) assume that training is an essential factor for improving human capital and is mandatory to polish skills and knowledge of individuals, so as to perform a particular job with ease and speed. Khan (2010) considers training as one of the most important components of HR practices by saying that it has progressive influence on employees’ job performance. An organization is willing to invest in training for the purpose of advancing skills, abilities and confidence of its employees. It also aims to count on its employees realizing them to make more efforts and show their higher level of performance. Danvila, Castillo, Miguel, Rodrý and Antonio (2009) conclude that training is more effective and significantly linked with employee engagement and its impact upon the overall performance of the organization is also progressive.

Training enhances employees’ performance and skills (Delaney & Huslid, 1996; Russell, Terborg & Powers, 1985; Silberman, & Biech, 2015). According to Iles, Mabey and Robertson (1990), training helps direction towards enhancing skills level and correcting every apprehensions linkage to performance that eventually empowers employees to manage the prevailing and prospective task connected matters more efficiently and effectively. The quality of performance of the employees can be improved by providing them quality training and therefore training of employee is absolutely connected to the job performance.
2.1.4.2 Compensation.

Employees are vital assets for an organization (Drucker, 2002). Organizations face challenges in improving employee’s engagement and performance. Thus, compensation is developed to reward and motivate employees. Compensations are the rewards paid to workers whose production or performance exceeds some predetermined standards. Compensations are usually in the form of monetary rewards or in compensation-based remuneration, like stock option and ownership, prizes and bonuses. Monetary compensation is a procedure of rewarding employees in financial terms such as increase in pay and offering them stock option. Financial compensations are “the ways of monetary return offered for service rendered by employees” (Kyani, Akhtar & Haroon, 2011). Compensation is the “entire package of rewards, including financial and non-financial benefits, which an organization provides to its employees in exchange for their services rendered” (Thomas & Martin, 1999; Aswathappa, 2007). Illustrations of monetary compensations may take the form of an increase in pay, bonuses, and stock option. Therefore, it is described as “The amount paid to employees, either in the form of lump sum or monthly payment which makes individuals perceive as an immediate feedback of their efforts contributed” (Al-Nsour, 2011). Ichniowski, Shaw and Prennushi (1997) conclude that compensation plans improve employees’ performance supported by innovative work practices. Mohammad, Lo and La (2009) found positive connection between compensation and performance.

Employees are optimistic when they are monetarily rewarded and it is linked to efficiency and effectiveness. Organizations, such as universities, can attract and keep high skilled workforce by compensating them properly. Compensations plans and innovative
job practices together play a positive role in improving employees. According to Atkinson et al., (2009), a constructive association exists between rewards and performance outcomes of academic professors. Compensation practice has a statistically important association with employee job performance and organizational productivity and significant positive link has been determined between compensation practices and perceived employee performance. Compensation has positive impact on attitude of employees and improve performance in line with organizational strategies and objectives (Johnson, Friend & Agrawal, 2016).

2.1.4.3 Performance appraisal.

Performance appraisal is the employees’ job evaluation when performed systematically according to their jobs and potential developments (Ishaq, Iqbal & Zaheer 2009). Jamil and Raja (2011) explain that performance appraisal is a process of pinpointing, assessing and evolving an employee’s performance. Performance appraisals focus over capacity building and equip the authorities to feel earlier and react more rapidly to tentative changes (Akinyele, 2010). Performance appraisal is a cluster of practices or holistic philosophy including employees’ motivation, knowledge, development, monitoring and measuring performance to achieve organizational goals and determines what areas needs to be improved (Brown & Heywood, 2005). Performance appraisal is a strategy link to every activity; it varies from organization to organization according their business context.
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Individual employee’s performance and organizational performance can be improved by comparing its present and past performance standards in order to identify the gap between them. The performance appraisal feedback system highlights the quality of employees’ performance and drives organizational success. But sometimes, organizations cannot take the desired benefits from performance appraisal process due to unanticipated large variances between the predictions and experiences in the existing system.

According to Shahzad, Bashir and Ramay (2008), performance appraisal is used for the purpose of making managers countable, while determining the goal and the degree to support employees in achieving the target aims of the organizations. Hence, it is a continuing partnership between personnel and manager, related to main job activities for employees’ participation in goals settings. In addition, performance appraisal is also related to performance measures and the procedures that how the restrictions in attaining high performance will be detached (Brown & Heywood, 2005). Mullins (2002) states that performance appraisal is a systematic way of assessing the individual performance for the purpose of future career advancement and improvement of performance. According to Brown and Heywood (2005), performance appraisal is a practice through which employees are examined and monitored to increase the output of job performance.

The organizational performance can be improved by employee performance, which can be done through good managerial skills, knowledge, abilities, values and commitment and proper performance appraisals. It is an important factor which contributes towards better performance of employees and overall organizational performance. The term was
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first introduced in Taylor’s revolutionary time and motion studies in beginning of 20th century, but was practiced initially in 1940s nearby the Second World War for the purpose of justifying employees’ pay called merit rating system (Amin & Khan, 2009).

To generate higher level of employee engagement and performance, modern organizations emphasis upon performance assessment system. Performance evaluation or appraisal is a grave feature of organizational effectiveness (Cardy, 2004). Since it is a basic procedure over which the job is measured, it always remains as top most important for managers (Lawler, 2008). However, according to employees’ satisfaction survey carried out by Pulakos (2009), performance management is frequently remained in the lowest areas in surveys of employee’s satisfaction. Moreover, less than a third of workers trust that their organizational performance appraisal practice supports them in refining their job performance.

Organizations always try to develop performance appraisal strategies to ensure an increase in quality and productivity. Yet, quality and productivity ought to be accompanied by the corresponding concern to find the ways to be aligned with organizational goals and motivate and develop each employee. The effective HR system where employees are considered as human assets leads better understanding of employees’ work. It results an increase in employees’ contribution towards organizational success. Therefore, performance appraisal is an essential process and is thought to be part of managing manpower and enhances employees’ performance (Brown & Heywood, 2005).
2.5 Relationship of Human Resource Practices with Job Performance and Employee Engagement

Few empirical research studies have explored how employees perceive HR-practices linked within an organization that may affect this relationship. Training and career progress opportunities are the significant aspect affecting engagement level in an organization (Gebauer et al., 2008). Ballot, Gerard, Fakhfakh and Taymaz (2006) present evidence that training improves performance in the form of productivity and benefits both employees and an employer. In addition, positive link between performance appraisal and employee performance, and compensation were reported by various studies (Ichniowski, Shaw & Prennushi, 1997; Brown & Heywood, 2005; Marwat et al., 2009; Huslid, 1995, Tessema & Soeters: 2006; Shahzad, Bashir & Ramay, 2008). It is “A distinct and unique construct consisting of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components, associated with individual role performance” (Saks, 2006; p. 602). Engaged employees believe that they are treated justly and being valued. Simpson (2009) establishes the significant positive relationship between HR-practices to the expansion of employee engagement.

There is no such study available on the moderating role of training, compensation and performance on the relationship of employee engagement and determinants of job performance. Therefore, on the basis of previous studies investigating relationship of training, compensation and performance appraisal to employee engagement and determinants of job performance, it is inferred that these three HR-practices moderate employee engagement and job performance link.
2.6 Theoretical Background to the Framework

In the present study, the job performance as a dependent variable is taken to be affected by employee’s engagement having characteristics like vigor, dedication and absorption. In literature, there is plenty of work done on the relationship between employee engagement and other work associated effects, but little is done on the relationship to employee’s job performance. Harter, Schmidt and Hays (2002) used the Questions 12 (Q12) and coined a positive association between employees’ engagement and job performance in terms of customer satisfaction, profitability, productivity, safety outcomes and employee turnover. Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) established a reasonably positive and stable relationship between job resources (extrinsic and intrinsic motivators).

Babcock-Roberson and Strickland (2010) found that employee engagement, charismatic leadership and contextual performance had a strong positive link between employee engagement and contextual performance. Correspondingly, similar results of positive relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance were also found by some previous studies (Rurkkhum & Bartlett, 2012; Christian, Garza & Slaughter, 2011; Avey, Wernsing & Luthans, 2008; Rich, LePine & Crawford, 2010). Similarly, Matamala, Pace and Thometz, (2010) and Dullaghan, Loo and Johnson (2010) further added the same positive relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance.
The Moderating Role of HR Practices

Bakker and Demerouti (2008) assert that employee engagement is connected to different performance related constructs such as in-role behavior or task performance, creativity and contextual performance. Their study shows positive association among engagement and task performance and contextual performance. Engaged employees shift their engagement to the fellow co-workers and consequently increase the performance of the group as a whole. Thus the engaged employees tend to perform better and enhance overall job performance.

Few studies have been conducted on the relationship of employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior. Borman et al., (2001) and Sulea, Virga, Maricutoiu, Schaufeli, Zaborila Dumitru and Sava (2012) in their studies found negative association between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior.

In the study at hand, job performance will be measured through task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior, as assumed a representative of job performance used in some previous studies (Rich, LePine, & Crawford 2010; Cote & Miners, 2006; Schaufeli, Taris, & Bakker, 2006; Kahya, 2007, Little & Little, 2006; Lockwood, 2007). Engaged employees concentrate on their performance and show willingness to perform a job with dedicated, physical, mental and expressive resources. According to Christian, Garza and Slaughter (2011) engaged employees perform a task with drive, self-investment and appetite directed to greater levels of task and contextual performance.
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Marwat, Qureshi and Ramay (2009) declare that for high growth achievement, the organization must pay attention to training, employee performance appraisal and compensation. Providing of training to employees indeed increases firm level outcome (Barak, Maymon & Harel 1999). Similarly, Huselid (1995) determines that the efficiency of workers rely on HRM effects on the behaviors of employees. Marwat, Qureshi and Ramay (2009) illustrate that HR practice has powerful impact on performance. One of the important HR practice is training, which benefits employees to enhance their skills and performance (Delaney & Huslid, 1996; Russell, Terborg & Powers, 1985). According to Iles, Mabey and Robertson (1990) training helps skills improvement, correcting performance, empower employees efficiently to manage their prevailing and prospective task connections. Employees’ performance can be improved by providing them quality training and, therefore, training of employee is positively related to job performance.

Ichniowski, Shaw and Prennushi (1997) found that the performance of the employees can be positively affected by compensation pay plans subject to flexible job design and providing training to learn new skills. Huselid (1995) affirms that compensation is positively related to the performance of employees, while the same positive correlation between perceived employee performance and compensation (Teseema & Soeters: 2006, Shahzad, Bashir & Ramay, 2008).

Brown and Heywood (2005) consider performance appraisal as an HR practice used to increase the output and employee performance. Huselid (1995) argues that performance appraisal has a relationship with performance of an employee. This view is also supported by Teseema and Soeters (2006) and Marwat et al., (2009). Having examined
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the relevant literature, the study assumes a positive connection between performance appraisal and job performance.

2.7 Conceptual Definitions of the Variables

**Employee engagement.**

According to Shaufeli and Bakker (2006), it is “A positive, fulfilling work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption” (Shaufeli et al., 2002; Shaufeli & Bakker, 2006; Sheufeli, 2014).

**Job performance.**

Job Performance is the actions or behavior relevant to organizational goals, which includes task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behaviors of employees that add to or detract from organizational goals (Campbell, McCloy, Oppler & Sager, 1993; Campbell, 1999; Hunt, 1996; Motowidlo, 2003; Dalal et al., 2012)

**Task Performance.**

Task performance is “The proficiency with which employees perform the activities recognized as part of their jobs or job description” (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Dalal et al., 2012)

**Contextual Performance.**

Contextual performance or discretionary behavior allied with the support of other employees in an organization and contribute to organization less directly (Borman & Motowidlo 1997; Becker & Kernan, 2003; Eisenberger et al., 2010, Dalal et al., 2012)
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*Counterproductive Work Behavior.*

Counterproductive work behavior is “a volitional employee behavior that is intended to harm the legitimate interest of an organization” (Robinson & O’Leary-Kelly, 1998; Spector & Fox, 2001; Sackett, Berry, Wiemann & Laczo, 2006, Dalal et al., 2012).


The conceptual definitions of HR-practices are given below:

*Training.*

Training refers to “The programs that are more present day oriented, focuses on individual’s current jobs, enhancing specific skills and abilities to immediately perform their job” (DeCenzo & Robbins, 2005).

*Compensation.*

Compensation is “The entire package of rewards, including financial and non-financial benefits, which an organization provides to its employees in exchange for their services rendered” (Thomas & Martin, 1999; Aswathappa, 2007).

*Performance Appraisal.*

Performance appraisal is "A systematic way of assessing the individual performance for the purpose of future career advancement and improvement of performance” (Mullins, 2007).
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2.8 Operationalization of the Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts (Variable)</th>
<th>Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement</strong></td>
<td>Feel energetic, strong and vigorous, willing to go for work, willing to work for long period, resiliently and persist even if thing goes wrong, work purposely, enthusiastically with inspiration and pride even if the job is challenging. During job, the time passes quickly, forget about surroundings, and feels happy and absorbed, carried away and difficult to detach from job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual performance</strong></td>
<td>Help others, voluntarily perform, orienting employees, team work, assist others, improve overall image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task performance</strong></td>
<td>Achieve objectives, meet the criteria, demonstrate expertise, fulfill the requirements, accept more than assigned, suitable for higher role, competent, perform well, and meet deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counterproductive work behavior</strong></td>
<td>Destructing property, hurting behavior, withholding efforts, deceitful, refusing to cooperate, unfair criticism, destructive behavior, confrontational deeds, tell malicious stuff about employer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Conduction of training programs, training time and schedule, needs identification of academic staff for training, formal training programs for new employees, new knowledge and skills via training programs, training according to needs of the University strategy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisal</td>
<td>Basis for performance appraisal, purpose of appraisal in university, performance appraisal counseling with employees, employees trust, impact of appraisal on employees, use of appraisal data, and objectives of the appraisal system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>Provide incentives, result based salary, market comparable salary, considers employees expectations and suggestions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9 Research Framework and Hypotheses

In the light of the previous literature examined in this chapter, the researcher has developed the following research framework:
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Figure 2. 3 Schematic Diagram of Research Framework

Source: Developed by author
2.9.1 The employee engagement and job performance relationship

In the current study, the researcher formulated the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1:** There is a positive relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is positive relationship between employee engagement and task performance.

**Hypothesis 3:** There is negative relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior.

**Figure 2.4 The connection between employee engagement and dimensions of job performance**

2.9.2 Moderating Effect of Human Resource Practices on Employee Engagement and Job Performance Dimensions

It is recommended by a number of researchers that human resource practices are positively associated to job performance (Huslid, 1995; Delery & Doty, 1996; Teseema & Soeters, 2006, Shahzad et al., 2008, Ahmad & Shezad, 2011). HR-practices have positive effect on the overall employee’s job performance. Therefore, to evaluate the moderating influence of HR-practices on engagement and job performance link, the following hypotheses are formulated:
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**Hypothesis 4:** Training significantly moderates the relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance.

**Hypothesis 5:** Training significantly moderates the relationship between employee engagement and task performance.

**Hypothesis 6:** Training significantly moderates the relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior.

**Figure 2.** Moderating effect of training on the association of employee engagement and job performance dimensions

**Hypothesis 7:** Compensations significantly moderates the relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance.

**Hypothesis 8:** Compensations significantly moderates the relationship between employee engagement and task performance.

**Hypothesis 9:** Compensations significantly moderates the relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior.
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Figure 2.6 Moderating role of compensations on the relationship of employee engagement and job performance dimensions

Hypothesis 10: Performance Appraisal significantly moderates the relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance.

Hypothesis 11: Performance Appraisal significantly moderates the relationship between employee engagement and task performance.

Hypothesis 12: Performance Appraisal significantly moderates the relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior performance.

Figure 2.7 Moderating effect of performance appraisal on the connection of employee engagement and job performance dimensions
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The present chapter describes the methodology employed in conducting the present study. It explains the research framework and hypotheses formulated in the light of previous literature discussed in chapter two. The chapter further elaborates the pilot study and the main study approach, adopted for conducting the research, including information regarding research design, population, sample, and data analysis methods.

3.2 Research Philosophy

In social sciences, there are two different types of Philosophies, which are interpretivism and positivism (Sauder et al., 2007). Interpretivism determines the reality of the people as a replacement of objectives. Easterby-Smith et al., (2012) examined that this philosophy focuses on the feels, thinking and social interactions of the people. On the other hand, positivism approach examines the objectivity rather than subjectivity. Saunders et al., (2009) examined that Positivism approach is based on knowledge of reality rather than perception nor sensation. In the similar way, the objectives of the present study have been examined empirically by using different quantitative methods and statistical tools. Therefore, the research study is quantitative in nature, which examined the level of employee engagement in Private Sector Universities in relationship to job performance of the teaching faculty members in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.
3.3 Pilot Study

This pilot study is incorporated in the research design because of the following motives;

1. To test the scales reliability adopted in this study for the measurement of employee engagement, job performance, training, performance appraisal, and compensation.

2. To recognize various characteristics of the association between the dependent and independent variables.

3. To check the instrument (Questionnaire) phrasing, difficulties faced by respondents and sentence structure, readability and understandability of questions asked in order to get a suitable feedback from the respondents.

4. To determine the respondents’ responses to the given five points Likert Scale.

5. To jot down a sufficient research design to be pursued in the main study.

A pilot study is a set of observations commenced before launching the full-scale study. It was carried out for testing the reliability and validity issues in the Self-administered Questionnaire. According to Punch (2013), pilot study should be conducted in the environment with similar participants where actual study is to be conducted. Newman (2007) suggests that for respondents undersize 1000, only 30% to 40% respondents could be chosen, therefore a number of 80 (30%) questionnaires were randomly distributed among academic staff of three universities (CECOS, INU and City University). Only 47 questionnaires were received back that formed 58% response rate out of 80. This sample size is suitable in homogenous population (academic staff), which precisely reflects the characteristics of all the respondents.
The overall alpha reliability of the 60 – item scale used for the study was found 0.95, which shows that the scale used in the questionnaire was internally consistent and reliable to use for conducting the main study. The scale of seven variables used in this study were also analyzed individually by applying alpha reliability test and found all as acceptable as their Cronbach’s Alpha were ranging from 0.71 to 0.95.

For content validity, the questionnaire was sent to the experts i.e. PhD scholars and their comments and suggestions were invited. The questionnaire reflectiveness, flow and conception were checked for the purpose of improvement in the questionnaire by consulting the same PhD holders. They found its sentence structure and language according to the educational level and culture of the respondents. Furthermore, the 5-point rating scale was repeated at each page of the questionnaire for the purpose of getting the honest and factual responses of the subjects.

3.4 Main Study Approach

The researcher needs to take care in identification of problem and the research methods to be used in conducting a research. The researcher has to think carefully to understand whether the study is experimental, case study, survey, or archival analyses in order to select and develop strategies accordingly. These strategies are developed on the ground of given research questions and the level of control the investigator has over concrete conduct of events and the degree of emphasis on contemporary, as opposed to historic proceedings (Yin, 1994).

The choice of study methodologies caused ample debate and discussion between HR scholars in latest years (Zulfiqar et al., 2011). As presumed hypotheses are grounded
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on proven relationships of HR-practices and their moderating impact upon the employee engagement-job performance link and empirical studies on said area of research, the survey methodology has been selected to boost the generalizability of the study outcomes. Therefore, the field survey was conducted to gather perceptual measures from academic faculty of Private Sector Universities of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa.

Data can be collected from the individuals in two ways: either subjects can be asked or they can be observed. The former is called 'survey research' whereby the researchers communicate with a sample of respondents in order to generalize upon the characteristics and behavior of the population that they represent (Weiers, 1984). The survey-based study is an observation method usually used by researchers in the social sciences (Rubin & Babbie, 1993). It is generally used for getting information about recent past, present and near future (Weiere, 1984). Researchers have found that unlike other approaches, survey method provides responses to the study questions of who, where, how and what (Yin, 1994).

3.4.1 Research design.

The research plan or scheme is a detailed design or overall framework which describes the direction and method used to gather the data- either from primary or secondary sources. It also presents the procedures adapted for data analysis through statistical tools, data interpretation and retrieval of results (Nardi, 2003; Malhotra, 2007). According to Kerlinger and Lee (2000), research design is a schema of research study. Similarly, research design provides a map to operationalize the variables and to determine solution to a research problem (Selltiz, 1986).
The Moderating Role of HR Practices

In the present study, the scholar used quantitative research design. The research hypotheses have been generated, while different data collection tools have been incorporated to test hypothesis and answer the research questions of the study. The principal theme of the present quantitative study is to understand the engagement of faculty members. In addition, it examined the association between employee engagement with job performance dimensions, including contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive work behavior, HR-practices comprising of training, performance appraisal and compensations among the faculty members of Private Sector Universities of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

Furthermore, the researcher selected cross sectional approach rather than longitudinal study. Cross sectional approach is selected on the basis of cost and time consideration (Yamamoto, 2007). Cross sectional study is a process of data collection over a period of day, week or a month, while longitudinal study is elaborated as the data gathered over a period of one or more years to answer the research question of the study (Sekaran, 2005).

3.4.2 Population and sample size.

The population of the present research study was the academic faculty members working in Private Sector Universities of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa, where at least graduation (16-years education) was required to perform a specific teaching job. All those Private Sector Universities were considered for study which have been recognized by Higher Education Commission (HEC) of Pakistan and chartered by Government of Khyber-
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Pakhtunkhwa till December, 2012. The details of target population are available in the following table 3.1:

Table 3. 1 List of Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the university</th>
<th>Faculty Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar (CUSITP)</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CECOS University of Information Technology and Emerging Sciences, Peshawar (CECOSUITESP)</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandhara University, Peshawar (GUP)</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abasyn University, Peshawar”(AUP)</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern University, Nowshera”(NUN)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghulam Ishaq Khan Institute of Engineering Sciences &amp; Technology, Topi (GIKIESTT)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qurtaba University of Science and Information Technology (QUSIT)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iqra National University, Peshawar (INU)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarhad University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar”(SUSITP)</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston University</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1215</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Websites of individual universities

3.4.3 Sample and unit of analysis.

A sample is a demonstrative portion of overall population, comprising all the characteristics possessed by the population. For conducting a sample survey, the researcher must select a sufficient number of samples representing the characteristics of target
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population. On the basis of selected sample, its results would be generalized for the properties or characteristics to the population elements (Sekaran, 2005). The data was collected through simple random sampling for the finite total population of 1215 faculty members working in Private Sector Universities of Khyber Pukhtunkhwa. In simple random sampling, each employee has an equal opportunity to be chosen and thus intended to be unbiased representation of a population. The representative sample size selected was 293 employees on the basis of statistical formula (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970).

The formula for determining the sample size was with sampling error of 5% and confidence interval 95% (α = 0.05), which is given below

Sample Size  = \( Y^2 N X (1 - X) / d^2 (N - 1) + Y^2 X (1 - X) \)

Whereas:  \( Y^2 = \) (Table value of Chi square for degree of freedom) whereas (df) = 1 at the anticipated confidence level (0.10 = 2.71, 0.05 = 3.84, 0.01 = 6.64, 0.001 = 10.83)

\( N = \) Size of Population

\( X = \) Supposed to be 0.50 proportion of population

\( D = \) Degree of accuracy stated in fraction (0.05)

The sample distribution details of faculty members selected from each target University is as follows:
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Table 3.2 Detail of Sample Distribution of Faculty Members in Selected Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of University</th>
<th>Population (N)</th>
<th>Sample Size (n) taken as per Krejcie &amp; Morgan’s (1970) formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUSITP</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CECOSUITESP</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUP</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUO</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUN</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIKIESTT</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUSIT</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INU</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUITS</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston University</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1215</strong></td>
<td><strong>293</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Universities’ individual websites.

The unit of analysis for conducting the present study was individual faculty members working in Private Sector Universities of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa. Furthermore, this research is cross sectional in nature where data was gathered once or one-off from sample units of the representative target population. The data for main study was collected between the month of January 2013 and May 2013.
3.4.4 Data collection and analysis.

The data collection procedures and analysis methods adopted in this study are elaborated below:

3.4.4.1 Data collection methods.

Literature survey and questionnaire methods were used in this study for collection of data.

- **Literature survey**: The main sources for collection for data related to previous studies were collected from secondary sources- including research journals, magazines, books, and online sources.

- **Questionnaire**: Questionnaire was used to collect the primary data on the basis of the literature survey. The questionnaire contained structured close ended questions comprising of 5-point Likert Scale (See Appendix- I). The researcher distributed questionnaire among a sample of 293 correspondents in their respective Universities.

3.4.4.2 Questionnaire design.

The questionnaire for the current study was divided into three portions. The first portion was an introduction describing the objectives of the study and instructions for filling the questionnaire. The second portion was concerned with the assessment of the demographic variables. Finally, the third portion was about the assessment of the main variables of the study.

In order to obtain genuine responses and for cultural relevancy, the questionnaire was sent to three PhD’s experts from areas of management sciences, education and
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psychology. Their comments and views were invited. Accordingly, no changes were recommended and all the three expert found it cultural relevant.

All the items on the questionnaire were listed continuously on 5-point rating scale (Likert scale), which was used to identify a response for the main variables (Employee Engagement, Job performance and HR-practices). The letter 1 denotes ‘strongly disagree’ 2 ‘indicates disagree’, 3 stands for ‘neither agree nor disagree’, 4 denotes ‘agree’ and 5 represents ‘strongly agree’. The detail of the variables included in the questionnaire is given below:

**Employee engagement.**

The scale for employee engagement was evaluated through Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Sahaufeli et al., 2001). In the present research the questionnaire of employee engagement comprises of three sub-dimensions particularly vigor, dedication and absorption. Six of the questions were related to vigor and absorption respectively, while the following five questions were related to dedication. The internal consistencies for UWES scale is demonstrated from 0.80 to 0.90 (Schaufeli et al., 2002, Yi-Wen & Yi-Qun, 2005, Shimazu et al., 2008, Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003; Schaufeli, 2014). The total of 17 questions are related to employee engagement from 01 to 17 in the questionnaire (See Appendix- I). The overall score of the 17 items ranged from 17 to 85 score. The high score demonstrates employees’ higher level of employee engagement. Overall score for EE is more valuable in empirical research as compared to the scores on overall three distinct dimensions of UWES (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008). Therefore, in the present study, the overall score of EE is considered instead of its dimensions.
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Job performance.

Job performance was measured on the basis of three sub dimensions like task and contextual performance, and counterproductive work behaviors.

Task performance.

Task performance was measured from an adapted questionnaire of Goodman and Svyantek’s (1999) with $\alpha = 0.88$. Question from 18 to 26 are related to task performance.

Contextual performance.

Contextual performance was measured from the adapted scale of Goodman and Svyantek’s (1999), having 9-items with a Cronbach’s alpha value 0.90. The total of seven questions (from 27 to 33) are about contextual performance.

Counterproductive work behavior.

Counterproductive work behavior was analyzed through 9-item scale introduced by Robinson and O’Leary-Kelly (1998) with a coefficient alpha of 0.88. Similarly, the questionnaire reliability of the same scale was also tested by Rich (2006). A total of nine questions from 34 to 42 are related to counterproductive work behaviors.
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Training.

Training was measured through 6-item scale of Singh (2004) with having coefficient alpha of 0.86. A total of six questions in the questionnaire (from 43 to 48) deal with training.

Compensation.

Compensation was assessed through Demo, Neiva, Nunes and Rozzett (2012) adapted scale with coefficient alpha of 0.81. The reliability of the scale was also confirmed by Bal, Bozkurt, & Ertemsir (2014) which was a little higher of 0.95. A total of five questions from 49 to 53 are related to compensations.

Performance Appraisal.

Performance appraisal was assessed through 7-item scale of Singh (2004) with Cronbach’s alpha of 0.91. In aggregate, seven questions (from 54 to 60) are concerned with performance appraisal.

3.4.4.3 Procedure.

Participants were sent the questionnaires through their respective offices at the university campuses through personal visits. They were assured that the data will be retained confidential and will be utilized only for the academic purpose. The respondents were guided to respond all the questions honestly at their own ease and return it at a later time to the researcher. Among the respondents, 273 returned the questionnaire on proper time, while 06 of them were incomplete and thus exempted from analysis.
3.4.4.4 Data entry.

After receiving the questionnaires, they were assigned numbers and were thoroughly studied. All the missing values and incomplete questionnaires were identified. Some questionnaires contained wrong entries and missing values (more than 15%). Misleading information were scrutinized and removed from analysis. After this, a comprehensive detailed code book was developed, where all the variables including the main variable were employed on 5-point Likert Scale. The values were fluctuating from 1 to 5. All the variables including demographic factors were defined on SPSS (Version -20) and thus all the data received from respondents through questionnaire were entered into SPSS data base. The data was checked again and again for the purpose of removing mistakes and organizing figures on daily basis until data entry was completed.

3.4.4.5 Data verification.

Data was verified after entering into Statistical Package of Social Science (SPSS) version-20 and accuracy was checked to ensure 100% accuracy. To achieve this level, frequencies of all variables were checked and for correcting any discrepancies or incorrectness, the original questionnaire was consulted by their serial numbers and with the help of the code book developed such as 1 for male and 2 for females. Measures like ordinal, ratio, interval and nominal data were determined (Green & Salkind, 2005). For further confirmation of data precision, 70 questionnaires that is 70*60= 4200 entries were checked randomly and found an error rate of 0%.

3.4.5 Missing value analysis of data.

Missing value analysis is the process of evaluating the amount of missing responses in the questionnaires (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Out of the total sample, 293
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respondents, no questionnaire was found to have missing values. None of the variables had any missing data except very few questionnaires which was less than 5%. That little missing percentage is usually considered as normal (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2010).

3.4.6 Outliers analysis.
Outliers in data set are those specific values, which have notably lower or higher values from other data (Pallant, 2010). It measures the situation of each observation matched to the center of overall observation on a cluster of variables (Haire et al., 2010). Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggest that data lies in the range $\pm$ 3.3 is considered outliers. Both univariate and multivariate outliers’ analysis are important before multivariate analysis (Pallant, 2010). Therefore, both univariate and multivariate outlier’s analysis were carried out in the present study. The results are given in chapter 4.

3.4.7 Reliability of the scale.
Cronbach’s alpha and Guttman Split-Half Coefficient both were measured for calculating reliability of the measures used in the present study to confirm internal consistency of the scales. Reliability of the instruments plays an essential role for evaluating the quality and adequacy of the questionnaires (Polit & Beck, 2004). The results of the pilot study that is Cronbach’s Alpha value of overall scale 0.95 confirmed the reliability of the instrument.

3.4.8 Validity of data.
Consistency and accuracy in findings come from validity analysis of the data set. Therefore, Validity analysis was carried out finally for data on the basis of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). In order to check the sample size
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adequacy and inter-correlation among variables, first KMO measures were determined to conduct factor analysis. Kaiser (1974) suggests a minimum acceptable value of 0.5. Hutcheson and Sofroniou (1999) suggests that figures ranging from 0.5 to 0.7 are considered mediocre, 0.7 to 0.8 represent good, and 0.8 to 0.9 represent great and above 0.9 are considered superb. Therefore, the KMO was applied in final data analysis to measure the sample adequacy and inter-correlation between variables.

3.4.9 Descriptive statistics.

Descriptive statistics was incorporated to measure frequencies, distribution, mean, maximum, minimum variation, standard deviation and measure of central tendency (Sekaran, 2005). It is usually used for the purpose to understand general nature of data. In addition, descriptive statistics was used to check the normality of the study through calculation of skewness and kurtosis.

3.4.10 Correlation.

Pearson Correlation Test was applied for checking the link between dependent and independent variables by calculating Pearson Correlation Coefficients.

3.4.11 Regression analysis.

Multivariate statistical tool, called step-wise multiple Regression, has been applied to data analysis to forecast the discrepancy in dependent variable by regressing the independent variables (Sekaran, 2005).

3.4.12 Moderation analysis.

Moderating variable is the one which modifies the direction or strength of relationship between a predictor and an outcome. Cohen, Cohen, West and Aiken (2013) stated that “Moderation occurs when the relationship between two variables relies upon
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third variable”. Moderating variable is the one that effects the relationship between dependent and independent variables; by themselves they are independent variables (Hair et al., 1998). Hierarchical Multiple Moderated Regression Analysis (HMMRA) models were applied to test the moderation effect in the present study. According to HMMRA model, investigating the dependent variable was regressed on independent variable as shown in step 1:

\[ Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \varepsilon \]

Moderator variable was added into the regression equation (step 1) for measuring its effect on both dependent and independent variables, shown in equation step 2:

\[ Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \varepsilon \]

In the third and final step, the multiplication of moderator and independent variable was taken to create interaction effect in regression equation (step 2)

\[ Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 (X_1 \times X_2) + \varepsilon \]

Where

\( Y = \) Dependent variable

\( \beta_1 X_1 = \) Linear effect of \( X_1 \)

\( \beta_2 X_2 = \) Linear effect of \( X_2 \)

\( \beta_3 (X_1 \times X_2) = \) Interaction effect of \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \)

\( \varepsilon = \) error term

For checking moderation role of human resource practices (training, compensation and performance appraisal) on the relationship of employee engagement (Independent
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variable) and Job performance’s dimensions including task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior, the following statistical procedure was applied in SPSS (version -20).

- Centering of independent and moderating variable was made by deducting mean value from each value of the relevant variable for all the participative effect that resulted mean value of 0 for the total variables used in this study.

- The term “interaction” was determined by taking product of the centered employee engagement and training, compensation and performance appraisal respectively.

- The value of “interaction” was calculated and a custom model was constructed by treating EE and HR-practices as main effect and their centered product as an “interaction” term.

After performing the multiple regression equations, the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was carried out to indicate the significance value for the various models developed by researcher. The job performance’s components were taken as dependent variables, and showed a significant value for the entire model including intercept, EE (first independent variable), HR-practices (second independent but moderating variables) and the term interaction represented the moderating role of HR practices.

As the General Linear Model could not yield “R²” and “ΔR²”, therefore, step-wise regression was run to measure the strength of moderating variables (Second independent variable). A model summary table, generated on the basis of the above analysis and values of R² and ΔR², led it to acceptance or rejection of the model and validated the correspondence change in coefficient.
4.1 Introduction

The current chapter presents the statistical procedures adopted for data analysis; the data was collected through the tool of questionnaire. It covers preliminary statistical analysis of data and the research methodology applied in conducting this study. All demographic variables obtained from the information gathered through questionnaire were analyzed. The relationship between employee engagement (IV) and job performance dimensions (DV) were measured by determining the Pearson Correlation Coefficients, as well as, Linear Regression procedure to forecast the value of contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive work behavior on the basis of employee engagement. For checking the moderating influence of HR-practices on relationship between employee engagement and job performance’s dimensions, a step-wise regression analysis was applied to check the researcher hypothesis.

4.2 Preliminary Analysis

In order to check any possible violation of assumptions associated with data analysis, the following checks and screenings must be performed before execution of the final data analysis and testing of hypotheses- as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007).

4.2.1 Normality test.

Data normality is an assumption to check that the data is continuous and normality is distributed in the process of investigation. Gravetter and Wallnau (2004) explain that
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normality is ball-shaped curve in asymmetrical form with highest scores of frequency close to the mean or middle. While lowest frequencies values are towards the extreme. According to Hair et al., (2010), normality can also be calculated through comparison of histogram residual and normal distribution curve of the study. The most common approach to measure the normality in a data model is P-P plot (Hair et al., 2010). It is bell shaped symmetrical curve in histogram, having the highest and lowest frequencies in the middle and towards edge respectively (Rocha, 2008). Therefore, in the present study the normality of the data was checked through observing the standardized normal P-P plots and standardized residual histograms. The skewness and Kurtosis statistics values shown in the following Table 4.1 are within the acceptable ranges ±2.0. (Tabachnich & Fidell, 2007).

Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Normality Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>3.0965</td>
<td>-.389</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2.8818</td>
<td>-.417</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>3.0004</td>
<td>-.334</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>1.8602</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRNG</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2.5993</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2.5408</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2.9872</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (list wise)</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To further verify the normality of data in the distribution of Model, the following histograms were developed which clearly show that the dependent variables are not violating the normality assumption- as the figures depict symmetrical bell curve and thus
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satisfying the normality assumption. The histograms of employee engagement, contextual performance and task performance are given in the following Figure 4.1 and 4.2. The same relationships were found for the rest of the variables and are shown in the Appendix - II

**Figure 4.1 Regression Standardized Residual of EE and CP**

**Figure 4.2 Regression Standardized Residual of EE and TP**

*Histogram of EE and CP*  
*Histogram of EE and TP*

### 4.2.2 Linearity Test

Linearity assumption refers to the direct (straight line) relationship between dependent and independent variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The linearity of data was analyzed through scattered plots of standardized residuals of both dependent and independent variables. The linear relationship is achieved by straight line or curvilinear, and hence the correlation is usually carried out (Pallant, 2010). The linearity in a model of data are shown in the following normal Histogram, while P-P plot and scattered plots for employee engagement, contextual performance and task performance are shown in the following figures which reflect that the results of the study have not violated the assumption of normality observed in Histogram (Figure 4.1 & 4.2), Normal P-P plot (Figure 4.3 & 4.4) and Scattered plots (Figure 4.5 & 4.6). These show a positive linear relationship between employee engagement, contextual performance and task performance. Furthermore,
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Appendix- III (Normal P-P plots) and Appendix- IV (Scattered plots) encompasses the figures for the rest of the variables used in the present study.

Figure 4. 3 Normal Probability Plot of Regression Standardized Residual of EE and TP

Figure 4. 4 Normal Probability Plot of Regression Standardized Residual of EE and CP
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Figure 4. 5 Normal Probability Plot Regression Standardized Residual of EE and TP

Figure 4. 6 Normal Probability Plot of Regression Standardized Residual of EE and CP
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4.2.3 Multicollinearity test.

Multicollinearity stems from the situation where variables are highly correlated with coefficient 0.9 or above with each other (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Pallant (2007) suggests that collinearity analysis can be checked by Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). According to Hair et al., (2010), the Multicollinearity can fundamentally influence the predictive ability of independent variables. In order to analyze Multicollinearity in the data model, tolerance and VIF factors were examined in the present study. Tolerance value found more than 0.1 and VIF value less than 10, which proved that there is no problem of Multicollinearity in the data model (Pallant, 2007).

Table 4. 2 Tolerance and VIF values for employee engagement, job performance components, and HR-practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Performance</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>1.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterproductive Work Behavior</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>1.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>1.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 Homoscedasticity test.

Homoscedasticity is an essential assumption of multivariate analysis. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) defined it as “a variety in a score for one continuous variable which is roughly the same at all values of another continuous variable” (p. 85). Homoscedasticity were measured on
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the basis of scattered plots of standardized residual. According to Pallant (2010), it occurs when the standardized residual is rectangular distributed with more scores distributed around 0. When the residual plots depict equal variance across the range of independent variable, then the assumption of homoscedasticity is accepted (Hair et al., 2010). The standardized residuals would be within the range of -3.3 to +3.3 for all the variables to be considered normal and homogenous. Therefore, homoscedasticity test was applied between moderator and independent variable. Figure 4.4 and 4.6 demonstrates that relationship between variables is a linear and regression line which reveals that scores are closely dispersed in region of regression line. Therefore, increasing or decreasing patterns were observed, and hence the homoscedasticity condition is satisfied for regression analysis. The scatter plots of other variables used in the present study confirmed no violation of the same assumption (See Appendix -IV)

4.2.5 Outlier test.
Outliers are those numerical unique values having higher or lower values than the other values in the data set (Pallant, 2010). The existence of such observation can adversely affect the results and hence the results may not be generalized (Tabachnick & Fidell,2007). Values in a data model other than in the range of + 3.3 should be considered outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Therefore, Outliers test was applied and the results clearly indicated that the values are almost similar to each other and are in between the range and confirming the outlier assumption that is having no outlier in the data set. The evidence are shown in Figure 4.4 and 4.6 as well as in Appendix – IV for all the variables of the study.

4.2.6 Missing value analysis.
A total of 273 questionnaires were received back from respondents. Each questionnaire was properly checked and screened. Out of 273, six questionnaires had incomplete data and thus
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those six questionnaire were removed from analysis. The rest of the variables mentioned in the questionnaire had no any missing data except seven questionnaires which form less than 2%.

4.2.7 Reliability analysis.

Reliability analysis shows the level of consistency incorporated in the self-administered questionnaire (Ho, 2006) and measured through Cronbach’s Alpha analysis by using SPSS (version-20). Similarly, in this study, the Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient was used to calculate the reliability of the questionnaire ranging from 0.77 to 0.95- shown in the following Table 4.4. All of them are in acceptable ranges and hence all the scales used in the present study are internally consistent.

The overall alpha reliability of the scale used for the study is 0.95, which shows that the scales used in the study were internally consistent and is demonstrated in the following Table 4.3.

Table 4. 3 The Overall Coefficient of Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability of 60 – items Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>No of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by author

The scale of variables used in the present study was also analyzed individually by applying Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient reliability test. It was found all acceptable as their Cronbach’s Alpha is ranging from 0.77 to 0.95. It is shown in the following Table 4.4
Table 4. Alpha Reliability Statistics of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Performance</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterproductive Work Behavior</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.8 Validity of measures.

Validity of the scale refers to the degree to which the researcher intended to measure- as recommended by Clark-Carter (2004). It is a procedure used to investigate that variables of the study are linearly correlated with smaller number of unobservable factors supposed to measure the same concept. In the present study, the validity of issues was analyzed through Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlet Test. The details of each step are given below:

4.2.8.1 Kaiser-meyer-olkin (kmo) and bartlet test.

The sampling adequacy in this study was checked by KMO. It is considered if the KMO value is greater than 0.5 for satisfactory factor analysis. In the context of the present study, KMO =0.833 is greater than 0.50. Thus, the sampling adequacy is acceptable. Therefore, the researcher is confident for adequacy of factor analysis to test the data. As stated by Kaisen (1974), KMO value 0.5 is minimum and hardly acceptable; values ranging from 0.7 to 0.8 are acceptable; while
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value more than 0.9 is excellent. Bartlett’s test is applied to further confirm the appropriateness of the factor analysis, which measures the relationship among variable in form of correlation matrix. If correlation matrix is identity matrix and significant value is less than 0.005, the factor analysis is highly appropriate. In the present study, Bartlett’s test is very significant (p < .001).

Table 4.5 KMO and Bartlett's Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.</th>
<th>.864</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square</td>
<td>7138.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.2.8.2 Correlation analysis.

The correlation results of the variables used in the present study are elaborated in Table 4.6. The results illustrate the correlation among variables.

Table 4.6 Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>TRNG</th>
<th>COMP</th>
<th>PA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.608**</td>
<td>.625**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.651**</td>
<td>-.357**</td>
<td>-.533**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRNG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.624**</td>
<td>.323**</td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td>-.454**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.479**</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>-.406**</td>
<td>.435**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.378**</td>
<td>.335**</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>-.498**</td>
<td>.421**</td>
<td>.467**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

4.2.8.3 Factor analysis (principal component analysis).

The Principal Component Analysis (PCA) is usually applied to determine the nearest value of total communalities to the observed variance. According to Cohen, Cohen, West & Aiken
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(2013), PCA is a factor analysis procedure used for dimensions’ reduction and extraction of variables. The results of PCA for employee engagement variable are shown in Table 4.7 and have formed five factors on the basis of Eigen values more than standard value of 1. The 54.36% of variance in employee engagement questionnaire is explained by five factors. The decision of five factors was further supported by Figure 4.6 of Scree plot. Scale validity is confirmed by Rotated Component Matrix shown in Table 4.8; it indicated same items arise from the same five factors. The same analysis for other variables of the study are given in Appendix-V.

Table 4. 7 Total Variance Explained (Employee Engagement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.900</td>
<td>22.939</td>
<td>22.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.749</td>
<td>10.288</td>
<td>33.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.355</td>
<td>7.971</td>
<td>41.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>6.376</td>
<td>54.362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Figure 4. 7 Scree Plot of Factor Analysis for Employee Engagement
Table 4. 8 Rotated Component Matrix (Employee Engagement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td></td>
<td>.530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.
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4.3 Descriptive Outcome

4.3.1 Taxonomy based on demographic characteristics.

The participants of the study were the academic staff members of Private Sector Universities. The demographic characteristics of the participants have an essential effect on the overall results of the analysis. To get the sufficient and relevant data related to the variables, the total number of 293 questionnaires were distributed among the respondents. Data was collected conveniently and 267 questionnaires were returned- forming a response rate of 91%. The Gender-wise statistics of the respondents show 83.5 % males and 16.5% females shown in the following Table 4.9.

Table 4. 9 Gender-wise Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Marital status-wise statistics of the respondents comprise of 46.3% participants who were single and 53.8 % who were married. They are presented in the following Table 4.10

Table 4. 10 Marital Status –wise Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MissingSystem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>267</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Education-wise statistics of the respondents indicate 17.2% Bachelor degree holders (where sixteen years education was involved); 37.1%, 40.1% and 5.6% were Masters, MS /M.Phil, and Ph.D degree holders respectively. They are shown in the following Table 4.11

Table 4.11 Education-wise Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Designation wise statistics of the respondents were contained of 72.7% lecturers, 17.6% Assistant Professor, 8.6% Associate Professors and 1.1 % Professors, demonstrated in the following Table 4.12

Table 4.12 Designation-wise Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Experience-wise statistics of the respondents include 18.7% of the respondents who possessed less than one-year experience, 49.1% were having experience between one to three years, 22.5% were having experience in between four to six years, 6.4% were having experience of seven to ten years, and 3.4% were having experience of more than ten years. Experience wise statistics of the correspondents are demonstrated in the following Table 4.13

Table 4.13 Experience-wise Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 year</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6 year</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 10 year</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Levels of Employee Engagement, Contextual Performance, Task Performance, and Counterproductive Work Behavior according to Demographic Characteristics

A thorough examination was conducted to analyze the level of employee engagement, contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive work behavior in relationship to demographic characteristics of the respondents. T-test analysis was calculated to compare mean scores of the variables with the demographic variables such as age, gender, marital status, education, designation and experience.
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4.4.1 Levels of employee engagement, task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior according to gender.

The statistical means and standard deviation of dependent and independent variables used in the present study were checked according to gender. Results are shown in the following Table 4.14. The results of statistical mean of employee engagement, contextual performance and task performance shows that female participants had higher mean calculated than males. It was the other way round as far as the counterproductive work behavior is concerned. It suggests that females are more devoted to their duties and willing to do more for their organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>3.0794</td>
<td>.49611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.1832</td>
<td>.49366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>2.8578</td>
<td>.55320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.0032</td>
<td>.38418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>2.9836</td>
<td>.46631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.0859</td>
<td>.43522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1.8744</td>
<td>.63851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.7879</td>
<td>.62708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, a t-test was applied in order to further verify this comparison of means. It was found that both male and female participants had no mean difference for the level of employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior. Whereas, females have higher level of mean
value calculated for contextual performance and task performance as compared to male subjects.

The results are shown in the following Table 4.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>1.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>61.373</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>13.188</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2.116</td>
<td>82.700</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>1.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>64.050</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>61.891</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.4.2 Levels of employee engagement, task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior according to age.

The statistical means and standard deviation of dependent and independent variables used in the present study were also checked according to age of the respondents. The results of statistical mean of respondents aging between 36 to 40 have the highest mean (µ =3.1 with SD=0.48). Next, participants’ age ranges from 31 to 35 have the lowest mean (µ =2.9 with SD=0.52). Moreover, participants whose age was 25 or below have µ = 3.04 and SD = .51. Lastly, participants aging between 26 to 30 have a µ =3.13 and SD = 0.49.

For contextual performance, participants having age ranges from 36 to 40 have the highest mean (µ =2.93 with SD=0.61); those having the age of 25 or below has the lowest mean (µ =2.83 with SD=.46). Participants aging between 26 to 30 have a µ =2.88 and SD = 0.53, and those whose age ranges from 31 to 35 have a µ =2.87 and SD =.59.

For task performance, participants whose age ranges from 36 to 40 have the lowest mean (µ =2.96 with SD=.48). Those who aging 26 to 30 have the highest mean (µ =3.00 with SD=0.45). Moreover, participants whose age ranges from 25 or below have a µ =2.98 and SD = 0.49. Others whose age ranges from 36 to 40 have a µ =2.96 and SD =.48.

For counterproductive work behavior, subjects whose age ranges from 36 to 40 have the lowest mean (µ =1.78 with SD=0.67). Next, those whose age was between 31 to 35 have the highest mean (µ =2.14 with SD=0.65). Moreover, participants whose age ranges from 25 or below have a µ =1.98 and SD = 0.59. Lastly, participants aging between 26 to 30 have a µ =1.81 and SD = 0.63.
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Table 4. 16 Level of employee engagement, contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive work behavior according to age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 or Below</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.0436</td>
<td>2.8295</td>
<td>2.9821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.51393</td>
<td>.46132</td>
<td>.49781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.1308</td>
<td>2.8868</td>
<td>3.0097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.48901</td>
<td>.52586</td>
<td>.45415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 35</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.9301</td>
<td>2.8705</td>
<td>2.9896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.51551</td>
<td>.59109</td>
<td>.48008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 40</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.1289</td>
<td>2.9320</td>
<td>2.9630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.48064</td>
<td>.60713</td>
<td>.48091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.0965</td>
<td>2.8818</td>
<td>3.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.49628</td>
<td>.53122</td>
<td>.46211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3 Levels of employee engagement, task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior according to marital status.

The statistical means and standard deviation of dependent and independent variables used in the present study were also checked according to participants' marital Status. The results of statistical mean of employee engagement, contextual performance, task performance and
counterproductive work behavior show that there is no significant difference in means calculated for both married and unmarried respondents.

Table 4. 17 Levels of employee engagement, task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior according to marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.0698</td>
<td>2.8676</td>
<td>2.9494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.50283</td>
<td>.52574</td>
<td>.44993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.1148</td>
<td>2.8911</td>
<td>3.0412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.48994</td>
<td>.53826</td>
<td>.46987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.0940</td>
<td>2.8802</td>
<td>2.9987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.49551</td>
<td>.53164</td>
<td>.46217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For further verification of the comparison of means, a t-test was applied by the researcher. It was found that both the married and unmarried respondents have no mean difference for the level of employee engagement, contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive work behavior. The result of means of t-statistics are shown in the following Table 4.18.
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### Table 4.18 Independent samples test according to Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>-.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.735</td>
<td>255.960</td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>-.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.360</td>
<td>259.753</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>1.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td>260.954</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>263.736</td>
<td>.509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.4.4 Levels of employee engagement, task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior according to level of education.

The statistical means and standard deviation of dependent and independent variables used in the present study were checked upon the basis of education of the respondents. The results are displayed in the subsequent table (4.19). For employee engagement the results of statistical mean of respondents educated up to bachelor level have the highest mean (µ = 3.13 with SD = 0.51). Respondents holding the highest education of PhD have the lowest mean (µ = 3.04 with SD = 0.51). Next, respondents who were M.A/M.S.C have µ = 3.08 and SD = 0.49. Lastly, respondents bearing qualification of M.S have µ = 3.10 and SD = 0.49.

Table 4. 19 Levels of employee engagement, task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior according to education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.1292</td>
<td>2.9037</td>
<td>2.9952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.51005</td>
<td>.55944</td>
<td>.49522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.0802</td>
<td>2.8456</td>
<td>2.9899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.49959</td>
<td>.50474</td>
<td>.44305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.1050</td>
<td>2.9025</td>
<td>3.0197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.49116</td>
<td>.52456</td>
<td>.46389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.0431</td>
<td>2.9048</td>
<td>2.9481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.51062</td>
<td>.68866</td>
<td>.50894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.0965</td>
<td>2.8818</td>
<td>3.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.49628</td>
<td>.53122</td>
<td>.46211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.4.5 Levels of employee engagement, task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior according to experience.

The statistical means and standard deviation of dependent and independent variables used in the present study were also checked by taking into consideration the experience possessed by the respondents of this study. The following Table (4.20) displays the results. For employee engagement, the results of statistical mean of respondents having experience of 4 to 6 years have the highest mean ($\mu =3.17$ with $SD=0.49$). Likewise, participants whose experience ranged from 7 to 10 years have the lowest mean ($\mu =2.92$ with $SD=0.51$). Next, respondents who were holding experience from less than 1 year have $\mu = 3.06$ and $SD = 0.52$. Furthermore, participants possessing experience of 1 to 3 years have $\mu = 3.11$ and $SD = 0.48$. Finally, those participants whose experience's span extended more than 10 years have $\mu = 3.03$ and $SD = 0.67$.

For contextual performance, the results of statistical mean of respondents having the experience of 4 to 6 years have the highest mean ($\mu =2.98$ with $SD=0.52$). Participants who had the experience of more than 10 years have the lowest mean ($\mu =2.68$ with $SD=0.67$). Next to them, respondents possessing the experience of less than 1 year have $\mu = 2.80$ and $SD = 0.52$. Next, participants having the experience ranging between 1 to 3 years have a $\mu =3.10$ and $SD = 0.48$. Finally, the experience of 7 to 10 years possessed by participants have $\mu = 2.92$ and $SD = 0.50$.

Furthermore, for task performance, the results of statistical mean of respondents having experience ranging from 4 to 6 years have the highest mean ($\mu =3.08$ with $SD=0.47$). Next, participants possessing the experience of 7 to 10 years have the lowest mean ($\mu =2.86$ with $SD=0.47$). Moreover, the experience of less than 1 year bearers have $\mu = 2.95$ and $SD = 0.45$. Next to this, participants whose experience ranged from 1 to 3 years have a $\mu =2.99$ and $SD = 0.45$. Lastly, respondents having the experience of more than 10 years have $\mu = 3.00$ and $SD = 0.63$. 
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Analyzing the counterproductive work behavior, the results of statistical mean of respondents having experience ranges from 7 to 10 years have the highest mean (μ =2.86 with SD=0.47). Next to them were the participants who possessed the experience extending on 1 to 3 years have the lowest mean (μ =1.81 with SD=0.62). Furthermore, participants possessing the experience of less than 1 year have μ = 1.91 and SD = 0.59. Among the remaining three groups of participants, those who were having experience of 4 to 6 years have a μ =1.86 and SD = 0.72, while the participants who possessed the experience of 7 to 10 years have μ = 2.12 and SD =0.56. Finally, the last group of participants having the experience over 10 years have μ = 1.84 and SD = 0.73.
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#### Table 4. 20 Levels of Employee Engagement, Task Performance, Contextual Performance and Counterproductive Work Behavior according to Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.0600</td>
<td>2.8029</td>
<td>2.9556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.52148</td>
<td>.50725</td>
<td>.45398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 year</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.1046</td>
<td>2.9019</td>
<td>2.9975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.47617</td>
<td>.52745</td>
<td>.44710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6 year</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.1686</td>
<td>2.9762</td>
<td>3.0833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.48898</td>
<td>.51954</td>
<td>.47213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 10 year</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.9204</td>
<td>2.7311</td>
<td>2.8627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.50514</td>
<td>.46807</td>
<td>.47390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.0327</td>
<td>2.6825</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.66818</td>
<td>.80742</td>
<td>.62608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.0965</td>
<td>2.8818</td>
<td>3.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.49628</td>
<td>.53122</td>
<td>.46211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.5 Hypothesis Testing

4.5.1 Relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance.

The first hypothesis of the present study --concerning employee engagement-- is positively related to contextual performance. It was tested by using Pearson Correlation analysis and Simple Regression Analysis. It is evident from Table 4.21, that employee engagement is significantly (p<0.01) and positively correlated (r = 0.45) with contextual performance. Thus it supports the first hypothesis of the present study.

Table 4.21 Correlation between employee engagement and contextual performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>CP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.455**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Simple regression analysis was performed in order to further confirm this positive relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance- as the researcher used a single continuous independent variable. The ANOVA test results of simple regression determined the significance F-value at p< 0.05 for the relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance. Therefore, the result shown in Table 4.22 supports the first hypothesis by affirming that employees’ score on employee engagement significantly predicts the contextual performance.
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Table 4.222 Analysis of variance for relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>15.545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.545</td>
<td>69.211</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>59.518</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75.063</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: CP
b. Predictors: (Constant), EE

The strength of this relationship is demonstrated by the values of slope and intercept for employee engagement in Table 4.23. A constant value of 1.37 and a slope of 0.49 of EE regression line represents that one-unit upturn in EE, can significantly predict a 0.487 units upturn in employees’ contextual performance.

Table 4.223 Coefficients of relationship of employee engagement and contextual Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>1.373</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>7.480</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>8.319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ‘R²’ value of 0.207 demonstrates that 20.7% of the variance in contextual performance could be counted for employees’ score on EE. The results are shown in the following Table 4.24:
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Table 4.24 Model summary of relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.455&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.47392</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>69.211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), EE
b. Dependent Variable: CP

In summary, the results depict that employee engagement shows a 20.7% variance significant at p<0.001 with F= 69.21. Thus it supports the first hypothesis i.e. employee engagement is positively related to contextual performance.

4.5.2 Relationship between employee engagement and task performance.

The second hypothesis of the present study is that employee engagement is positively related to task performance. It was tested by using Pearson Correlation and Simple Regression Analysis. It is evident from Table 4.25 that employee engagement is significantly (p<0.01) and positively correlated (r = 0.61) with task performance. Thus it supports the second hypothesis of this study.
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Table 4.25 Correlation between employee engagement and task performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.608**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

In order to further confirm this positive relationship between employee engagement and task performance, simple regression analysis was performed— as the researcher used a single continuous independent variable. The ANOVA test results of simple regression determined the significance F=155 at p< 0.05 for the relationship between employee engagement and task performance, shown in Table 4.26. Therefore, the result supports the second hypothesis by affirming the fact that employees’ score on employee engagement significantly predicts the task performance.

Table 4.26 Analysis of variance for relationship between employee engagement and task performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>20.988</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.988</td>
<td>155.292</td>
<td>.000^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Residual</td>
<td>35.815</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56.802</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TP
b. Predictors: (Constant), EE
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The strength of this relationship is revealed by the values of slope and intercept for employee engagement. A constant value 1.25 and a slope of 0.566 of EE regression line represents that one-unit upturn in EE can significantly predict a 0.566 units upturn in employees’ task performance as represented in the following Table 4.27.

Table 4.27 Coefficients of relationship of employee engagement and task performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant) 1.248</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>8.761</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EE 0.566</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>12.462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Task Performance

The ‘R^2’ value of 0.367 demonstrates that 36.7% of the variance in task performance could be counted for employees' score on EE. The results are shown in the following Table 4.28.

Table 4.28 Model summary of relationship between employee engagement and task performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>Adjusted R^2</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>ΔR^2</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.608a .369 .367 .36763 .369 155.292 1 265 .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), EE
b. Dependent Variable: TP

In summary, the results illustrate that employee engagement displays a 36.7% variance significant at p<0.01 with F= 155. It supports the second hypothesis i.e. employee engagement is positively related to task performance.
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4.5.3 Relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior.

The third hypothesis of the present study was that the employee engagement is negatively related to counterproductive work behavior. It was tested by using Pearson Correlation and Simple Regression Analysis. It is evident from Table 4.29 that employee engagement is significantly (p<0.01) and negatively correlated (r = - 0.65) with counterproductive work behavior. Thus it validates the third hypothesis of the present study.

Table 4.29 Correlation between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.651**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

For the purpose of further confirmation of this negative relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior, simple regression analysis was performed- as the researcher used a single continuous independent variable. The ANOVA test results of simple regression determined the significance F-value at p< 0.05 for the relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior. Accordingly, the results support the third hypothesis by affirming that employees’ score on employee engagement negatively predicts the counterproductive work behavior. The results are displayed in Table 4.30.
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Table 4.30 Analysis of variance for relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>45.635</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.635</td>
<td>194.871</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Residual</td>
<td>62.058</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107.693</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: CWB
b. Predictors: (Constant), EE

The strength of this relationship is demonstrated by the values of slope and intercept for employee engagement- elaborated in Table 4.31. A constant value 4.45, a slope of -0.84 of EE regression line represents that one-unit downturn in EE, can significantly predict a -0.83 units’ downturn in employee’s counterproductive work behavior.

Table 4.31 Coefficients of relationship of employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.445</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>23.706</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>-.835</td>
<td>-.651</td>
<td>-13.960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: CWB

The ‘R²’ value of 0.424 demonstrates that 42.4% of the variance in counterproductive work Behavior could be counted for employee’s score on EE. The results are shown in the following Table 4.32.
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Table 4. Model summary of relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.651&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.48392</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>194.871</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), EE

In summary, the results indicate that employee engagement shows a 42.4% variance significant at p<0.01 with F= 194. Consequently, it supports the third hypothesis that employee engagement is negatively related to counterproductive work behavior.

4.5.4 Moderating role of HR-practices.

The moderating role of HR-practices including training, compensation and performance appraisal over the association between employee engagement and performance dimensions was carried out through applying General Linear Model analysis. Whereas, hierarchal regression analysis was used to evaluate the extent of incremental variance that expresses to determine the dependent variable i.e. ΔR². The results of the analysis are given in Table 4.33.

In order to carry out the moderating analysis, first, all the variables were centered for the purpose of checking the moderating role of independent variables. Each moderating and independent variable was considered in manner that mean value of that specific variable was deducted from each participant’s score on that particular variable. Centering the variables does not affect their connection with the dependent variable, however, it decreases the collinearity amongst the core effects and an interaction term (DeCoste & Claypool, 2004; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007; Pallant, 2007). The results of the centered variables are given in the following Table 4.33. These results show a new mean value of zero for all the centered variables, but carry no changes in the standard deviations.
4.5.5 Moderating role of training on the employee engagement and contextual performance link.

The fourth hypothesis of the study was tested by applying step-wise regression analysis, where contextual performance was entered as dependent variable and centered employee engagement and centered training entered as independent variables along with interaction term (EE*TRNG). Three different models were generated by running multiple regression analysis (step-wise method). All the three models are shown in Table 4.34. The results depict that F values calculated for the first independent variable (centered EE), the second independent variable (centered Training) and the interaction term are significant (p< 0.05). Model 1 shows that significant variance $\Delta R^2$ of 20.7% in contextual performance was made on the basis of employee engagement. Model 2 indicates that a significant $\Delta R^2$ of 6.2% in contextual performance was made on the basis of employee engagement and training, whereas, Model 3 indicates that a significant variance of 10% in contextual performance was made on the basis of employee engagement, training and interaction term of the two variables. By adding interaction term to the model indicated, significant incremental variance of 4.0% was formed in order to predict the value of contextual performance. Therefore, as the F values are significant and there is incremental variance in the model due to addition of interaction term, it confirms the moderating role of training for the relationship of employee engagement and contextual performance. Hence, it supports the given hypothesis.
The results of slope analysis for training moderating effects on the relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance are shown in Figure 4.2. The results of slope analysis confirm that employee engagement increases contextual performance when training is
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higher, in other words, employee engagement decreases contextual performance when training is low. These results validate hypothesis 4 of this study.

Figure 4.8 Slope analysis for EE X TRNG on Employee Engagement and Contextual Performance

4.5.6 Moderating role of training on the employee engagement and task performance link.

The fifth hypothesis of the study was tested by applying step-wise regression analysis, where task performance was entered as dependent variable and centered employee engagement and centered training entered as independent variables along with interaction term (EE*TRNG). Three different models were generated by running multiple regression analysis (step-wise method). All the three models are shown in Table 4.35. It depicts that F values is calculated for the first independent variable (centered EE), the second independent variable (centered Training) and the interaction term are significant (p< 0.05). Model 1 shows that significant variance ΔR² of
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36.9% in task performance was made on the basis of employee engagement. Model 2 shows that a significant $\Delta R^2$ of 8.1% in task performance was made on the basis of employee engagement and training. Model 3 indicates that a significant variance of 6% in task performance was made on the basis of employee engagement, training and interaction term of the two variables. The addition of interaction term to the model indicated significant incremental variance of 6% in order to predict the value of task performance. Therefore, as the F values are significant and there is an incremental variance in the model due to addition of interaction term, it confirms the moderating role of training for the relationship of employee engagement and task performance. Thus, it supports the given hypothesis of the study.
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Table 4.35 Moderation analysis of training on the relationship between employee engagement and task performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>F Model</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>12.462</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>155.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>8.005</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>84.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Training</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>3.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>7.325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Training</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>2.675</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>57.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Term</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>1.620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: TP (Task Performance)  
EE = Employee Engagement  
TRNG = Training  
a. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement, Centered Training  
c. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement, Centered Training, interaction Centered EE*TRNG

The results of slope analysis for training moderating effects on the relationship between employee engagement and task performance are shown in Figure 4.3. These results confirm the fact that employee engagement increases task performance when training is higher; similarly,
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employee engagement equally decreases task performance when training is low. On the basis of these results study hypothesis 5 is validated.

**Figure 4.9** Slope analyses for EE X TRNG on Employee Engagement and Task Performance

4.5.7 Moderating role of training on the employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior link.

The sixth hypothesis of the study was tested by applying step-wise regression analysis, where task performance was entered as dependent variable while centered employee engagement and centered training were entered as independent variables, along with their interaction term (EE*TRNG). Three different models were generated by running multiple regression analysis (step-wise method). All the three models are shown in Table 4.36. These model depict that F values calculated for the first independent variable (centered EE), the second independent variable (centered TRNG) and the interaction term are significant (p< 0.05). Model 1 shows that significant variance $\Delta R^2$ of 42.4 % in counterproductive work behavior was made on the basis of employee engagement. Model 2 shows that a significant $\Delta R^2$ of 32.8% in counterproductive was made on
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the basis of employee engagement and training. Finally, Model 3 indicates that a significant variance of 7% in task performance was made on the basis of employee engagement, training and interaction term of the two variables. By adding interaction term to the model, a significant incremental variance of 7% is indicated in order to predict the value of counterproductive work behavior. As the F values are significant and there is an incremental variance in the model due to addition of interaction term, it confirms the moderating role of training for the relationship of employee engagement and task performance. Thus these results support the given hypothesis.
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### Table 4. 36 Moderation analysis of training on the relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Model</th>
<th>F Model</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beta</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>13.960</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>194.871</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>4.920</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>99.379</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Training</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>18.666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>4.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Training</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>18.846</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>276.028</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Term</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>2.835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered EE*TRNG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: CWB (Counterproductive Work Behavior)

EE = Employee Engagement  TRNG= Training

a. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement
b. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement, Centered Training

c. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement, Centered Training,  Interaction Centered EE*TRNG
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The results of slope analysis for training moderating effects on the relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior are shown in Figure 4.4. Analysis of these results confirm that employee engagement decreases counterproductive work behavior when training is higher; employee engagement likewise increases counterproductive work behavior when training is low. These results validate hypothesis 6 of the present study.

Figure 4.10 Slope analyses for EE X TRNG on Employee Engagement and Counterproductive Work Behavior

4.5.8 Moderating role of compensation on the employee engagement and contextual performance link.

The seventh hypothesis of the study was tested by applying step-wise regression analysis, in which contextual performance was entered as dependent variable and centered employee engagement and centered compensation entered as independent variables along with interaction term (EE*Comp). There were three different models generated by running multiple regression
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analysis (step-wise method). All the three models are shown in Table 4.37. They depict that F values calculated for the first independent variable (centered EE), the second independent variable (centered Compensation) and the interaction term are significant (p< 0.05). Model 1 shows that significant variance $\Delta R^2$ of 20.7% in contextual performance was made on the basis of employee engagement. Model 2 indicates that a significant $\Delta R^2$ of 9% in contextual performance was made on the basis of employee engagement and compensation. Finally, Model 3 indicates that a significant variance of 9% in contextual performance was made on the basis of employee engagement, compensation and interaction term of the two variables. By adding interaction term to the model, a significant incremental variance of 4% is indicated in order to predict the value of contextual performance. Since the F values are significant and there is incremental variance in the model due to addition of interaction term, it confirms the moderating role of compensation for the relationship of employee engagement and contextual performance. Hence the hypothesis is validated by these results.
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Table 4. 37 Moderation analysis of compensation on the relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>R² Model</th>
<th>F Model</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>8.319</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>69.211</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>R² Model</th>
<th>F Model</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>5.825</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>36.292</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Compensation</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>1.697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>R² Model</th>
<th>F Model</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>4.887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Compensation</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>1.774</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>27.056</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Term</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>2.636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered EE*Comp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: CP (Contextual Performance)
EE = Employee Engagement Comp= Compensation
a. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement
b. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement, Centered Compensation
c. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement, Centered Compensation, Interaction Centered EE*Comp

Figure 4.4 displays the results related to slope analysis for compensation moderating effects on the relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance. The results of slope analysis confirm that employee engagement increases contextual performance when compensation is higher, likewise, employee engagement decreases contextual performance when compensation is low. These results validate study hypothesis 7.
4.5.9 Moderating role of compensation on the employee engagement and task performance link.

The eighth hypothesis of the study was also tested by applying step-wise regression analysis, where task performance was entered as dependent variable and centered employee engagement and centered Compensation entered as independent variables along with interaction term (EE*Comp). Here also, three different models were generated by running multiple regression analysis (step-wise method). All the three models are shown in Table 4.38 which depict that F values calculated for the first independent variable (centered EE), the second independent variable (centered Compensation) and the interaction term are significant (p< 0.05). Model 1 shows that significant variance $\Delta R^2$ of 36.9 % in task performance was made on the basis employee engagement.
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engagement. Similarly, Model 2 indicates that a significant $\Delta R^2$ of 6.7% in task performance was made on the basis of employee engagement and compensation. Finally, Model 3 illustrates that a significant variance of 4.1% in task performance was made on the basis of employee engagement, compensation and interaction term of the two variables. By adding interaction term to the model, a significant incremental variance of 4.1% is signified in order to predict the value of task performance. Because the F values are significant and there is incremental variance in the model due to addition of interaction term, it confirms the moderating role of compensation for the relationship of employee engagement and task performance. Hence it supports the hypothesis.
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Table 4.38 Moderation analysis of compensation on the relationship between employee engagement and task performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Model</th>
<th>$F$ Model</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1: Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>12.462</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>155.292</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2: Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>8.377</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>86.727</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3: Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>7.441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dependent Variable:** TP (Task Performance)  
EE = Employee Engagement  
Comp = Compensation  
a. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement, Centered Training  
c. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement, Centered Training, Interaction Centered EE*Comp
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The next step concerns the analysis for Compensation moderating effects on the relationship between employee engagement and task performance. The results of slope analysis for Compensation moderating effects on the relationship between employee engagement and task performance are shown in Figure 4.6. Results of these slope analysis confirm the fact that employee engagement increases task performance when compensation is higher, similarly, employee engagement decreases task performance when compensation is low. On the basis of these results study hypothesis 8 is substantiated.

Figure 4. 12 Slope analyses for EE X Comp on Employee Engagement and Task Performance
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4.5.10 Moderating role of compensation on the employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior link.

Next, the ninth hypothesis of the study was tested by applying step-wise regression analysis, where counterproductive work behavior was entered as dependent variable while centered employee engagement and centered compensation were entered as independent variables along with their interaction term (EE*Comp). Three different models were generated by running multiple regression analysis (step-wise method). All the three models are shown in Table 4.39 which depicts that F values calculated for the first independent variable (centered EE), the second independent variable (centered Comp) and the interaction term are significant (p< 0.05). Model 1 shows that significant variance $\Delta R^2$ of 42.4% in counterproductive work behavior was made on the base of employee engagement. Similarly, Model 2 shows that a significant $\Delta R^2$ of 27.5% in counterproductive was made on the basis of employee engagement and performance appraisal. Finally, Model 3 indicates that a significant variance of 9.1% in counterproductive work behavior was made on the basis of employee engagement, compensation and interaction term of the two variables. By adding interaction term to the model, a significant incremental variance of 9.1% is indicated in order to predict the value of counterproductive work behavior. As the F values are significant and there is incremental variance in the model due to addition of interaction term, it confirms the moderating role of compensation for the relationship of employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior. Consequently these results support the hypothesis
### Table 4. 39 Moderation analysis of compensation on the relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>R² Model</th>
<th>F Model</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>13.960</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>194.871</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>6.720</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>3.8.358</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Compensation</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>15.605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>5.638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Compensation</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>15.936</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>215.968</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Term</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>3.170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered EE*Comp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: CWB (Counterproductive Work Behavior)

EE = Employee Engagement  
Comp= Compensation

a. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement, Centered Compensation  
c. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement, Centered Compensation, Interaction Centered EE*Comp
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The results of slope analysis for compensation moderating effects on the relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior are shown in Figure 4.7. These results confirm that employee engagement decreases counterproductive work behavior when compensation is higher, likewise, employee engagement increases counterproductive work behavior when compensation is low. On the basis of these results study hypothesis 9 is validated.

Figure 4.13 Slope analyses for EE X Comp on Employee Engagement and Counterproductive Work Behavior
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4.5.11 Moderating role of performance appraisal on the employee engagement and contextual performance link.

The ninth hypothesis of the study was tested by applying step-wise regression analysis, in which contextual performance was entered as dependent variable and centered employee engagement and centered performance appraisal entered as independent variables along with interaction term (EE*PA). Three different models were generated by running multiple regression analysis (step-wise method). All the three models are shown in Table 4.40 which depict that F values calculated for the first independent variable (centered EE), the second independent variable (centered Performance Appraisal) and the interaction term are significant (p< 0.05). Model 1 shows that significant variance $\Delta R^2$ of 20.7 % in contextual performance was made on the basis of employee engagement. Model 2 illustrates that a significant $\Delta R^2$ of 5.8% in contextual performance was made on the foundation of employee engagement and performance appraisal, Lastly, Model 3 indicates that a significant variance of 4.3% in contextual performance was made on the foundation of employee engagement, performance appraisal and interaction term of the two variables. A significant incremental variance of 4.3% is indicated by adding interaction term to the model in order to predict the value of contextual performance. Since, the F values are significant and there is an incremental variance in the model due to addition of interaction term, it confirms the moderating role of performance appraisal for the relationship of engagement and contextual performance. Thus, it supports the hypothesis.
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Table 4. 40 Moderation analysis of performance appraisal on the relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>R² Model</th>
<th>F Model</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>8.319</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>69.211</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>5.872</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>36.127</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>1.618</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>1.806</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Term</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>2.806</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>1.806</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: CP (Contextual Performance)
EE = Employee Engagement  PA= Performance Appraisal
a. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement
b. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement, Centered Performance Appraisal
c. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement, Centered Performance Appraisal, Interaction Centered EE*PA
The Moderating Role of HR Practices

The results of slope analysis for performance appraisal moderating effects on the relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance are shown in Figure 4.8. The results of slope analysis confirmed that employee engagement increases contextual performance when performance appraisal is higher, likewise, employee engagement decreases contextual performance when performance appraisal is low. On the basis of these results, study hypothesis 10 is substantiated.

**Figure 4.14** Slope analyses for EE X PA on Employee Engagement and Contextual Performance
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4.5.12 Moderating role of performance appraisal on the employee engagement and task performance link.

The tenth hypothesis of the study was tested by applying step-wise regression analysis, in which also the task performance was entered as dependent variable and centered employee engagement and centered performance appraisal entered as independent variables along with interaction term (EE*PA). Three different models were generated by running multiple regression analysis (step-wise method). The three models (shown in Table 4.41) depict that F values calculated for the first independent variable (centered EE), the second independent variable (centered Performance Appraisal) and the interaction term are significant (p< 0.05). Model 1 shows that significant variance $\Delta R^2$ of 36.9% in task performance was made on the basis employee engagement. Model 2 shows that a significant $\Delta R^2$ of 5.1% in task performance was made on the basis of employee engagement and Performance Appraisal. Model 3 indicates that a significant variance of 4.4% in task performance was made on the basis of employee engagement, performance appraisal and interaction term of the two variables. The addition of interaction term to the model indicated significant incremental variance of 4.4% in order to predict the value of task performance. As the F values are significant and there is an incremental variance in the model due to addition of interaction term, it confirms the moderating role of performance appraisal for the relationship of employee engagement and task performance, hence it supports the given hypothesis.
### Table 4.41 Moderation analysis of performance appraisal on the relationship between employee engagement and task performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>R² Model</th>
<th>F Model</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>12.462</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>155.292</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>8.563</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>84.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Performance</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>7.522</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>59.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>7.522</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>59.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Performance</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>3.220</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>59.626</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Term</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered EE*PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: TP (Task Performance)

EE = Employee Engagement  PA= Performance Appraisal

a. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement
b. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement, Centered Performance Appraisal
c. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement, Centered Performance Appraisal, Interaction Centered EE*PA
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The results of slope analysis for performance appraisal moderating effects on the relationship between employee engagement and task performance are shown in Figure 4.9. It indicates that employee engagement increases task performance when performance appraisal is higher, similarly, employee engagement decreases task performance when performance appraisal is low. These results validate study hypothesis 11.

Figure 4. 15 Slope analyses for EE X PA on Employee Engagement and Task Performance
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4.5.13 Moderating role of performance appraisal on the employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior link.

The eleventh hypothesis of the study was tested by applying step-wise regression analysis. In this analysis, counterproductive work behavior was entered as dependent variable while centered employee engagement and centered performance appraisal were entered as independent variables along with their interaction term (EE*PA). Three different models were generated by running multiple regression analysis (step-wise method). These three models (shown in Table 4.42) depict that F values calculated for the first independent variable (centered EE), the second independent variable (centered PA) and the interaction term are significant (p< 0.05). Model 1 shows that significant variance $\Delta R^2$ of 42.4% in counterproductive work behavior was made on the basis of employee engagement. Model 2 shows that a significant $\Delta R^2$ of 32.8% in counterproductive was made on the basis of employee engagement and performance appraisal.

Finally, Model 3 indicates that a significant variance of 6.7% in counterproductive work behavior was made on the basis of employee engagement, performance appraisal and interaction term of the two variables. The addition of interaction term to the model indicated a significant incremental variance of 6.7% in order to predict the value of counterproductive work behavior. Since the F values are significant and there is an incremental variance in the model due to addition of interaction term, these results confirm the moderating role of training for the relationship of employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior. Thus it supports the hypothesis.
Table 4. Moderation analysis of performance appraisal on the relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>R² Model</th>
<th>F Model</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>13.960</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>194.871</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>6.790</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>294.363</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>15.079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>5.536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>15.639</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>210.419</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Term</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>3.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered EE*PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: CWB (Counterproductive Work Behavior)
EE = Employee Engagement  PA= Performance Appraisal
a. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement
b. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement, Centered Performance Appraisal
c. Predictors: (Constant), Centered Employee Engagement, Centered Performance Appraisal, Interaction Centered EE*PA
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The results of slope analysis for performance appraisal moderating effects on the relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior are shown in Figure 4.10. These results illustrate the fact that employee engagement decreases counterproductive work behavior when performance appraisal is higher, similarly, employee engagement increases counterproductive work behavior when performance appraisal is low. These results validate study hypothesis 12.

Figure 4.16 Slope analyses for EE X PA on Employee Engagement and Counterproductive Work Behavior
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

The current chapter of the study contains the discussion on the results in connection to the research hypothesis- in the context of literature review. The aims of the study were to find out both practical and theoretical implications as well as recommendations of future studies. The results of the research analysis are discussed one by one as follows.

5.2 Discussion

5.2.1 Level of employee engagement among the faculty members.

The empirical findings of the study proved that the perceived performance of academic staff working in Private Sector Universities is due to their engagement. The study also proved that the engagement and performance link of academic staff of Private Sector Universities could be moderated by training, performance appraisal and compensation. The values of employee engagement and performance were used and analyzed by applying statistical mean and standard deviation.

The current study examined the levels of employee engagement and dimensions of performance in the association with individual differences. In the light of the previous literature (surveyed in chapter 2), more attention was given to the association of demographic and the study variables. Therefore, the researcher also gave preference in evaluating the results. Analysis of these results showed mean values that there is no difference found regarding gender in employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior. However, differences were found in contextual and task performance on the basis of gender of the participants. The results of the study are in
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accordance with Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova (2006), Shuck and Wollard (2010). Furthermore, examining the factor of marital status of the participants shows that there is no difference in the level of employee engagement, contextual and counterproductive work behaviors. In addition, the study found differences in task performance with marital status among the faculty members in Private Sector Universities Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Pakistan.

On the basis of careful examination of previous research into this area, level of education and experience were also considered important factors among the study variables by the researcher. In the present study, the results showed that there are no such differences among the faculty members pertaining to their level of education and experience linked with level of engagement, contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive work behavior. Similar results were reported by Shuck & Wollard (2010) and Rurkkhum & Bartlett (2012).

5.2.2 Correlation between employee engagement and contextual performance

Keeping in view the previous studies, a positive correlation was expected between employee engagement and contextual performance. In the present research, it was hypothesized that employee engagement is positively correlated with contextual performance. This relationship was determined through Pearson Correlation Bivariate Coefficients. The results confirmed a positive relationship between both dependent and independent variables. Bakker and Bal (2010) reported similar positive results for association amongst engagement and contextual performance. Gorgievski, Bakker and Schaufeli (2010) also found positive relationship between employee engagement and contextual performance, which was evaluated through Self-assessed UWES scale. Rich et al., (2010), Christian et al., (2011) and Bakker, Demerouti & ten Brummelhuis (2012) also concluded a positive relationship between employee engagement and...
contextual performance in developed countries. Whereas Rasheed, Khan and Ramzan (2013) in a study of employees working in banking sector, confirmed a positive association between employee engagement and contextual performance.

5.2.3 Correlation between employee engagement and task performance

The second hypothesis of the current study was that there exists a positive relationship between employee engagement and task performance. This association amongst independent and dependent variables was empirically investigated. The results of the current study confirmed a positive relationship between employee engagement and task performance. Similar results have also been yielded by previous studies. Bakker and Demerouti (2009) in the study of working couples’ engagement in association to task performance established a significant positive connection between employee engagement and task performance. Similarly, Bakker and Bal (2010) deliberated the connection amongst weekly engagement and task performance among teachers, and found a positive relationship between employee engagement and task performance. Moreover, Chughtai and Buckley (2011) in the study of mediating role of learning goal orientation between engagement and task performance also found positive relationship between employee engagement and task performance. Furthermore, the same positive significant relationship between employee engagement and task performance was also confirmed by Rich et al., (2010), Babcock-Roberson & Strickland (2010), Kim et al., (2012), and Shantz et al., (2013).
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5.2.4 Correlation between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior

The third hypothesis of the current study was that there lies a negative relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior. It was empirically investigated in this study. The results of this study confirmed negative association between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior. The results of the present study are in accordance with the study of Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt and Barrick (2004) and Judge, Scott and Illes (2006). These researchers also found negative correlation between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior in their studies. Similar results to the present study were also yielded by the work of Rich et al., (2010).

5.2.5 Moderating role of training.

The fourth, fifth and sixth hypotheses of this study were formulated on moderating influence of training on the relationship between independent variable (employee engagement) and dependent variables (contextual, task and counterproductive work performance) among the faculty members of Private Sector Universities KP, Pakistan. The results of general linear model and the step-wise regression analysis depicted that training significantly adds to the incremental variance explained for each contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive work behavior.

In literature, no such study was found on the moderating role of training on employee engagement and contextual, task and counterproductive work behavior performance.
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Cooke (2000) suggested that performance of employee can be enhanced by proper training. According to Khan (2010), training is an important aspect of human resource practices and have a significant positive impact on employees’ job performance.

5.2.6 Moderating role of compensation.

The seventh, eighth and ninth hypotheses of the study maintained that compensation moderates the relationship between employee engagement and contextual, task and counterproductive work behavior. The results were validated through general linear model and step-wise regression analysis for compensation as an interaction term or second independent variable. The results of this study showed a moderating role of compensation on the association of independent and dependent variables. From the previous discussion of direct relationship, the researcher is able to conclude that if the level of compensation is increased, the level of employee engagement will also be increased. It will increase the level of contextual performance and task performance (Rich et al., 2010), and will decrease the level of counterproductive work behavior (Borman et al., 2001) The same phenomenon was observed by the researcher among the faculty members of Private Sector Universities in KP Pakistan.

5.2.7 Moderating role of performance appraisal.

The tenth, eleventh and twelfth hypotheses voiced the moderating role of performance appraisal over the association between employee engagement and contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive. The empirical results of the study found a moderating role of performance appraisal on the link of independent (employee engagement) and
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dependent (contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive work behavior) variables. Though no such study was available to directly support these hypotheses, it has been examined that as the level of performance appraisal increases, it also increases the level of job performance (Brown & Heywood 2005). Their findings indirectly support the hypotheses of the present study. Teseema and Soeters (2006) observed compensation as independent variable to job performance, and confirmed a positive significant relationship between these two variables. Similar results were also produced by the studies Shahzad, Bashir & Ramay (2008).

5.3 Conclusions

The main purpose of the current study was to examine the moderating role of HR-practices i.e. training, compensation and performance appraisal on the association of employee engagement and job performance i.e. contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive work behavior. The results of the study were derived from the data collected from 267 academic staff of Private Sector Universities. Findings of the study showed a positive relationship between employee engagement and two important dimensions of job performance i.e. contextual performance and task performance. On the other hand, a negative association was found between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior (job performance dimension). Furthermore, this study confirmed a moderating role of HR-practices (training, compensation and performance appraisal) on the relationship of employee engagement and job performance dimensions.
The Moderating Role of HR Practices

5.4 Recommendations of the Study

The results of this research study have many implications for human resource managers of an organization as well as for those who are interested in private sector universities. Based on previous research studies, the first purpose of this research study was to confirm expected positive relationship between employee engagement and job performance (Rurkkum, 2010). The findings of this study confirmed a positive relationship between employee engagement and job performance. The variable used in this research study reflects job behavior and attitude towards both the employee and organization performance which can be designed and affected by managerial actions.

The finding of this research also confirms the moderating role of training, compensation incentives and performance appraisal on relationship of employee engagement and job performance. This leads an employee to increase its performance and go beyond its formal job requirement and achieve organizational goals effectively and efficiently. According to previous studies training not only contributes towards improving job performance but also provide the opportunity to learn from peers and supervisor, which can provide personal benefits to the employees (Swanson & Holton, 2009). Therefore, organizations spending on training can gain more than direct economic values (Watkins, 2009).

The organization needs a proper compensation system to compensate employees according to their level of outcome. This will encourage employee to work more, eliminate waste and devote themselves in their job will ultimately enhance organization performance. The human resource managers need to develop an environment where employee feels that they will be treated with justice, and whatever is their performance and outcome, will be evaluated fairly and according
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to the standard criteria. In summary if teaching faculty of private universities are treated with fairness and justice in giving compensation, benefits in performance assessment and training, they less desire to leave the organization.

5.5 Future Research Recommendations of the Study

In the light of the findings of the present study, the researcher recommends the following:

1. A future research should be conducted on longitudinal basis in order to cover the variations in the variables over time.

2. This study should also be expanded to national and cross national level in order to know the dynamics of employee engagement, training, compensation, performance appraisal and job performance dimensions at national and global level.

3. In future, a replica of the same study may be carried out by taking into consideration the mixed level of both teaching and administrative staff in order to increase the generalizability of research findings.

4. It is suggested that future studies should be carried on peer rating and supervisor’s rating, which will give a vibrant and good assessment on level of employee engagement, job performance dimensions and role of training, compensation and performance appraisal. It will lead to avoidance of potential common source bias.

5. In future studies, other HR – practices, such as recruitment and selection, grievance procedures, and promotional practices shall be used to examine the same cross sectional study in universities, as well as, in corporate sectors.
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5.6 Limitations of the study

The present study suffers from some limitations --just like other research studies-- while making contributions to the existing body of research and knowledge. The limitations of the present study are given in the following paragraphs:

First of all, this research study measured variables at a single point being a cross sectional study. Due to this reason, Any variations in the variables under study over time including employee engagement, job performance dimensions, training, and compensation and performance appraisal were not covered by it.

Secondly, the present study has collected data only from Private Sector Universities located within Khyber Pakhtunkhwa due to financial and time constraints.

Thirdly, this study has used training, performance appraisal and compensation as moderating variables on the EE – performance link.

Fourthly, the research tools used in the present study are exclusive to be applied in a comparative study of employees of public universities. The study only took private sector universities of KP Pakistan into its consideration. The comparative study of both public and private universities will help in generalizing the research findings

Fifthly, the data was collected only from employees through self-reported questionnaires. There is the possibility that the respondents may try to impress other people while giving self-reported data and thus provide socially desirable answers (O”Driscoll, Pierce, & Coghlan, 2006). The researcher, however, took intensive care in collecting data by ensuring full confidentiality in order to eradicate the social desirability aspect of the responses.
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Lastly, the sample size used in the current study was consisted of academic staff only, which are usually influenced by similar factors, while universities are organizations where both teaching and administrative staff work.

5.7 Implications of the Study

This study brings forth findings that deepen conceptual understanding of the phenomenon under investigation. In addition to the three HR-practices used as moderators for strengthening the relationship of engagement and performance, this study suggests few more and new HR-practices like: employee/industrial relations, selection tests, employee attitudes. The immediate theoretical implication of the study relates to the measurements developed for this study. Because the concepts employed in this study are context-specific, the measurement of each construct varies depending on the behavior under investigation and the user group chosen. Theoretical implications also included methodological contributions and operationalization of concepts which might further facilitate application of the theory in future research studies.

Results of the current study showed that the relationship between engagement and performance of academic staff of Private Sector Universities is moderated by training, performance appraisal and compensation. Data analysis also highlights that male and female staff are of the same view about employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior. The results also highlight that level of education and experience are important factors characteristics that may affect the responses of the people about the research variables. It also showed similarity among the opinions regarding characteristics of education and experience linked with level of engagement, contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive work behavior. The study also confirmed a positive association between employee engagement and contextual
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performance, task performance, and a negative association between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior. The results also demonstrate the fact that training significantly adds to the incremental variance explained for each contextual performance, task performance and counterproductive work behavior. It further identifies training as one of the important HR-practices with significant positive impact on employees’ job performance. Similarly, data analysis showed a trend of increase in compensation that increases the level of employee engagement, which in turn increases the level of contextual performance and task performance among the faculty members of Private Sector Universities in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Pakistan. The empirical results of the study also indicate that an increase in the level of performance appraisal increases the level of job performance.

This study has both theoretical and practical implications for individual and managerial cadre, which are explained as follows:

5.7.1 Theoretical implication.

The study can be termed as a prime study that was carried out in the context of academic staff of Private Sector Universities of Pakistan, as it adds to the literature of employee engagement, contextual performance and job performance by providing evidence in the context of Private Sector Universities of developing countries like Pakistan. The corresponding change in the job performance dimensions is determined by employee engagement in Private Sector Universities of developing country like Pakistan. This finding of the present study is an important contribution to the existing body of knowledge. The study also extended the concept of employee engagement of Schaufeli et al., (2002) from a developed country to a developing country like Pakistan, by bearing in mind the level of employee engagement as an important practice influencing job performance.
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The reliability coefficients for the scales of employee engagement, contextual performance, task performance, counterproductive work behavior, training, and compensation and performance appraisal delivered the foundation for future research to be carried out in educational sectors as well as in corporate sectors. Since this prime study was conducted on the validation of moderating relationship of HR-practices with employee engagement and job performance dimensions in both developed and developing countries, therefore, it is the important addition to the existing body of research studies.

5.7.2 Practical implications of the study.

The study also bears some practical implications for organizations- specifically both for universities and individual employees. First, this study has validated a positive association between employee engagement and contextual performance as well as task performance. Negative relationship was found between employee engagement and counterproductive behavior. The study also established an incremental variance that was resulted in this relationship due to introduction of moderating variables to the model. All these variable and concepts were directly associated with management practices within universities and organizations. The total sum of variables used in the current study revealed to be job behaviors and attitudes that can form and affect management activities and actions.

The previous literature and the present study revealed that many factors influence employee engagement such as vigor, dedication and absorption, which can be manage and improved by administrators. Administrations can improve employee engagement level and job performance by offering them training, proper compensation, honest performance appraisal,
supportive work environment and developing good relationship with employees and supervisor (Shaufeli et al., 2014; Rich et al., 2010; Babcock-Roberson & Strickland, 2010; Truss et al., 2006).

The study in lines with some earlier studies by stating that employee engagement showed a positive significant relationship with contextual performance and task performance. Contextual performance is linked with engaged employees team work, helping others, obeying organization policies and going an extra mile for achieving organization objectives and goals. Task performance is the ability with which engaged employees fulfill the responsibilities mentioned in their job descriptions more efficiently and effectively. Focusing on both contextual performance and task performance --in terms of employee engagement-- can make an organization successful, improve, as well as, capable of maintaining competitive advantages by discouraging counterproductive work behavior (Podsakoff et al., 2009; Chirstian et al., 2011).
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APPENDIX-I

QUESTIONNAIRE

A survey of Moderating Role of HR practices on the association of Employee Engagement and Job Performance

Department of Management Science

Hazara University

Dear Participants,

This questionnaire is only used for academic research purpose and your response will be kept confidential. The purpose of this questionnaire is to study “The Moderating Role of HR practices on the association of employee engagement and performance”. The objective is to obtain your valuable views on the said issue. There is no right or wrong answer. Therefore, feel free to respond to all questions. The researcher will be thankful to you for sparing your precious time in filling up this questionnaire in an honest manner. Thanking you in advance for your efforts in fostering this research exertion.

Researcher

Hazrat Bilal

Ph.D Scholar
Demographic Information

Please respond to the following items by encircling the most appropriate and related to yourself. All such biographical data will be kept confidential and will be used for research purposes only.

Gender:  
- Male  
- Female

Marital Status:  
- Single  
- Married

Age (Years)

- 25 or below
- 26 to 30
- 31 to 35
- 36 to 40
- More than 40

Education:  
- Bachelor (16-years)
- Master
- MS
- PhD
- Other (specify) ____________

Designation:

- Lecturer
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor
- Any other please specify: ______________________

Experience (Years):

- Less than 1
- From 1 to 3
- From 4 to 6
- From 7 to 10
- More than 10
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Please tick the number in the box that best describes how do you feel about the statement by using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vigor

1. During my work at University, I always feel energetic 1 2 3 4 5
2. When I am working, I feel strong and vigorous 1 2 3 4 5
3. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work 1 2 3 4 5
4. I can continue working for very long periods at a time 1 2 3 4 5
5. At my job, I am very resilient, mentally 1 2 3 4 5
6. At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well 1 2 3 4 5

Dedication

7. My work is meaningful and purposeful 1 2 3 4 5
8. I am enthusiastic about my job 1 2 3 4 5
9. My job inspires me 1 2 3 4 5
10. I feel proud for the work I am performing at University 1 2 3 4 5
11. My job is challenging, to me 1 2 3 4 5
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### Absorption

| 12 | Time passes quickly, when I'm working | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 13 | When I am working, I forget everything else around me | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 14 | I feel happy when I am working intensely | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 15 | I am absorbed in my work | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 16 | I get carried away when I’m working | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 17 | It is difficult to detach myself from my job | 1 2 3 4 5 |

### Task Performance

| 18 | I achieve the objectives of my job | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 19 | I meet the criteria for performance | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 20 | I demonstrate expertise in all job-related tasks. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 21 | I fulfill all the requirements of the job | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 22 | I can manage more responsibility than typically assigned. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 23 | I appear suitable for a higher level role. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 24 | I am competent in all areas of the job, handle tasks with proficiency. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 25 | I perform well in the overall job by carrying out tasks as expected. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 26 | I plan and organize to achieve objectives of the job and meet deadlines. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
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Contextual Behavior

27. I help others employers with their work when they have been absent. 1 2 3 4 5
28. I volunteer to do things not formally required by the job. 1 2 3 4 5
29. I take initiatives to orient new employees to the department even though not part of your job description 1 2 3 4 5
30. I help others when their work load increases (assist others until they get over the hurdles) 1 2 3 4 5
31. I assist my colleagues with their duties. 1 2 3 4 5
32. I make innovative suggestions to improve the overall quality of the department 1 2 3 4 5
33. I willingly attend functions not required by the organization, but help in its overall image. 1 2 3 4 5

Counterproductive work behavior

34. Damage property belonging to the employer 1 2 3 4 5
35. Say or do something to purposely hurt someone at work 1 2 3 4 5
36. Do work badly, incorrectly, or slowly on purpose 1 2 3 4 5
37. Gripe with co-workers 1 2 3 4 5
38. Deliberately bend or break rules 1 2 3 4 5
39. Criticize people at work 1 2 3 4 5
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40. Do something that harms the employer or boss

41. Start an argument with someone at work

42. Say rude things about the employer or boss

Training

43. My university conducts extensive training programs for its employees in all aspects of quality

44. As per our university policy, employees in each job will normally go through training programs every year

45. Training needs are identified through a formal performance appraisal mechanism in our university.

46. There are formal training programs to teach new employees the skills they need to perform their jobs at University

47. New knowledge and skills are imparted to employees periodically to work in teams.

48. Training needs identified are realistic, useful and based on the strategy of the University.

Compensation

49. In the university where I work, I get incentives such as promotions, commissioned functions, awards, bonuses, etc.
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50 In the university where I work, my salary is influenced by my results. 1 2 3 4 5

51 The university I work for, offers me a salary that is compatible with my skills, training, and education. 1 2 3 4 5

52 The university I work for, remunerates me according to the remuneration offered at either the public or private marketplace levels. 1 2 3 4 5

53 The university I work for, considers the expectations and suggestions of its employees when designing a system of employee rewards. 1 2 3 4 5

Performance Appraisal

54 Performance of the employees is measured on the basis of objective quantifiable results. 1 2 3 4 5

55 Appraisal system in my university is growth and development oriented. 1 2 3 4 5

56 Employees are provided performance based feedback and counseling. 1 2 3 4 5

57 Employees have faith in the performance appraisal system. 1 2 3 4 5

58 Appraisal system has a strong influence on individual and team behavior. 1 2 3 4 5
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59 The appraisal data is used for making decisions like job rotation, training and compensation.

60 The objectives of the appraisal system are clear to all employees
APPENDIX - II

Figure 1 Regression Standardized Residual of EE and CWB

Figure 2 Regression Standardized Residual of TRNG and TP

Figure 3 Regression Standardized Residual of TRNG and CP

Figure 4 Regression Standardized Residual of TRNG and CWB
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Figure 5 Regression Standardized Residual of COMP and TP

Figure 6 Regression Standardized Residual of COMP and CP

Figure 7 Regression Standardized Residual of COMP and CWB

Figure 8 Regression Standardized Residual of PA and TP
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Figure 9 Regression Standardized Residual of PA and CP

Figure 10 Regression Standardized Residual of PA and CWB
APPENDIX- III

Figure 11 Normal Probability plot of Regression Standardized Residual of EE and CWB

Figure 12 Normal Probability plot of Regression Standardized Residual of TRNG and TP

Figure 13 Normal Probability plot of Regression Standardized Residual of TRNG and CP

Figure 14 Normal Probability plot of Regression Standardized Residual of TRNG and CWB
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Figure 15 Normal Probability plot of Regression Standardized Residual of COMP and TP

Figure 17 Normal Probability Plot of Regression Standardized Residual of COMP and CWB

Figure 16 Normal Probability plot of Regression Standardized Residual of COMP and CP

Figure 18 Normal Probability Plot of Regression Standardized Residual of PA and TP
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APPENDIX- IV

Figure 19 Normal Probability Plot of Regression Standardized Residual of PA and CP

Figure 20 Normal Probability Plot of Regression Standardized Residual of PA and CWB

Figure 21 Normal Probability plot of Regression Standardized Residual of EE and CWB

Figure 22 Normal Probability plot of Regression Standardized Residual of TRNG and TP
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Figure 23 Normal Probability plot of Regression Standardized Residual of TRNG and CP

Figure 24 Normal Probability plot of Regression Standardized Residual of TRNG and CWB

Figure 25 Normal Probability plot of Regression Standardized Residual of COMP and TP

Figure 26 Normal Probability plot of Regression Standardized Residual of COMP and CP
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Figure 27 Normal Probability plot of Regression Standardized Residual of COMP and CWB

Figure 28 Normal Probability plot of Regression Standardized Residual of PA and TP

Figure 29 Normal Probability plot of Regression Standardized Residual of PA and CP

Figure 30 Normal Probability plot of Regression Standardized Residual of PA and CWB
A. Task Performance (Factor Analysis)

Table 1. Total Variance Explained Task Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>17.345</td>
<td>38.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>12.281</td>
<td>50.971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Figure 1. Scree Plot for Task Performance Factor Analysis
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Table 2. Rotated Component Matrix Task Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td></td>
<td>.389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td></td>
<td>.688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

B. Contextual Performance (Factor Analysis)

Table 3. Total Variance Explained Contextual Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Variance</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>27.008</td>
<td>27.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>18.337</td>
<td>45.345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
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Figure 2. Scree Plot for Contextual Performance Factor Analysis

Table 4. Rotated Component Matrix Contextual Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33</td>
<td></td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.
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C. Counterproductive Work Behavior (Factor Analysis)

Table 5. Total Variance Explained (Principal Component Analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.110</td>
<td>56.774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Figure 3. Scree Plot for Counterproductive Work Behavior Factor Analysis
D. Training (Factor Analysis)

Table 6. Total Variance Explained (Principal Component Analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.832</td>
<td>63.863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Figure 4. Scree Plot for Training Factor Analysis
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E. Compensation (Factor Analysis)

Table 7. Total Variance Explained (Principal Component Analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>40.152</td>
<td>40.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>20.905</td>
<td>61.056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Figure 5. Scree Plot for Compensation Factor Analysis
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Table 8. Rotated Component Matrix Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q50</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q52</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q53</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49</td>
<td></td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

F. Performance Appraisal (Factor Analysis)

Table 9. Total Variance Explained (Principal Component Analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>33.655</td>
<td>33.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>16.083</td>
<td>49.739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
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Figure 6. Scree Plot for Performance Appraisal Factor Analysis

![Scree Plot](image)

Table 10. Rotated Component Matrix Performance Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q54</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q55</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q56</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q57</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q58</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.