



Journal Homepage: -[www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

## INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)

Article DOI:10.21474/IJAR01/16062  
DOI URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/16062>



### RESEARCH ARTICLE

#### LEVEL OF WORK PERFORMANCE AND WORK ENGAGEMENT OF EMPLOYEES IN THE CITY GOVERNMENT OF GENERAL SANTOS

**Marites M. Cuyos**

Master in Business Management Major in Human Resource Management, Mindanao State University Graduate School, General Santos City, Philippines.

#### Manuscript Info

##### Manuscript History

Received: 25 November 2022  
Final Accepted: 27 December 2022  
Published: January 2023

##### Key words:-

Work Engagement, Work Performance,  
Motivation, Employees

#### Abstract

Work performance is an essential aspect for both the employees and the organization. However, there were limited studies on the work performance and work engagement of employees in the City Government of General Santos. For this reason, this study attempted to determine the level of work performance of the employees and its effect on work engagement. Correlational methods of research were used. The study involved ninety-three (93) permanent employees. An adopted questionnaire was used. The findings revealed that the work performance of employees is high in terms of contextual performance, this means that they worked and kept their job skills up to date. It is also high in terms of task performance that employees kept in their mind the results that they had to achieve in their work while it is low in terms of counterproductive work behavior, that they complained about unimportant matters in work. Further, work engagement is high in terms of supervisors; they consider their supervisors as approachable and easy to talk to. In terms of the team, they agreed that the people they work with treat them with respect. In terms of organization, they agreed that the vision and goals of the organization are important, and in terms of jobs, they see positive results because of their work. It was also revealed that most of the components in the work engagement have a significant influence on the sub-variables of work performance.

*Copy Right, IJAR, 2023.. All rights reserved.*

#### Introduction:-

Work performance is an essential aspect for both the employees and the organization. The ability of the employees to complete the task within a specific period indicates that they are motivated. However, the employees that are not willing to exert extra effort are most likely to feel disengaged and unmotivated in work.

Motivation is a strategy that necessitates a common goal. It is a simple motivating word that describes the goal and it is a decision of employees using the set of skills to achieve it (Palmer, 2005). Similarly, Inuwa and Mohammad (2016) stated that organizations should create motivational measures to increase the performance of employees. They also noted that motivated employees are satisfied with their jobs.

The Performance Management System of the City Government of General Santos is a 5-years plan used by human resources management. It is composed of strategies, methods, and tools to ensure, fulfill and assess the

**Corresponding Author:- Marites M. Cuyos**

Address:- Master in Business Management Major in Human Resource Management, Mindanao State University Graduate School, General Santos City, Philippines.

accomplishment of the employees. It is also a mechanism that centralizes the safeguards of the employees' achievements based on the objectives set by the organization in the strategic plan. Evidently, the data produced is useful in terms of human resource planning, management, and decision-making process.

Work engagement is the effectiveness of an employee towards work. In order to be effective, the employees should exert effort mentally and physically. It is also observed that an engaged employee is dedicated to work. It was first conceptualized by Kahn (1990) as the harnessing of employees' work roles in the organization; more likely engaged employees are expressive physically, cognitively, and emotionally in performing their work roles.

This study aimed to know the work performance and work engagement of employees in the City Government of General Santos. It is important to assess the performance of the workforce to ensure that organizational goals and objectives are achieved. This study also aimed to highlight the ways in which work performance is beneficial to the organization and career development of employees. Further, the result of this study was a basis to determine the competitiveness of the employees in the City Government of General Santos.

### **Objectives Of The Study:-**

This study focused on the level of work performance and work engagement of employees in the City Government of General Santos.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions: 1) What is the level of work performance of employees in the City Government of General Santos? 2) What is the level of work engagement of the employees in the City Government of General Santos? 3) Relationship between the level of work performance and work engagement of the employees? 4) Relationship between the level of work performance and demographic profile of the respondents. 5) Relationship between the level of work engagement and demographic profile of the respondents. 6) The issues and challenges encountered by the employees.

### **Methodology:-**

This study employed the descriptive-correlative type of research method. The descriptive method was used to determine the level of work performance and work engagement of the employees in the City Government of General Santos. While the correlative method was used to determine the significant relationship between work performance and work engagement of the employees and their demographic profile.

This study was conducted in the twenty-seven departments of the City Government of General Santos.

The respondents were the identified permanent employees at the twenty-seven departments of the City Government of General Santos. Specifically, the population of employees was based on the list of employees provided by the Human Resource Department Office. Employees who are co-term, elected, temporary and contractual are excluded to be part of this study.

The instrument used in this study was adopted from the study of Koopmans, et al., 2014 to measure work performance. The 18-item scale was composed of subscales namely task performance (5 items), contextual performance (8 items), and counterproductive work behavior (5 items). Another instrument was adopted from Decision Wise Intelligence to determine work engagement. It was an 18-item scale composed of job (5 items), team (3 items), supervisor (4 items), and organization (6 items).

The researcher asked permission from the school of Graduate Studies for the conducted study. After approval was granted, the researcher sent a letter for cooperation from the Human Resource Management Development Office for the administration of the research questionnaires. She was instructed to personally proceed to the Human Resource Academy for the other requirements. Right after, the distribution of questionnaires to the employees was administered online using google forms. Retrieval of the data was gathered after which the employees' answered questionnaires.

The researcher employed frequency distribution and weighted mean to treat the data gathered. In order to determine the relationship between the variables, Spearman's Rho and Chi-Square Test were used.

The 5-point Likert scale with a range of descriptions and description levels was used to describe the data gathered on the work performance of the employees.

### Results And Discussions:-

Table 1 summarizes the respondents' profiles. The age ranges from 30 years and below (35.5%). Altogether, 60.2% of the respondents are 40 years old and below. This age profile shows a force of young employees; dominated by females which constituted 63.4%; the majority were married (51.6%) This shows that most permanent employees were married in the City Government of General Santos. Similarly, Choong et al., (2012) highlighted that married employees were more determined to display higher performance in their job because they were concerned about the economic safety of their families. Additionally, most of the employees were college graduates (67.7%) these results show that they were educationally qualified for their job positions. Almost 27% were pursuing graduate and postgraduate degrees, an indication that these employees value the importance of educational advancement in the quality of work performance and work engagement and 5 years and below in service (43%).

**Table 1:-** Profile of the Respondents.

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Age</b>		
61 years old and above	1	1.1%
51-60 years old	18	19.4%
41-50 years old	18	19.4%
31-40 years old	23	24.7%
30 years old and below	33	35.5%
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	34	36.6%
Female	59	63.4%
<b>Civil Status</b>		
Married	48	51.6%
Single	45	48.4%
<b>Educational Attainment</b>		
Doctoral Degree	1	1.1%
Master's Degree	24	25.8%
College Graduate	63	67.7%
High School Graduate	5	5.4%
<b>Years in service</b>		
26 years and above	12	12.9%
21-25 years	14	15.1%
16-20 years	3	3.2%
11-15 years	6	6.5%
6-10 years	18	19.4%
5 years and below	40	43.0%

Table 2 shows the summary of mean levels of task performance. The table reveals that the employees rated **very high** that they kept in mind the results they had to achieve their work (M=4.69); they managed to plan their work so that it was done on time (M = 4.56). The employees also rated as **high** that they are able to separate main issues from side issues at work (M=4.46) and they are able to perform their work well with minimal time and effort. The lowest under-task performance was that their planning was optimal (M=3.96). Taken as a whole, the work performance of employees was described as **high** in terms of task performance with a mean of 4.35.

**Table 2:-** Level of Work Performance in terms of Task Performance.

Task Performance	Mean	Description
In the past three months. .... 1. I managed to plan my work so that it was done on time.	4.56	Very High
2. My planning was optimal.	3.96	High

3. I kept in mind the results that I had to achieve in my work.	4.69	Very High
4. I was able to separate main issues from side issues at work.	4.46	High
5. I was able to perform my work well with minimal time and effort.	4.08	High
Over-all Mean	4.35	High

Table 3 shows the summary of the mean level of contextual performance. The table reveals that the employees in the City Government of General Santos rated items 5, 4, and 1 as **very high** in that they took challenging work tasks when available (M=4.58); they worked and kept their job skills up to date (M=4.65), and they took extra responsibilities (M=4.63). The employees also rated items 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8 as **high**. This means that they start new tasks when the old ones were finished (M=4.26), they work and kept their job knowledge up to date (M=4.44), they came up with creative solutions to new problems (M=4.46), they kept looking for new challenges in their job (M=4.23) and they actively participated in work meetings (M=4.47). Item 7 is identified as the lowest in terms of the contextual performance of the employees. The mean of 4.47 is described as **high**. This means that the employees have a **high** level of work performance in terms of contextual performance.

**Table 3:-** Level of Work Performance in terms of Contextual Performance.

Contextual Performance	Mean	Description
In the past three months.....		
1. I took on extra responsibilities.	4.63	Very High
2. I started new tasks myself when my old ones were finished.	4.26	High
3. I worked at keeping my job knowledge up-to-date.	4.44	High
4. I worked on keeping my job skills up-to-date.	4.65	Very High
5. I took on challenging work tasks, when available.	4.58	Very High
6. I came up with creative solutions to new problems.	4.46	High
7. I kept looking for new challenges in my job.	4.23	High
8. I actively participated in work meetings.	4.47	High
Over-all Mean	4.47	High

Table 4 shows the summary of the mean level of counterproductive work behavior. The table reveals that the employees of the City Government of General Santos rated items 1, 4, and 5 as **low**, that they complained about unimportant matters in work (M=2.24), they speak with colleagues about the negative aspects of their work (M=2.12) and they speak with people from outside the organization about the negative aspects of their work (M=1.71). The two lowest in counterproductive work behavior of employees were rated as **very low**, that the problems they made were greater than when they were at work (M=1.49) and they focused on the negative aspects of the work situation, instead of on the positive aspects (M=1.45). Both were rated by the employees as **very low**. The mean of 1.80 is described as **very low**. This means that the employees have **verylow** work performance in terms of counterproductive work behavior.

**Table 4:-** Level of Work Performance in terms of Counterproductive Work Behavior.

Counterproductive Work Behavior	Mean	Description
In the past three months.....		
1. I complained about unimportant matters at work.	2.24	Low
2. I made problems greater than they were at work.	1.49	Very Low
3. I focused on the negative aspects of a work situation, instead of on the positive aspects.	1.45	Very Low
4. I spoke with colleagues about the negative aspects of my work.	2.12	Low
5. I spoke with people from outside the organization about the negative aspects of my work.	1.71	Low
Over-all Mean	1.80	Low

Table 5 shows the summary of the mean level of work performance. The table reveals that the highest work performance is contextual performance (M=4.47) followed by task performance (M=4.35) and counterproductive work behavior (M=1.80). This means that contextual performance is important to the employees to strengthen social networks. Contextual performance is **high** an indication that the employees are aware of the aligned responsibilities in their tasks therefore, they work and kept their job skills up to date. Task performance is rated **high** this indicates that the performance condition of the employees is high when they kept in mind the results they achieved at work. Further, the counterproductive work behavior of the employees is **low** and should be maintained. Contextual performance is a measurement of job performance that influences the quality of human resource practices (Befort&Hatrup, 2003).

**Table 5:-** Summary of the Level of Work Performance.

Work Performance	Mean	Description
A. Task Performance	4.35	Somewhat true
B. Contextual Performance	4.47	Somewhat true
C. Counterproductive work behavior	1.80	Slightly true
Over-all Mean	3.54	Moderately true

Table 6 shows the summary of the mean level of job and rated by the employees as **high**. The table reveals that the employees agreed that they see positive results because of their work (M=4.38), their work was valued by the organization (M=4.35), they have the tools and resources they needed to do their job (M=4.17), the amount of work they expected is reasonable (M=4.14) and they received the training they need to do their job (M=4.01). The job has a mean of 4.21 described as **high**. This means that the employee has a **high** level of work engagement in terms of the job.

**Table 6:-** Level of Work Engagement in terms of Job.

Job	Mean	Description
1. I have the tools and resources I need to do my job well.	4.17	High
2. Most days, I see positive results because of my work.	4.38	High
3. My work is valued by this organization.	4.35	High
4. I have received the training I need to do my job well.	4.01	High
5. The amount of work I am expected to do is reasonable.	4.14	High
Over-all Mean	4.21	High

Table 7 shows the summary of the mean level of work engagement in terms of team. The table reveals that employees of the City Government of General Santos rated items 2 and 3 as **very high**, that the people they work with treat them with respect (M=4.56) and their coworkers openly talk about what needs to be done to be more effective (M=4.58). They also rated item 1 as **high** that the people they work with take accountability and ownership for the results (M=4.23). The mean of 4.46 is described as **high** this means that the work engagement of employees is **high** in terms of team.

**Table 7:-** Level of Work Engagement in terms of Team.

Team	Mean	Description
1. The people I work with take accountability and ownership for results.	4.23	High
2. The people I work with treat me with respect.	4.56	Very High
3. My coworkers and I openly talk about what needs to be done to be more effective.	4.58	Very High
Over-all Mean	4.46	High

Table 8 shows the summary of the mean levels of supervisors. The table reveals that the employees rated items 1 and 2 as **very high**, they consider the supervisor as approachable and easy to talk to (M=4.55) and it helps them understand how their work is important to the organization (M=4.52). Likewise, they rated items 3 and 4 as **high**

and supervisors set high expectations for their team performance ( $M=4.44$ ) and created a motivating and energizing workplace ( $M=4.37$ ). The mean of 4.47 is described as **high**. This means that the employees have **high** engagement in terms of supervisor.

Supervisor performance is recognized as an important factor to promote employee work performance. The leaders that lead the employees with a transformational style, will be more engaged in their work, which improved as well as their work performance (Poubakhordari et al., 2016).

**Table 8:-** Level of Work Engagement in terms of Supervisor.

Supervisor	Mean	Description
1. My supervisor helps me understand how my work is important to the organization.	4.52	Very High
2. My supervisor is approachable and easy to talk to.	4.55	Very High
3. My supervisor creates a motivating and energizing workplace.	4.37	High
4. My supervisor sets high expectations for our team's performance.	4.44	High
Over-all Mean	4.47	High

Table 9 shows the summary of the mean levels of the organization. The table reveals that the vision and goals of the organization are important ( $M=4.56$ ), they will recommend the organization as a great place to work ( $M=4.34$ ); they believe that the organization provides attractive opportunities for training and development ( $M=4.28$ ). Further, they consider that the organization cares for them ( $M=4.23$ ) and there are opportunities for their advancement in the organization ( $M=4.20$ ). The mean of 4.23 is described as **high**.

It is noted that a safe and secure workplace helped the engagement of their work. In this manner, they carry out their tasks to meet the organizational outcomes. The more suitable the workplace the more responsible the employees are to develop their potential to deliver quality service (Masadeh et al., 2016). Further, a workplace that is more enjoyable, and less anxiety among co-workers leads to a positive attitude toward work and increased productivity (Tayler, 2012).

**Table 9:-** Level of Work Engagement in terms of Organization.

Organization	WM	Description
1. The vision and goals of this organization are important to me personally.	4.56	Very High
2. This organization provides attractive opportunities for training and development.	4.28	High
3. There are opportunities for my own advancement in this organization.	4.20	High
4. My opinions are sought on issues that affect me and my job.	3.78	High
5. This organization cares about employees.	4.23	High
6. I would recommend this organization as a great place to work.	4.34	High
Over-all Mean	4.23	High

Table 10 shows the summary of work engagement. The table reveals that the employees rated high all the indicators of work engagement. They rated **high** that supervisor ( $M=4.47$ ), team ( $M=4.46$ ), organization ( $M=4.23$ ), and job ( $M=4.21$ ) are essential in work engagement. They also agreed that organization ( $M=4.23$ ) and job ( $M=4.21$ ) are important. The overall mean of 4.34 is described as **high**.

**Table 10:-** Summary of the Level of Work Engagement of Employees.

Work Engagement	Mean	Description
A. Job	4.21	High
B. Team	4.46	High
C. Supervisor	4.47	High
D. Organization	4.23	High

Over-all Mean	4.34	High
---------------	------	------

Table 11 shows the significant influence of work performance and work engagement of the employees in the City Government of General Santos ( $r=.110$  and  $p=.295$ ). A p-value of less than .05 ( $p=.000 < .05$ ) indicates a **significant relationship** or influence. Likewise, task performance ( $r=.390$  and  $p=.000$ ), contextual performance ( $r=.370$  and  $p=.000$ ), and counterproductive work behavior ( $r=-.250$  and  $p=.016$ ) also **significantly influence** the work engagement of the employees.

It is also noted that most of the components in the work engagement have a **significant influence** on the sub-variables of work performance.

**Table 11:-** Relationship Between Work Performance and Work Engagement.

Work Engagement	Work Performance			Over-all
	Task	Contextual	CWB	
Job	.439** .000	.361** .000	-.300** .004	<b>.105</b> <b>.316</b>
Team	.478** .000	.487** .000	-.238** .021	<b>.232**</b> <b>.025</b>
Supervisor	.253* .015	.136 .194	-.093 .378	<b>.048</b> <b>.647</b>
Organization	.174 .095	.292* .005	-.256** .013	<b>-.038</b> <b>.721</b>
<b>Over-all</b>	<b>.390**</b> <b>.000</b>	<b>.370**</b> <b>.000</b>	<b>-.250**</b> <b>.016</b>	<b>.110</b> <b>.295</b>

Table 12 shows the significant influence of demographic profile and work performance of the employees in the City Government of General Santos. A p-value of less than .05 ( $p=.000 < .05$ ) indicates a **significant relationship** or influence. On educational attainment, it **significantly influences** task performance ( $r=7.878$  and  $p=.047$ ). It is also noted that most of the components of the demographic profile have **no significant influence** on the contextual and counterproductive work behavior of the employees.

**Table 12:-** Relationship Between Demographic Profile and Work Performance of the Employees in the City Government of General Santos.

Demographic Profile	Work Performance			Overall
	Task	Contextual	CWB	
Age	11.218 .242	18.505 .411	11.735 .089	11.810 .288
Sex	1.383 -.119	2.508 -.164	1.106 -.076	4.496 -.195
Civil Status	8.314 .298	11.182 .342	5.245 .164	13.380 .362
Educational Attainment	7.878** .047	4.993 .146	17.790 -.226	10.338 -.135
Number of Years in Service	10.053 .141	21.003 .401	15.963 .115	15.944 .298

Table 13 shows the significant influence of demographic profile and work engagement of the employees in the City Government of General Santos. A p-value of less than .05 ( $p=.000 < .05$ ) indicates a **significant relationship** or influence. It was revealed that it **significantly influences** the organization ( $r=4.654$  and  $p=-.004$ ), civil status is **significantly** related to supervisor ( $r=2.482$  and  $p=-.008$ ) and educational attainment has **significantly influenced** the job ( $r=7.041$  and  $p=.025$ ). It is also noted that the educational attainment of employees **influences** the components of work engagement ( $r=5.190$  and  $p=-.016$ ).

**Table 13:-** Relationship Between Demographic Profile and Work Engagement of employees in the City Government of General Santos.

Demographic Profile	Work Engagement				Overall
	Job	Team	Supervisor	Organization	
Age	7.091 .129	16.510 .303	4.753 -.051	13.145 .075	10.021 .187
Sex	2.568 .054	2.320 .052	2.963 -.088	4.654** -.004	2.964 -.131
Civil Status	5.319 .121	10.286 .258	2.482** -.008	9.783 .059	7.457 .201
Educational Attainment	7.041** .025	5.468 .130	4.724 -.068	6.319 .101	5.190** -.016
Number of Years in Service	22.642 .065	11.786 .237	14.158 -.062	10.807 .091	13.965 .187

**Issues and Challenges**

Based on the results of the study the issues and challenges of the employees in the City Government of General Santos are about their educational attainment. It was found that the majority are college graduates.

In terms of work performance, it was found out that employees' plan was optimal. They kept on looking for the challenges in their job and they focus on the negative situation of their work.

Further, employees are more engaged when the organization values their work. They agreed that they take accountability and ownership with the people they work with, and a supervisor that creates motivating and energizing workplaces increases the level of work engagement.

**Conclusions:-**

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were formulated. In terms of the work performance of employees, they kept in their mind the results that they had to achieve in their work. They worked and kept their job skills up to date. They complained about unimportant matters at work.

Further, in terms of work engagement, they agreed that they see positive results because of their work and that the people they work with treat them with respect. They consider the supervisor as approachable and easy to talk to. Moreover, they believed that the vision and goals of the organization are important.

**References:-**

1. Abdullah, A., & Marican, S. (2017). Relationship between leadership perception and engagement in workplace deviant behavior. *The Malaysian Journal of Social Administration*, 9(1), 131-150.
2. Aguinis, H. (2013). *Performance management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
3. Ahmed, U., Majid, A., Al-Aali, L., & Mozammel, S. (2019). Can meaningful work really moderate the relationship between supervisor support, coworker support, and Work Engagement? *Management Science Letters*, 9(2), 229-242.
4. Ahmed, U., Khalid, N., Ammar, A., & Shah, M. H. (2017). Assessing moderation of employee engagement on the relationship between work discretion, job clarity, and business performance in the banking sector of Pakistan. *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, 7(12), 1197.
5. Ahmetoglu, G., Harding, X., Akhtar, R., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2015). Predictors of creative achievement: Assessing the impact of entrepreneurial potential, perfectionism, and employee engagement. *Creativity Research Journal*, 27(2), 198-205.
6. Akingbola, K., & van den Berg, H. A. (2019). Antecedents, consequences, and context of employee engagement in nonprofit organizations. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 39(1), 46-74.
7. Albrecht, S.L., Bakker, A.B., Gruman, J.A., Macey, W.H., and Saks, A.M. (2015). Employee engagement, human resource management practices and competitive advantage. *J. Organ. Effect.* 2,7-35. doi:10.1108/JOEPP-08-2014-0042

8. Albrecht, S. A., Bakker, A. B., Gruman, J. A., Macey, W. H., & Saks, A. M. (2015). Employee engagement, human resource management and competitive advantage: An integrated approach. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness, People and Performance*, 2, 7-35.
9. Ali, A., M. Abrar, J. Haider, 2012. Impact of Motivation on the Working Performance of Employees- A case study of Pakistan. *Global Advanced Research Journal of Management and Business Studies*, 1(4): 126-133.
10. Al Zefeiti, S. M. B., & Mohamad, N. A. (2017). The Influence of organizational commitment on Omani public employees' work performance. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 7(2), 151-160.
11. Al-Hamdan, Z., Oweidat, I. A., Al-Faouri, I., &Codier, E. (2017). Correlating Emotional intelligence and job performance among Jordanian hospitals' registered nurses. Paper presented at the Nursing forum.
12. Appelbaum, S. H., Iaconi, G. D., &Matousek, A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviors: causes, impacts, and solutions. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*.
13. Ariani, D. W. (2015). Relationship with supervisor and co-workers, psychological condition and employee engagement in the workplace. *Journal of Business and Management*, 4(3), 34-47.
14. Atamba, C. (2019). Restorative effects of awe on negative affect after receiving negative performance feedback. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 29(2), 95-103.
15. Babbie, Earl R. (2017). *The Practice of Social Research*. 12th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage.
16. Babic, A., Gillis, N., &Hansez, I. (2020). Work-to-family interface and well-being: The role of workload, emotional load, support and recognition from supervisors. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 46(1), 1-13.
17. Babic, A., Stinglhamber, F., Bertrand, F., &Hansez, I. (2017). Work-home interface and well-being: A cross-lagged analysis. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 16(1), 46–55. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000172>
18. Baeriswyl, S., Krause, A., &Schwaninger, A. (2016). Emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction in airport security officers – Work-family conflict mediator in the job demands-resources model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00663>
19. Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., & Fletcher, L. (2017). The meaning, antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19(1), 31-53.
20. Bakker, A. B. (2017). Strategic and proactive approaches to work engagement. *Organizational Dynamics*, 46(2), 67-75.
21. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: the JD–R approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*. 1, 389 – 411. doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091235
22. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 22(3), 273.
23. Bakker, A. B., & Bal, M. P. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 83(1), 189-206.
24. Bakker, A. B., Hakanen, J. J., Demerouti, E., &Xanthopoulou, D. (2007). Job resources boost work engagement, particularly when job demands are high. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(2), 274-284.
25. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.
26. Barret-Cheetham, E., Williams, L. A., &Bednall, T. C. (2016). A differentiated approach to the link between positive emotion, motivation, and eudaimonic well-being. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 11, 595-608.
27. Barrick, M. R., Thurgood, G. R., Smith, T. A., & Courtright, S. H. (2015). Collective organizational engagement: Linking motivational antecedents, strategic implementation, and firm performance. *Academy of Management journal*, 58(1), 111-135.
28. Bashir, A., Amir, A., Jawaad, M., & Hasan, T. (2020). Work conditions and job performance: An indirect conditional effect of motivation. *Cogent Business & Management*, 7(1), 1801961.
29. Befort, N., &Hatstrup, K. (2003). Valuing task and contextual performance: Experience, job roles, and ratings of the importance of job behaviors. *Applied HRM Research*, 8(1), 17-32.
30. Benevene, P., Dal Corso, L., De Carlo, A., Falco, A., Carluccio, F., &Vecina, M. L. (2018). Ethical leadership as antecedent of job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment and intention to stay among volunteers of non-profit organizations. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 2069.
31. Bernal, B. (2016). Help needed for PH tuna industry workers. Retrieved from <https://www.rappler.com/newsbreak/in-depth/143036-tabang-help-tuna-industry-workers-general-santos>
32. Bilal, H., Farooq, N., & Rukh, L (2019). Trust, Rewards and Training Impact on Employee's Work Engagement: Evidence from Banking Sector.
33. Biyanwila, B. D. L. P. N., &Perera, H. P. N. (2018). Associated Factors for Efficient Development of School Sports System for National Level Sports in Sri Lanka.

34. Borst, R. T., Kruyen, P. M., Lako, C. J., & de Vries, M. S. (2020). The attitudinal, behavioral, and performance outcomes of work engagement: A comparative meta-analysis across the public, semipublic, and private sector. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 40(4), 613-640.
35. Borst, R. T., Kruyen, P. M., & Lako, C. J. (2019). Exploring the job demands–resources model of work engagement in government: Bringing in a psychological perspective. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 39(3), 372-397.
36. Borst, R. T. (2018). Comparing work engagement in people-changing and people-processing service providers: A mediation model with red tape, autonomy, dimensions of PSM, and performance. *Public personnel management*, 47(3), 287-313.
37. Bowling, N. A., & Burns, G. N. (2015). Sex as a moderator of the relationships between predictor variables and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 30(1), 193-205.
38. Bowling, N. A., & Gruys, M. L. (2010). Overlooked issues in the conceptualization and measurement of counterproductive work behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(1), 54-61.
39. Campbell, J. P., & Wiernik, B. M. (2015). The modeling and assessment of work performance.
40. Carter, R. (2015). *Language and creativity: The art of common talk*. Routledge.
41. Cesario, F. & Chambel, M. J. (2017). Knowledge and Process Management. Published online in Wiley Online Library. DOI: 10.1002/kpm.1542
42. Chen, S., Jiang, W., Zhang, G., & Chu, F. (2019). Spiritual leadership on proactive workplace behavior: The role of organizational identification and psychological safety. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10, 1206.
43. Ciobanu, A., Androniceanu, A., & Lazaroiu, G. (2019). An integrated psycho-sociological perspective on public employees' motivation and performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 36.
44. Choong, Y.O., Tan, C.E., Keh, C.G., Lim, Y.H. and Tan, Y.T. (2012), "How demographic factors impact organisational commitment of academic staffs in Malaysian private universities: a review and research agenda", *International Journal of Academic Research*, Vol. 4 No. 3.
45. Conway, J.M. (1999). Distinguishing contextual performance from task performance for managerial jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(3), 3–13.
46. Costa, P. L., Passos, A. M., & Barata, M. C. (2015). Multilevel influences of team viability perceptions. *Team Performance Management*.
47. Coxen, L., Van der Vaart, L., & Stander, M. W. (2016). Authentic leadership and organisational citizenship behaviour in the public health care sector: The role of workplace trust. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 42(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip/v42i1.1364>
48. Cristofoli, D., Nasi, G., Turrini, A., & Valotti, G. (2011). Civil service reforms in Italy: The importance of external endorsement and administrative leadership. *Governance*, 24, 261–283. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2011.01524.x>
49. Dajani, D., & Zaki, M. A. (2015). The impact of employee engagement on job performance and organizational commitment in the Egyptian banking sector.
50. Dalal, R. S., Baysinger, M., Brummel, B. J., & LeBreton, J. M. (2012). The relative importance of employee engagement, other job attitudes, and trait affect as predictors of job performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42, E295-E325.
51. Damianus, A., Magallanes, T., Foronda, G. S. L., & Encarnacion, M. J. (2020). Employees' workplace well-being and work engagement of divine word colleges' employees in Ilocos region, Philippines. *International journal of academic research in business and social science*, 9(2), 70-84.
52. Díaz-Vilela, L. F., Rodríguez, N. D., Isla-Díaz, R., Díaz-Cabrera, D., Hernández-Fernaud, E., & Rosales-Sánchez, C. (2015). Relationships between contextual and task performance and interrater agreement: Are there any? *PloS one*, 10(10), e0139898.
53. Dodd, P., DuPlessis, A. and Douangphichit, N. (2015), "HRM in relation to employee motivation and job performance in the hospitality industry", *International Business Conference (IBC)*.
54. Elçi, M., Şener, I., & Alpkan, L. (2013). The impacts of ethical leadership on the antisocial behavior of employees: the mediating role of ethical climate. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, 14(1), 56-66.
55. Eldor, L. (2018). Public service sector: The compassionate workplace—The effect of compassion and stress on employee engagement, burnout, and performance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 28(1), 86-103.
56. Farndale, E., & Murrer, I. (2015). Job resources and employee engagement: A cross-national study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.
57. Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N.E., Hyun, H. H. (2015). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* 9th Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.

58. Ghaith, A., & Mutia, S. A. A. (2019). Effect of behavioral variables on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), with job satisfaction as moderating among Jordanian five-star hotels: A pilot study. *International Journal of Ethics and Systems*.
59. Goodsell, C. (2003). *The case for bureaucracy* (4th edn.). Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.
60. Griep, Y., and Vantilborgh, T. (2018). Reciprocal effects of psychological contract breach on counterproductive and organizational citizenship behaviors: the role of time. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 104, 141–153. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2017.10.013
61. Guglielmi, D., Avanzi, L., Chiesa, R., Mariani, M. G., Bruni, I., & Depolo, M. (2016). Positive aging in demanding workplaces: The gain cycle between job satisfaction and work engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1224.
62. Gupta, M., Acharya, A. & Gupta, R. (2015). Impact of work engagement on performance Indian higher education system. *Review of European Studies*. 7 (3) 192 – 201. doi:10.5539/res.v7n3p192
63. Hamdan, K. B., Al-Ghalabi, R. R., Al-Zu'bi, H. A., Barakat, S., Alzoubi, A. A., & AbuAd, W. B. (2020). ANTECEDENTS OF JOB PERFORMANCE DURING COVID-19: A PILOT STUDY OF JORDANIAN PUBLIC HOSPITALS NURSES. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(4), 339-351.
64. Hakanen, J. J., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). Do burnout and work engagement predict depressive symptoms and life satisfaction? A three-wave seven-year prospective study. *Journal of Affective Disorders*. 141, 415 – 424. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2012.02.043
65. He, J., Morrison, A. M., & Zhang, H. (2019). Improving millennial employee well-being and task performance in the hospitality industry: The interactive effects of HRM and responsible leadership. *Sustainability*, 11(16), 4410.
66. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B.B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
67. Hesketh, B., & Neal, A. (1999). Technology and performance. In D.R. Ilgen & E.D. Pulakos (Eds), *The changing nature of performance: Implications for staffing, motivation, and development* (pp. 21–55). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
68. Hewitt, A. (2017). Trends in global employee engagement: Global anxiety erodes employee engagement gains. AON Hewitt.
69. Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology*, 50(3), 337-421.
70. Hoole, C., & Hotz, G. (2016). The impact of a total reward system of work engagement. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 42(1), 1-14.
71. Horng, J.S., Tsai, C.Y., Yang, T.C. and Liu, C.H. (2016), “Exploring the relationship between proactive personality, work environment and employee creativity among tourism and hospitality employees”, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 25-34.
72. Hsieh, C.-C., & Wang, D.-S. (2015). Does supervisor-perceived authentic leadership influence employee work engagement through employee-perceived authentic leadership and employee trust? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(18), 2329–2348. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1025234>
73. Hunsaker, W., & Jeong, W. (2020). Engaging employees through spiritual leadership. *Management Science Letters*, 10(15), 3527-3536.
74. Ibrahim, N. F., Said, A. M. A., Abas, N., & Shahreki, J. (2020). Relationship between well-being perspectives, employee engagement and intrinsic outcomes: A Literature review. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(12), 69-74.
75. Intelligence, D. W. L. *Employee Engagement Survey*. Retrieved from [www.Decision-Wise.com](http://www.Decision-Wise.com).
76. Inuwa, M., Mashi, M. S., & Salisu, I. M. (2017). Job Attitude and Employee Performance: An Empirical Study of Non-Academic Staff of Bauchi State University Gadau Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management Future*, 1(1), 1-13.
77. Inuwa, M. (2017). Relationship between job equity and performance of employee: A literature review. *International Journal of Business and Management Future*, 1(1), 8-15.
78. Inuwa, M., & Muhammad, A. (2016). Impact of Job Satisfaction on Performance of Non-Academic Staff of Bauchi State University Gadau: The Moderating Effect of Physical Working Environment. *International Journal of Economics and Business Management*, 2(8), 60-77.
79. Ismail, H. N., Iqbal, A., & Nasr, L. (2019). Employee engagement and job performance in Lebanon: the mediating role of creativity. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*.
80. Jacobs, S., Renard, M., & Snelgar, R. J. (2014). Intrinsic rewards and work engagement in the South African retail industry. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40(2), 1- 13.

81. Jena, R.K. (2015), "An assessment of demographic factors affecting organizational commitment among shift workers in India", *Management-Journal of Contemporary Management Issues*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 59-77.
82. Jiang, W., Gu, Q., & Wang, G. G. (2015). To guide or to divide: The dual-side effects of transformational leadership on team innovation. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 30(4), 677-691.
83. Jones, N., & Sambrook, S. (2016). *Employee engagement in the public sector. Human Capital Management Research: Influencing Practice and Process*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar, 31-45.
84. Kartikaningdyah, E., & Surya, R. O. (2017). The Influence of Motivation, Voice Behavior and Work Engagement of the Individual Performance at Islamic Bank. *Journal of Applied Accounting and Taxation*, 2(1), 18.
85. Kasale, L. L., Morrow, S., & Winand, M. (2020). An Institutional Work Perspective to Performance Management: The Case of Botswana National Sport Organizations. *Journal of Global Sport Management*, 1-22.
86. Kazimoto, P. (2016). Employee engagement and organizational performance of retails enterprises. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 6(4), 516-525. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ajibm.2016.64047>
87. Khan, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 692-724.
88. Kinnunen, U., Rantanen, J., Mauno, S., & Peeters, M. (2014). Work-family interaction. In M. Peeters, J. De Jonge, & T. Taris (Eds.), *An introduction to contemporary work psychology* (pp. 267-289). Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.
89. Kim, W., Han, S. J., & Park, J. (2019). Is the Role of Work Engagement Essential to Employee Performance or 'Nice to Have'? *Sustainability*, 11(4), 1050.
90. Kim, W., Kim, J., Woo, H., Park, J., Jo, J., Park, S. & Lim, S. Y. (2017). The Relationship Between Work Engagement and Organizational Commitment: Proposing Research Agendas Through a Review of Empirical Literature. *Human Resource Development Review*. 1 - 27. DOI: 10.1177/1534484317725967
91. Koodamara, N.K. (2017). Procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice as the antecedents of employee engagement. *International Journal of Scientific Research*, 5(11), 3-30.
92. Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., De Vet, H. C., & Van der Beek, A. J. (2014). Construct validity of the individual work performance questionnaire. *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine*, 56(3), 331-337.
93. Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2014). *Perilaku Organisasi (Organizational Behavior) (Edisi-9)*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
94. Kuschel, K. (2017). The work-family field: Gaps and missing links as opportunities for future research. *Innovar*, 27(66), 57-74. <https://doi.org/10.15446/innovar.v27n66.66711>.
95. Lavigna, R. J. (2015). Public Service Motivation and employee engagement. *Public Administration Review*, 75, 732-733.
96. Lavigna, R. J. (2013). *Engaging government employees: Motivate and inspire your people to achieve superior performance*. New York, NY: Amacom.
97. Law, F. M., & Guo, G. J. (2015). Correlation of hope and self-efficacy with job satisfaction, job stress, and organizational commitment for correctional officers in the Taiwan prison system. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 60 (11), 1257-1277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X15574997>
98. Lee, Y., Kwon, K., Kim, W., & Cho, D. (2016). Work engagement and career: Proposing research agenda through a review of literature. *Human Resource Development Review*. 15, 29-54. doi:10.1177/153448431662835
99. Li, P., Liu, Y., Yuan, P., Ju, F., (2017). The Study on the Relationship between University Faculties Job Stress and Organizational Commitment in China, *Procedia Computer Science*, 122, 642-648
100. Luthans, F., Youssef, C.M., & Avolio, B.J. (2007). Psychological capital: Investing and developing positive organizational behavior. In D.L. Nelson & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *Positive organizational behavior* (pp. 9-24). New York: Oxford University Press.
101. Mahjuri. 2016. Pengaruh kepribadian terhadap perilaku kerja Kontraproduktif melalu kecerdasan Emosional dan kecerdasan spiritual (studi pada pemerintah kotapalangka raya), Tesis Program Magister Sains Manajemen Pascasarjana Unpar.
102. Masa'deh, R. E. (2016). The role of knowledge management infrastructure in enhancing job satisfaction at Aqaba five-star hotels in Jordan.
103. Matsuo, M. (2019). Effect of learning goal orientation on work engagement through job crafting: A moderated mediation approach. *Personnel Review*, 48(1), 220-233. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-11-2017-0346>

104. Maximo, N., Stander, M. W., & Coxen, L. (2019). Authentic leadership and work engagement: The indirect effects of psychological safety and trust in supervisors. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 45(1), 1-11.
105. Mercurio, Z. A. (2015). Affective commitment as a core essence of organizational commitment: An integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 14(4), 389-414.
106. Merlicco, E. (2008). The Italian public administration: Ideas for innovation. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Malta, Msida, Malta.
107. Meutia, Tubagus, I., & Ahmad, B. (2017). The role of feedback and feed forward control system to improve competitive advantage of SMEs in Indonesia. *European Research Studies Journal*, 20(2A), 496-506.
108. Meyer, J. P., & Gagne, M. (2008). Employee engagement from a self-determination theory perspective. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 60-62.
109. Miah, M. M., & Hafit, N. I. A. (2019). A Proposed Framework Model of the Relationship between Organizational Culture, Work Engagement, and Employee Performance at Airasia Berhad. *Business and Economic Research*, 9(4), 69-78.
110. Mishra, K., Boynton, L., & Mishra, A. (2014). Driving employee engagement: The expanded role of internal communications. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 51(2), 183-202.
111. Motyka, B. (2018). Employee engagement and performance: a systematic literature review. *International Journal of Management and Economics*, 54(3), 227-244.
112. Mussagulova, A. (2020). Predictors of work engagement: Drawing on job demands-resources theory and public service motivation. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*.
113. Mustafa, G., & Ali, N. (2019). Rewards, autonomous motivation and turnover intention: Results from a non-western cultural context. *Cogent Business & Management*, 6(1), 1676090. (just-accepted). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2019.1676090>
114. Nasurdin, A. M., Ling, T. C., & Khan, S. N. (2018). Linking Social Support, Work Engagement and Job Performance in Nursing. *International Journal of Business & Society*, 19(2).
115. Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (1998). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence concerning specific forms, potential causes, and preferred targets. *Journal of management*, 24(3), 391-419.
116. Nilsen, H. R., & Ringholm, T. (2019). Lost in motivation? The case of a Norwegian community healthcare project on ethical reflection. *Cogent Business & Management*, 6(1), 1632045. (just-accepted). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2019.1632045>
117. Noesgaard, M. S., & Hansen, J. R. (2018). Work engagement in the public service context: The dual perceptions of job characteristics. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 41(13), 1047-1060.
118. Nguyen, D. T., Teo, S. T., & Dinh, K. C. (2020). Social support as buffer for workplace negative acts of professional public sector employees in Vietnam. *Public Management Review*, 22(1), 6-26.
119. Ogbulafor C. (2011). Motivation and job performance of academic staff of state universities in Nigeria: the case of Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai, Niger State. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(14), p142.
120. O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W., & Glew, D. J. (1996). Organization-motivated aggression: A research framework. *Academy of management review*, 21(1), 225-253.
121. Orgambidez-Ramos, A., & de Almeida, H. (2017). Work engagement, social support, and job satisfaction in Portuguese nursing staff: A winning combination. *Applied Nursing Research*, 36, 37-41.
122. Osborne, S., & Hammoud, M. S. (2017). Effective employee engagement in the workplace. *International Journal of Applied Management and Technology*, 16(1), 4.
123. Osborne, D. & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
124. Palmer, B. (2005). *Practical Advice for HR Professionals: Create individualized Motivation Strategies*. Melcrum Publishing Ltd.
125. Pang, K., & Lu, C.S. (2018). Organizational motivation, employee job satisfaction and organizational performance: An empirical study of container shipping companies in Taiwan. *Maritime Business Review*. 3 (1) 36 – 52.
126. Peng, J. C., Tseng, M. M., & Lee, Y. L. (2011). Relationships among supervisor feedback environment, work-related stressors, and employee deviance. *Journal of Nursing Research*, 19(1), 13-24.
127. Perry, J. L., & Vandenabeele, W. (2015). Public service motivation research: Achievements, challenges, and future directions. *Public Administration Review*, 75, 692-699.
128. Plester, B., & Hutchison, A. (2016). Fun times: the relationship between fun and workplace engagement. *Employee Relations*, 38(3), 332-350. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-03-2014-0027>

129. Pour Barkhordari, A., Zhou, E. H. I., & Pourkarimi, J. (2016). How Individual-focused Transformational Leadership Enhances Its Influence on Job Performance through Employee Work Engagement. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 11(2), 249.
130. Pradhan, R. K., & Jena, L. K. (2017). Employee performance at workplace: Conceptual model and empirical validation. *Business Perspectives and Research*, 5(1), 69-85.
131. Raman, S., Weigel, R., & Lee, T. (2016). The Internet of space (IoS): A future backbone for the Internet of Things? *IEEE IoT Newsletter*.
132. Ramdani, Z., Marliani, R., & Rahman, A. A. (2019). The individual work performance scale: A psychometric study and its application for employee performance. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(5), 405-414.
133. Rana, F. A., & Javed, U. (2019). Psychosocial job characteristics, employee well-being, and quit intentions in Pakistan's insurance sector. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 38(4), 38-45.
134. Rana, S., Pant, D., & Chopra, P. (2019). WORK ENGAGEMENT AND INDIVIDUAL WORK PERFORMANCE: RESEARCH FINDINGS AND AN AGENDA FOR EMPLOYEE RELATIONSHIPS.
135. Ramos Villagrasa, P. J., Fernández del Río, E., Koopmans, L., & Barrada, J. R. (2019). Assessing job performance using brief self-report scales: The case of the individual work performance questionnaire (No. ART-2019-113628).
136. Rashid, S. & Azhar, M. A. (2015). Employee engagement: a qualitative research on critical factors within Malaysia's sme businesses. *First Asia Pacific Conference on Contemporary Research*. 54 – 65.
137. Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(4), 698.
138. Saboor, A., Rehman, M., & Rehman, S. (2018). Organizational justice and employee contextual performance: the moderating effect of organizational respect. *Pakistan Business Review*, 19(4), 995-1011.
139. Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2014). What do we really know about employee engagement? *Human resource development quarterly*, 25(2), 155-182.
140. Saks, A.M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, 600–619. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
141. Sambung, R. (2019). Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance; Counterproductive Work Behavior and Organizational Citizenship Behavior as Mediations. *International Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 7(3), 50.
142. Saridakis, G., Lai, Y., and Cooper, C. L. (2016). Exploring the relationship between HRM and firm performance: a meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Hum. Resour. Manag. Rev.* 27, 87–96. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2016.09.005
143. Satata, D. B. M. (2020). Literature Review: Employee Engagement as an Effort to Improve Work Performance.
144. Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A confirmative analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92.
145. Sekhar, C., Patwardhan, M., & Vyas, V. (2017a). Causal modelling between human capital and firm performance indicators: An IT industries perspective. *International Journal of Learning and Intellectual Capital*. doi:10.1504/IJLIC.2017.10006263
146. Sharma, N., Schuster, P. L.-T., Ba, T., & Singh, V. K. (2016). Effect of workplace incivility on job satisfaction and turnover intentions in India. *South Asian Journal of Global Business Research*, 5(2), 234-249. doi:10.1108/sajgbr-02-2015-0020
147. Shaughnessy, A. O. (2017). Employees are a company's greatest asset, they're your competitive advantage. Poppulo. Retrieved January 16, 2019, from. <https://www.poppulo.com/blog/employees-are-a-companys-greatest-asset-they-re-your-competitive-advantage/>
148. Shields, Patricia and Rangarajan, N. (2013). *A Playbook for Research Methods: Integrating Conceptual Frameworks and Project Management*. Stillwater, OK: New Forum Press.
149. Shin, Y., Hur, W. M., & Choi, W. H. (2020). Coworker support as a double-edged sword: A moderated mediation model of job crafting, work engagement, and job performance. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(11), 1417-1438.
150. Singh, K. (2016). Influence of Internal Service Quality on Job Performance: A Case Study of Royal Police Department. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 224, 28-34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.396>
151. Swanberg, J. E., McKechnie, S. P., Ojha, M. U., & James, J. B. (2011). Schedule control, supervisor support and work engagement: A winning combination for workers in hourly jobs? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(3), 613-624.

152. Swart, R. P., Pretorius, R., & Klopper, H. (2015). Educational background of nurses and their perceptions of the quality and safety of patient care. *Curations*, 38(1), 1-8.
153. Tayler, B. (2012). Creating a psychologically healthy workplace: The role of communication. Retrieved February, 27, 2010.
154. Thompson, B. J. (2019). Does work-induced fatigue accumulate across three compressed 12 hour shifts in hospital nurses and aides? *PloS one*, 14(2), e0211715.
155. Tian, G., Wang, J., Zhang, Z., & Wen, Y. (2019). Self-efficacy and work performance: The role of work engagement. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 47(12), 1-7.
156. Tripathy, S.P. (2014). Impact of motivation on job performance of contractual staff in Devi Ahilya University Indore (M.P.). *Paripex-Indian Journal of Research*, 3(5), 1-5.
157. Tummers, L., Steijn, B., Nevicka, B., & Heerema, M. (2016). The effects of leadership and job autonomy on vitality: Survey and experimental evidence. *Review of public personnel administration*, 38, 355-377.
158. Turban, D. B., & Yan, W. (2016). Relationship of eudaimonia and hedonia with intrinsic outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(6), 1006-1020. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-07-2015-0271>
159. van der Walt, F. (2018). Workplace spirituality, work engagement and thriving at work. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 44(1), 1-10.
160. van Mierlo, H., & Bakker, A. B. (2018). Crossover of engagement in groups. *Career Development International*.
161. Verweij, H., Van der Heijden, F., Van Hooff, M., Prins, J., Lagro-Janssen, A., Van Ravesteijn, H., Speckens, A. (2017). The contribution of work characteristics, home characteristics and gender to burnout in medical residents. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 22(4), 803-818. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-016-9710-9>
162. Vigoda-Gadot, E., & Meiri, S. (2008). New public management values and person organization fit: A socio-psychological approach and empirical examination among public sector personnel. *Public Administration*, 86, 111-131. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2007.00703>.
163. Wang, C. & Chen, H. (2019). Relationship among workplace incivility, work engagement and job performance. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*. DOI 10.1108/JHTI-09-2019-0105
164. Wayne, J., Musisca, N., & Fleeson, W. (2004). Considering the role of personality in the work-family experience: Relationships of the big five to work-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64(1), 108-130. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(03\)00035-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00035-6)
165. Wushe, T., & Shenje, J. (2019). The antecedents of employee engagement and their effect on public sector service delivery: The case study of government departments in Harare. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17, 11.
166. Yin, N. (2018). The influencing outcomes of job engagement: an interpretation from the social exchange theory. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 67(5), 873-889. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-03-2017-0054>.
167. Yongxing, G., Hongfei, D., Baoguo, X., & Lei, M. (2017). Work engagement and job performance: the moderating role of perceived organizational support. *Anales de Psicología/Annals of Psychology*, 33(3), 708-713.
168. Zheng, W., Wu, Y.-C. J., Chen, X., & Lin, S.-J. (2017). Why do employees have counterproductive work behavior? The role of the founder's Machiavellianism and the corporate culture in China. *Management Decision*, 55(3), 563-578. doi:10.1108/MD-102016-0696.