






“Examining employee engagement and its importance at the selected South African university”

AUTHORS	Tatenda Chikukwa  Melanie Lourens   Sizwe Vincent Mbona 
ARTICLE INFO	Tatenda Chikukwa, Melanie Lourens and Sizwe Vincent Mbona (2024). Examining employee engagement and its importance at the selected South African university. <i>Problems and Perspectives in Management</i> , 22(3), 385-397. doi: 10.21511/ppm.22(3).2024.30
DOI	http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.22(3).2024.30
RELEASED ON	Tuesday, 03 September 2024
RECEIVED ON	Friday, 26 April 2024
ACCEPTED ON	Tuesday, 02 July 2024
LICENSE	 This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
JOURNAL	"Problems and Perspectives in Management"
ISSN PRINT	1727-7051
ISSN ONLINE	1810-5467
PUBLISHER	LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”
FOUNDER	LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”



NUMBER OF REFERENCES

55



NUMBER OF FIGURES

0



NUMBER OF TABLES

7

© The author(s) 2024. This publication is an open access article.



BUSINESS PERSPECTIVES



LLC "CPC "Business Perspectives"
Hryhorii Skovoroda lane, 10,
Sumy, 40022, Ukraine
www.businessperspectives.org

Received on: 26th of April, 2024

Accepted on: 2nd of July, 2024

Published on: 3rd of September, 2024

© Tatenda Chikukwa, Melanie
Elizabeth Lourens, Sizwe Vincent
Mbona, 2024

Tatenda Chikukwa, Ph.D., Department
of Human Resource Management,
Faculty of Management Sciences,
Durban University of Technology,
South Africa. (Corresponding author)

Melanie Elizabeth Lourens, Ph.D.,
Department of Human Resource
Management, Faculty of Management
Sciences, Durban University of
Technology, South Africa.

Sizwe Vincent Mbona, Ph.D.,
Department of Statistics, Faculty of
Applied Sciences, Durban University of
Technology, South Africa.



This is an Open Access article,
distributed under the terms of the
[Creative Commons Attribution 4.0
International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits
unrestricted re-use, distribution, and
reproduction in any medium, provided
the original work is properly cited.

Conflict of interest statement:

Author(s) reported no conflict of interest

Tatenda Chikukwa (South Africa), **Melanie Elizabeth Lourens** (South Africa),
Sizwe Vincent Mbona (South Africa)

EXAMINING EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND ITS IMPORTANCE AT THE SELECTED SOUTH AFRICAN UNIVERSITY

Abstract

An engaged workforce is vital for higher education institutions to contribute positively to the developing world. The purpose of this study is to examine employee engagement and its significance for academic and administrative employees at the Durban University of Technology in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal in South Africa. The study opted for a quantitative research design to explore the role and importance of employee engagement. The target population consisted of 1,861 university employees at the selected university in South Africa, and 320 employee from different university units and positions were selected using simple random sampling without replacement. The results revealed that 80% of respondents exert high levels of physical energy, concentration, and dedication toward achieving institutional objectives. Additionally, the results showed a significant difference in the support employees get, with administrative staff receiving more support than academic staff members. The study concluded that university employees exhibit high levels of physical energy at work. In addition, the study found a significant and positive relationship between employees exhibiting high levels of physical energy at work and employees who find their work meaningful and experience inspiration.

Keywords

higher education, universities, employee engagement,
academics, administrative staff members, support, vigor

JEL Classification

J24, L20, M54, O15

INTRODUCTION

The higher education environment is volatile and complex due to changing technological developments, competition, and increasing demands from various stakeholders. The ever-changing complex environment requires universities to not just focus on being sustainable and competitive but also understand the importance of employees and their sustained well-being (Inceoglu et al., 2018). Despite the higher education sector in South Africa being fragmented and unequal two decades after independence, higher education institutions are still viewed as the primary tool for sustainable economic development, growth, and transformation. Thus, engaged employees become crucial in contributing to the success of universities. However, despite employee engagement gaining popularity and being associated with positive institutional outcomes, a lack of a general definition in both theoretical and practitioner/consultancy literature overshadows its importance in the workplace. In addition, low employee engagement levels have been found across the higher education sector as numerous studies have brought attention to the fact that academic and non-academic employees are faced with declining working conditions and a dearth of employee engagement (Nazir & Islam, 2017; Kovaleski & Arghode, 2021). For instance, a 2013 Gallup study highlighted that em-

Employee engagement is a problem across universities as only 34% of employees were engaged, while 52% and 40% were not engaged and actively disengaged, respectively (Wasilowski, 2018). Zondo (2020) concluded that a mere 9% of the workforce was actively engaged, while at least 45% was actively disengaged.

Moreover, historically disadvantaged universities in South Africa, such as the Durban University of Technology, are further affected by external challenges such as declining funding, autonomy issues, transformation, massification, rising debt, and internal challenges such as heavy workloads, research output targets, student matters and protests, administrative issues among other issues (Bhana & Suknunan, 2021). These challenges can potentially lower employee engagement levels and result in employee disengagement. Employee disengagement manifests in low morale and deviant behavior and is associated with negative organizational outcomes, such as increased stress, anxiety, job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, staff turnover, declining work quality, and limited/no discretionary effort, which may negatively affect the achievement of institutional goals. Engaged employees are an asset and investment to universities as they are more profitable, productive, focused, and less likely to leave the organization, while disengaged and actively disengaged employees are a liability (Raina & Khatri, 2015; Chanana, 2021; Louw & Steyn, 2021). Therefore, it is imperative to investigate employee engagement and its significance for university employees.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

The phenomenon of employee engagement is found in both academic and practitioner/consultancy literature and is fundamental for individual and organizational outcomes. According to Jensen and Massyn (2017), definitions originating from academic literature highlight that employee engagement is the pervasive state in which individuals apply psychological, emotional, and physical effort to their work. On the other hand, practitioner literature often portrays employee engagement as an attitudinal concept linked to job satisfaction and other related constructs. Definitions from practitioner literature may not hold the same level of reliability as they are based on practical experiences rather than empirical research. Moreover, research studies by practitioners often utilize proprietary measuring instruments and methodologies that are not available for peer review, thereby limiting their validation (Saks, 2006; Schaufeli, 2013; Jensen & Massyn, 2017). In academic literature, various terms have been utilized to describe engagement, including personal engagement, employee engagement, work engagement, job engagement, and organizational engagement (Zhang et al., 2014; Nazir & Islam, 2017).

According to Zhang et al. (2014) and Chanana (2021), employee engagement is a multidimen-

sional motivation construct consistent with positive organizational psychology. It ensures that all adherents of an organization give off their excellence every day and are committed to the organization's mission, strategy execution, goals, and values. Raina and Khatri (2015), Geldenhuys et al. (2014), and Zondo (2020) affirm that employee engagement is a psychological and physical demonstration of how employees understand their role and their commitment to stewardship that manifests in improved productivity/performance. Tepayakul and Rinthaisong (2018) highlight that employee engagement is an attitude and behavior that employees bring in or leave out during their work performance. Furthermore, Louw and Steyn (2021) highlight that from a leadership perspective, employee engagement is a result of engaged leadership, where leaders lead in a way that engages employees. De-la-Calle-Durán and Rodríguez-Sánchez (2021) acknowledge that employee engagement entails a more persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state that is not momentary and specific to any particular object, event, or behavior. Chanana (2021) warns that employee engagement should not be a one-time implementation but should be integrated into the organizational culture. Zhang et al. (2014) and Raina and Khatri (2015) acknowledge that both academic and consulting/practitioner literature seem to concur that employee engagement comprises three dimensions:

- Physical dimension (vigor) relates to energy, resilience, and a strong desire to work diligently, as demonstrated through employees' exceptional performance beyond their regular tasks and their consistent presence at the workplace.
- Emotional dimension encompasses an employee's level of social connection with their colleagues and superiors and pertains to the employee's level of engagement, enthusiasm, sense of pride, and willingness to face challenges in their work.
- Cognitive dimension of employee engagement refers to the extent to which an employee clearly understands the role and purpose within the organization, i.e., the ability to concentrate and maintain a state of well-being while carrying out duties.

Four prominent academic theories have emerged, namely, Kahn's engagement theory, burnout antithesis, social exchange theory, and the Job-Demands Resources (JD-R) model. Kovalski and Arghode (2021) highlight that these theories suggest that employee engagement is a motivational state that depends on an employee's perception of valued resources and is linked to improved performance. Kahn's (1990) theory seeks to understand why employees apply varying degrees of physical, cognitive, and emotional selves to their roles. He identified psychological meaningfulness (receiving a return on investment of one's physical, cognitive, and emotional energy), psychological safety (ability to apply yourself), and psychological availability as driving factors of employee engagement (Kahn, 1990). Kahn's conceptualization lacks clear constructs required for the operationalization of employee engagement.

The burnout antithesis approach emerged from burnout research and investigated the conditions that cause employee engagement. Burnout encompasses exhaustion, cynicism, and professional efficacy. Exhaustion is characterized by a depletion of mental energy, and cynicism represents negative attitudes toward one's work and colleagues. The third element is a diminished sense of professional efficacy, leading to doubts regarding one's competency in one's work do-

main. According to Schaufeli and Bakker (2004), there is a continuum between employee engagement on the positive extreme and burnout on the negative extreme. They argue that employee engagement is a distinct construct that should be assessed independently from burnout, as they are not necessarily the same thing (Gruman & Saks, 2011).

Thirdly, the social exchange theory suggests that employee engagement is a way for employees to repay the resources provided by their employers and is based on the idea that relationships evolve to foster loyalty and trust (Jensen & Massyn, 2017). Chiwawa and Wissink (2021) highlight that the social exchange theory proposes that employees naturally find meaning in their work, and those with more fulfilling jobs are likely to experience higher levels of employee engagement.

Lastly, the JD-R model explores employee well-being and explains how job demands and resources can contribute to burnout and/or employee engagement. According to the model, job resources are beneficial for achieving work goals and personal growth, while job demands are factors related to how a job should be performed. Job demands and resources predict burnout, while their availability predicts employee engagement.

Daniels (2015) and Kovalski and Arghode (2021) highlight limited research studies on employee engagement specific to higher education despite the lack of employee engagement suggested within academia. For instance, Hakeem and Gulzar (2015) concluded that the level of employee engagement at the University of Kashmir was fairly good and that the engaged lecturers were an investment as they were efficient, effective, and productive. Nazir and Islam (2017) and Bryne and MacDonagh (2017) found that perceived organizational support was a significant predictor of employee engagement. Employees who perceive great institutional support (being appreciated and cared for, helping employees overcome barriers/cope with job demands) will likely repay through high levels of engagement (investing fully in what they do and the organization/passion; high vigor and enthusiasm), commitment, and performance as sug-

gested by the social exchange theory. Moreover, Pongton and Suntrayuth (2019) found that communication and job satisfaction in Thai universities have an effect on employee engagement as well as a positive effect on positive organizational outcomes, such as job performance. Similarly, Azmy (2019) found that employee engagement is crucial in improving academic quality at a tertiary institution in West Java. Seven dimensions had a significant influence on employee engagement, namely, supervisor relationship, employee satisfaction, compensation, corporate communication, job environment, training and development, and resources. Kovalski and Arghode (2021) suggested that clearly outlining employee engagement components, such as promotions and social interactions (relationships between leadership, colleagues, and students), should be considered when universities design and implement employee engagement strategies.

Several studies have been conducted in South Africa on employee engagement. Ngobeni and Bezuidenhout (2011) concluded that despite a lack of feedback and recognition for performance, university employees at Tshwane University of Technology in South Africa were aware of their job expectations, recognized the significance of their roles, and had the chance to utilize their skills daily. A study conducted in TVETs in South Africa by Mmako and Schultz (2016) in technical and vocational colleges found that despite disengagement, recognition and feedback were vital in enhancing employee engagement among lecturers. In addition, Bhana and Suknunan (2021) found that university employees were actively taking on responsibilities that go beyond their designated job roles at a public University of Technology in South Africa. A notable portion of employees were not willing to offer assistance to their colleagues, which could potentially lead to employee disengagement.

However, other empirical studies and scholars have argued about the existence of the dark side of employee engagement. For instance, Garrad and Chamorro-Premuzic (2016) and Imperatori (2017) warn that employee engagement has the potential to result in negative outcomes, such as poor performance, stress, exhaustion, and employee burnout.

Therefore, this study aims to investigate employee engagement and its significance for university employees. Moreover, this study seeks to determine the relationship between various employee engagement dimensions. Accordingly, the following hypotheses are developed:

H₁: There is a significant relationship between employment type and support received by employees from their superiors.

H₂: There is a significant relationship between vigor and inspiration at work.

H₃: There is a significant relationship between vigor and concentration at work.

H₄: There is a significant relationship between vigor and meaningful work.

H₅: There is a significant relationship between vigor and support from co-workers and superiors.

H₆: There is a significant relationship between inspiration and concentration at work.

H₇: There is a significant relationship between inspiration and meaningful work.

H₈: There is a significant relationship between inspiration and work environment.

H₉: There is a significant relationship between inspiration and support from co-workers and superiors.

H₁₀: There is a significant relationship between concentration and meaningful work.

H₁₁: There is a significant relationship between concentration and work environment.

H₁₂: There is a significant relationship between concentration and support from co-workers and superiors.

H₁₃: There is a significant relationship between meaningful work and work environment.

H₁₄: There is a significant relationship between meaningful work and support from co-workers and superiors.

2. METHOD

The quantitative research design is rooted in positivism. According to Muijs (2011) and Allen (2017), quantitative research emphasizes an empirical inquiry that allows for the gathering and analysis of numerical data to understand a phenomenon. Frey (2018) acknowledges that quantitative research is used to quantify attitudes, opinions, and behaviors and is characterized by neutrality and objectivity, empiricism, accuracy and precision, logical reasoning, and parsimonious explanations. A close-ended structured questionnaire (Appendix A) was adopted as the measuring instrument to collect primary data from sample respondents. The sample respondents were employees at the Durban University of Technology in KwaZulu-Natal in South Africa. Questionnaires were adopted as they are less expensive, convenient for respondents, and allow greater anonymity and no interview invariability (Ngulube, 2020).

Before distribution, the questionnaire was piloted with 15 respondents excluded from the sample list. The pilot study results were used to improve the terminology and technical aspects of the questionnaire (Andrew et al., 2019; Hair Jr et al., 2020). The reliability of the measuring instrument was evaluated using the most common estimate called Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α) to check the internal consistency of the items (Cronbach, 1951; Cronbach & Shavelson, 2004). By convention, an alpha value between 0.65 and 0.80 is often considered 'acceptable' for a scale used in human dimensions research (Vaske, 2019). The Cronbach's alpha shows the internal consistency of the items and their stability (Nunally & Bernstein, 1994). In all the sections, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was greater than the threshold of 0.6 (Bagozzi & Yi, 1998), thus showing consistency and reliability for data analysis (Table 2). The overall Cronbach's alpha for all the items was 0.864, which is larger than the recommended upper end (i.e., > 0.8). The study was approved by the Durban University of Technology Institutional Research Ethics Committee. The questionnaire was distributed to 320 respondents, and the collected responses amounted to a 71.0% response rate.

With regard to the measuring instrument, the measurement items incorporated the use of a five-point Likert scale, which allows respondents to

indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with a statement (Andrew et al., 2019). Apart from facilitating easy coding and analysis, Hair Jr et al. (2020) add that Likert scales are vital in measuring the attitudes and opinions of respondents. In addition, the completed questionnaire did not contain any identifying information about the individual subjects. All data were kept confidential, and data protection was observed at all stages of the study. The cleaned data were uploaded into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 29.0 for data analysis. The paper used descriptive statistics to present the demographic data of the participants. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated to check the reliability and consistency of the items. The correlation and Chi-squared tests are the inferential statistics used to interpret the data. The p -value < 0.05 was taken as statistically significant.

The sample respondents' profile, as illustrated in Table 1, shows that 37.3% were males, while 62.7% were females. Concerning age group (years), the majority of the respondents (42.1%) were aged between 26-35 years, followed by those in the age group 36-45 years (22.7%), 46-55 years (18.9%), less than 25 years (10.7%), and those who were above 55 years old (5.6%). About 80% of the sample respondents had a qualification above a bachelor's degree, while a mere 20% had either a diploma or a matric/certificate as their highest level of education. Furthermore, Table 1 shows that 55.8% were either administrative or support staff members, while 44.2% were academic staff members at the selected university. More than half of the sample respondents (63.5%) were permanent staff members, 35.6% were contract employees, and 0.4% selected other types of employment contracts. Moreover, most sample respondents (72.0%) had less than 10 years of experience, while 27.8% had more than 11 years of experience at the selected university.

Table 1. Demographic profile of the participants

Variable	Items	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	87	37.3
	Female	146	62.7
Age group (years)	≤ 25	25	10.7
	26-35	98	42.1
	36-45	53	22.7
	46-55	44	18.9
	≥ 56	13	5.6

Table 1 (cont.). Demographic profile of the participants

Variable	Items	Frequency	Percent
Highest education achieved	Matric	11	4.7
	Diploma	35	15.0
	Bachelor's degree	67	28.8
	Honor's degree	26	11.2
	Postgraduate degree	94	40.3
Job type	Administration/ support staff	130	55.8
	Academic	103	44.2
Type of employment	Permanent	148	63.5
	Contract	83	35.6
	Any other	1	0.4
How long have you been working in this university?	Below 12 months	29	12.4
	1-5 years	76	32.6
	6-10 years	63	27.0
	11-15 years	24	10.3
	16-20 years	15	6.4
	21-25 years	13	5.6
	26-30 years	8	3.4
	31 years and above	5	2.1

3. RESULTS

Table 2 presents the mean and Cronbach's alpha for the items for the employee engagement dimension. A mean value between 1 and 2.99 indicates agreement, 3 and 3.99 indicates neutral, and 4 and 5 indicates disagreement. The mean (\bar{x}) value for the items ranged from 1.65 to 2.67 (Table 2). The Likert scale responses of the participants ranged from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5). Based on the results, it can be concluded that all the items have a similar spread.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics

Section	Items	α	\bar{x}
Vigor at work	3	0.775	1.68
			1.65
			1.82
Inspiration at work	3	0.780	1.76
			2.10
			1.96
Concentration at work	3	0.651	1.73
			1.90
			2.43
Meaningful work	3	0.684	1.88
			1.73
			2.21

Section	Items	α	\bar{x}
Work environment	4	0.671	2.32
			1.73
			2.58
			2.67
Support at work	3	0.770	2.15
			2.27
			2.33
Overall		0.864	

Note: α – Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient; \bar{x} – Mean.

Table 3 depicts the relationship between the type of employment and the support they receive from their superiors. Based on the Chi-squared test results, there was a statistically significant difference among administrative staff members and academics regarding the support they receive from their superiors (p -value = 0.042). In addition, more administration staff members (37.0%) agreed that they receive support from their managers, as compared to 27.9% of academic staff members who agreed with the statement.

Table 3. The relationship between type of employment and support at work

Response option	Administration	Academics	p-value
Strongly agree	26 (11.2)	25 (10.7)	0.042*
Agree	60 (25.8)	40 (17.2)	
Neutral	35 (15.0)	23 (9.9)	
Disagree	3 (1.3)	12 (5.2)	
Strongly disagree	6 (2.6)	3 (1.3)	
TOTAL	130 (55.8)	103 (44.2)	

Note: * Statistically significant (p -value < 0.05).

The paper further computed the pair-wise correlations to measure the relationship between the dimensions of employee engagement. The results from the pair-wise correlations are illustrated in Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Table 4 presents the effects of the vigor dimension of employee engagement on other dimensions of employee engagement, namely, concentration at work, meaningful work, work environment, support at work, and inspiration at work. Based on Table 4, vigor has a positive and highly statistically significant correlation ($p < 0.05$) with inspiration at work ($r = 0.484$), concentration at work (0.430), meaningful work (0.278), and work environment (0.118). In addition, there is a statistically insignificant

Table 4. Vigor at work

Constructs	Pearson Correlation Co-efficient	p-value	Decision
Vigor – Inspiration at work	0.484	<0.001*	Supported
Vigor – Concentration at work	0.513	<0.001*	Supported
Vigor – Meaningful work	0.430	<0.001*	Supported
Vigor – Work environment	0.278	<0.001*	Supported
Vigor – Support at work	0.118	0.072	Not Supported

Note: *Statistically significant (p -value < 0.05).

Table 5. Inspiration at work

Constructs	Pearson Correlation Co-efficient	p-value	Decision
Inspiration at work – Concentration at work	0.461	<0.001*	Supported
Inspiration at work – Meaningful work	0.588	<0.001*	Supported
Inspiration at work – Work environment	0.422	<0.001*	Supported
Inspiration at work – Support at work	0.405	<0.001*	Supported

Note: *Statistically significant (p -value < 0.05).

nificant relationship between vigor and the presence of support from co-workers and supervisors at work ($p > 0.05$).

Table 5 presents the relationship between the inspiration dimension of employee engagement and three other dimensions, namely, meaningful work, work environment, and support at work. The results show a positive and highly significant relationship between inspiration at work and the other three dimensions of employee engagement ($p < 0.05$).

Table 6 presents the effects of concentration at work on meaningful work, work environment, and support at work. The results show a positive and statistically significant correlation between concentration at work and each of the three employee engagement dimensions, namely, meaningful work, work environment, and support at work ($p < 0.05$).

Table 6. Concentration at work

Constructs	Pearson Correlation Co-efficient	p-value	Decision
Concentration at work – Meaningful work	0.449	<0.001*	Supported
Concentration at work – Work environment	0.344	<0.001*	Supported
Concentration at work – Support at work	0.182	0.005*	Supported

Note: *Statistically significant (p -value < 0.05).

Table 7. Meaningful work

Constructs	Pearson Correlation Co-efficient	p-value	Decision
Meaningful work – Work environment	0.411	<0.001*	Supported
Meaningful work – Support at work	0.255	<0.001*	Supported

Note: *Statistically significant (p -value < 0.05).

Table 7 depicts the relationship between meaningful work and work environment as well as support at work. Based on the findings, there is a positive and statistically significant correlation between meaningful work and work environment ($p < 0.05$). In addition, there is a positive and statistically significant relationship between meaningful work and support at work constructs ($p < 0.05$).

4. DISCUSSION

The findings revealed a positive correlation between vigor and the four dimensions of employee engagement, namely, concentration at work, meaningful work, work environment, and inspiration at work. Morris (2009) and Sharafizad et al. (2020) highlights that when employees are engaged, they are prepared to voluntarily expand discretionary effort, which helps the organization

improve its performance efficacy as well as goal attainment. Organizations need to note that when employees are afraid of potential job loss, engagement is eroded, and it engenders undesirable negative attitudinal and behavioral outcomes, such as absenteeism, counterproductive work behaviors, disengagement, disinvolvement, and psychological withdrawal (Asfaw & Chang, 2019; Karatepe et al., 2020).

The findings further revealed that inspiration and employee emotions are significantly correlated to support at work, meaningful work, and work environment. According to Paakkanen et al. (2021), the act of sharing negative and/or positive emotions is prevalent in the workplace, and it has affective and relational consequences such as work relationships, collaboration, employee well-being, and work performance. Workplace activities that evoke and cultivate positive emotions and experiences, which include pleasure, meaning, and accomplishment, are critical in achieving success, psychological growth, and improved mental and physical health (well-being) (Aarrestad et al., 2015; Quidbach et al., 2015; Wall et al., 2017).

In addition, the results revealed a positive and significant relationship between concentration at work and meaningful work, support at work, and work environment. Dubreuil et al. (2014) highlight that when employees use their strengths, they enter into a state of deep concentration and involvement, which involves attention to detail and effective and efficient information processing. In addition, despite the literature not being consistent on the relationship between psychological detachment from work and work performance, remaining mentally present at work is not ideal

for employee satisfaction, well-being, and health (Sonnentag et al., 2008; Olafsen & Bentzen, 2020). According to Asmui et al. (2012), good ergonomic practices have the potential to create a comfortable and welcoming work environment as well as influence the physical and mental capabilities of employees. Kim and Jang (2022) affirm that a comfortable working environment positively influences the psychological responses of employees.

Moreover, the findings revealed a positive and significant correlation between meaningful work and work environment, as well as the availability of co-worker and supervisor support at work. Albrecht et al. (2021) highlight that apart from fostering meaningful work through diverse practices, organizations have the responsibility to establish the basic moral conditions that allow meaningful workplaces to flourish. Kahn's (1990) employee engagement model posits that meaningfulness results from employees experiencing challenging work, task variety, and jobs that allow employees to feel that they are making a valuable contribution. Furthermore, the JD-R model recognizes that employees who possess a clear comprehension of the significance and objective of their tasks are inclined to display high levels of engagement, motivation, and dedication (Albrecht et al., 2021). Tommasi et al. (2020) affirm that a job is a source of meaningfulness when employees experience a sense of value from their work. Experiencing meaningfulness at work has the potential to result in individual, work-related, and organizational attitudinal and motivational outcomes such as satisfaction, psychological well-being, greater commitment, involvement, improved motivation, lower absenteeism, engagement, and growth (Van Wingerden & Van der Stoep, 2018; Albrecht et al., 2021).

CONCLUSION

The study aimed to ascertain the role and importance of employee engagement among university employees at the selected university in South Africa. The results highlighted the indispensable role of employee engagement in enhancing institutional success and viability. The study also provided valuable insight into the magnetic force that employee engagement possesses, as well as the indispensable role of employee engagement in enhancing institutional sustainability and success in the South African higher education landscape.

The paper found that administrative support employees received more support from their line managers than academics. In addition, vigor or physical energy at work was positively correlated to inspira-

tion, concentration, and meaningful work. Moreover, meaningful work was also found to be positively related to work environment and support at work.

Universities should develop and implement a structured employee engagement strategy, continuously invest in workplace ergonomics, prioritize supervisor and organizational support, improve job security, and promote employee innovation and creativity. The study highlights that engaged employees are critical in generating ideas, skills, and talent necessary to enhance institutional effectiveness, sustainability, and competitiveness.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: Tatenda Chikukwa.

Data curation: Tatenda Chikukwa, Melanie Elizabeth Lourens.

Formal analysis: Melanie Elizabeth Lourens.

Funding acquisition: Sizwe Vincent Mbona.

Investigation: Tatenda Chikukwa, Sizwe Vincent Mbona.

Methodology: Tatenda Chikukwa, Melanie Elizabeth Lourens, Sizwe Vincent Mbona.

Resources: Sizwe Vincent Mbona.

Software: Tatenda Chikukwa, Melanie Elizabeth Lourens.

Supervision: Sizwe Vincent Mbona.

Validation: Melanie Elizabeth Lourens.

Visualization: Melanie Elizabeth Lourens.

Writing – original draft: Tatenda Chikukwa, Melanie Elizabeth Lourens, Sizwe Vincent Mbona.

Writing – review & editing: Tatenda Chikukwa, Melanie Elizabeth Lourens, Sizwe Vincent Mbona.

REFERENCES

1. Aarrestad, M., Brøndbo, M. T., & Carlsen, A. (2015). When stakes are high and guards are low: High-quality connections in knowledge creation. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 22(2), 88-98. <https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.1469>
2. Albrecht, S. L., Green, C. R., & Marty, A. (2021). Meaningful work, job resources, and employee engagement. *Sustainability*, 13(7), Article 4045. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13074045>
3. Allen, M. (2017). *The SAGE encyclopedia of communication research methods*. London: SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483381411.n293>
4. Andrew, D. P., Pedersen, P. M., & McEvoy, C. D. (2019). *Research methods and design in sport management*. Human Kinetics.
5. Asfaw, A. G., & Chang, C. C. (2019). The association between job insecurity and engagement of employees at work. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 34(2), 96-110. <https://doi.org/10.1080%2F15555240.2019.1600409>
6. Asmui, A., Hussin, A., & Paino, H. (2012). The importance of work environment facilities. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 2(1), 289-298. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijld.v2i1.1325>
7. Azmy, A. (2019). Employee engagement factors in a higher education institution. *Binus Business Review*, 10(3), 187-200. <https://doi.org/10.21512/bbr.v10i3.5857>
8. Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16, 74-94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009207038801600107>
9. Bhana, A., & Suknunan, S. (2021). Exploring leadership factors creating employee engagement or disengagement across job grade categories at a public higher education institution in South Africa. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 19(1), 317-327. [http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19\(1\).2021.27](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19(1).2021.27)
10. Bryne, O., & MacDonagh, J. (2017). What's love got to do with it? Employee engagement amongst higher education workers. *The Irish Journal of Management*, 36(3), 189-205. Retrieved from <https://intapi.sciendo.com/pdf/10.1515/ijm-2017-0019>
11. Chanana, N. (2021). Employee engagement practices during COVID-19 lockdown. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 21(4), Article e2508. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2508>
12. Chiwawa, N., & Wissink, H. (2021). Determinants of employee engagement in the South African hospitality industry during COVID-19 lockdown epoch: Employee perception. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 10(2), 487-499. <http://dx.doi.org/10.46222/ajhtl.19770720.113>

13. Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334. Retrieved from http://cda.psych.uiuc.edu/psychometrika_highly_cited_articles/cronbach_1951.pdf
14. Cronbach, L. J., & Shavelson, R. J. (2004). My current thoughts on coefficient alpha and successor procedures. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 64(3), 391-418. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164404266386>
15. Daniels, J. R. (2015). *An exploratory comparative case study of employee engagement in Christian higher education* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). School of Behavioural and Applied Sciences, Azusa Pacific University.
16. De-la-Calle-Durán, M. C., & Rodríguez-Sánchez, J. L. (2021). Employee engagement and well-being in times of COVID-19: A proposal of the 5Cs model. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(10), Article 5470. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18105470>
17. Dubreuil, P., Forest, J., & Courcy, F. (2014). From strengths use to work performance: The role of harmonious passion, subjective vitality, and concentration. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 9(4), 335-349. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2014.898318>
18. Frey, B. (2018). *The SAGE encyclopedia of educational research, measurement, and evaluation*. Sage Publications.
19. Garrad, L., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2016). *The dark side of high employment engagement*. Harvard Business review. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2016/08/the-dark-side-of-high-employee-engagement>
20. Geldenhuys, M., Laba, K., & Venter, C. M. (2014). Meaningful work, work engagement and organisational commitment. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40(1), Article a1098. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v40i1.1098>
21. Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(2), 123-136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.09.004>
22. Hair Jr, J. F., Page, M., & Brunsveld, N. (2020). *Essentials of business research methods* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
23. Hakeem, I. A., & Gulzar, S. (2015). Employee engagement: An empirical study of higher education sector in Kashmir. *Abhinav International Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Management and Technology*, 4(4), 20-27. Retrieved from <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=9057e3b5c1553569d49356b5afaf92de10773e19>
24. Imperatori, B. (2017). *Engagement and disengagement at work: Drivers and organisational practices to sustain employee passion and performance*. Cham: Springer Science + Business media.
25. Inceoglu, I., Thomas, G., Chu, C., Plans, D., & Gerbasi, A. (2018). Leadership behavior and employee well-being: An integrated review and a future research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 179-202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.006>
26. Jensen, J., & Massyn, L. (2017). Employee engagement: The magic bullet for all corporate ills. *The 29th SAIMS Annual Conference*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Osayuwamen-Omoruyi/publication/348930967_Conference_proceedings_of_the_29th_Annual_SAIMS_conference/links/6017dc43a6fdcc071ba93653/Conference-proceedings-of-the-29th-Annual-SAIMS-conference.pdf
27. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256287>
28. Karatepe, O. M., Rezapouraghdam, H. & Hassannia, R. (2020). Job insecurity, work engagement and their effects on hotel employees' non-green and nonattendance behaviors. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 87, Article 102472. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102472>
29. Kim, M., & Jang, J. (2022). The effect of physical environment of the employee break room on psychological well-being through work engagement in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 21(2), 175-196. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2022.2031606>
30. Kovaleski, B. J., & Arghode, V. (2021). Employee engagement: Exploring higher education non-tenure track faculty members' perceptions. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 45(8/9), 796-813. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-06-2020-0113>
31. Louw, T., & Steyn, R. (2021). Workplace engagement of South African Millennials: A non-issue? *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa*, 17(1), Article a938. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/td.v17i1.938>
32. Mmako, M., & Schultz, C. (2016). An employee engagement framework for technical vocational education and training colleges in South Africa. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 30(2), 143-163. <https://doi.org/10.20853/30-2-606>
33. Morris, R. J. (2009). *Employee work motivation and discretionary work effort* (Doctoral dissertation). Queensland University of Technology.
34. Muijs, D. (2011). Researching leadership: Towards a new paradigm. In T. Townsend & J. MacBeath (Eds.), *International Handbook of Leadership for Learning* (pp. 115-125). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-1350-5_9
35. Nazir, O., & Islam, J. U. (2017). Enhancing organizational commitment and employee performance through employee engagement: An empirical check. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, 6(1), 98-114. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-04-2016-0036>
36. Ngobeni, E. K., & Bezuidenhout, A. (2011). Engaging employees for improved retention at a higher

- education institution in South Africa. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(23), 9961-9970. Retrieved from <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=9accbebea82ec6569ec57d1b7df6bdec602ece68>
37. Ngulube, P. (2020). *Handbook of research on mixed methods research in information science*. IGI Global. Retrieved from https://books.google.co.za/books?hl=en&lr=&id=AfNLEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR1&dq=Handbook+of+research+on+mixed+method+s+research+in+information+science.+IGI+Global.&ots=eNk6zbBvz9&sig=CgKlfdfgLUE5eTAYe_uYsOiEJA4&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Handbook%20of%20research%20on%20mixed%20methods%20research%20in%20information%20science.%20IGI%20Global.&f=false
 38. Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
 39. Olafsen, A. H., & Bentzen, M. (2020). Benefits of psychological detachment from work: Does autonomous work motivation play a role? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00824>
 40. Pongton, P., & Suntrayuth, S. (2019). Communication satisfaction, employee engagement, job satisfaction, and job performance in higher education institutions. *ABAC Journal*, 39(3), 90-110. Retrieved from <http://www.assumptionjournal.au.edu/index.php/abacjournal/article/view/4204>
 41. Paakkanen, M. A., Martela, F., & Pessi, A. B. (2021). Responding to positive emotions at work – The four steps and potential benefits of a validating response to co-worker's positive experiences. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.668160>
 42. Quoidbach, J., Mikolajczak, M., & Gross, J. J. (2015). Positive interventions: an emotion regulation. *Perspective. Psychological Bulletin*, 141(3), 655-693. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038648>
 43. Raina, K., & Khatri, P. (2015). Faculty engagement in higher education: prospects and areas of research. *On the Horizon*, 23(4), 285-308. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/OTH-03-2015-0011>
 44. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
 45. Schaufeli, W. B. (2013). What is engagement? In K. Truss, K. Alfes, R. Delbridge, A. Shantz, & E. Soane (Eds.), *Employee Engagement in theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
 46. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 25(3), 293-315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
 47. Sharafzad, J., Redmond, J., & Morris, R. (2020). Leadership/management factors impact on employee engagement and discretionary effort. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 23(1), 43-64. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-12-2018-0134>
 48. Sonnentag, S., Mojza, E. J., Binnewies, C., & Scholl, A. (2008). Being engaged at work and detached at home: A week-level study on work engagement, psychological detachment, and affect. *Work and Stress*, 22(3), 257-276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802379440>
 49. Tepayakul, R., & Rinthaisong, I. (2018). Job satisfaction and employee engagement among human resources staff of Thai private higher education institutions. *The Journal of Behavioral Science*, 13(2), 68-81. Retrieved from <https://so06.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/IJBS/article/view/109260>
 50. Tommasi, F., Ceschi, A., & Sartori, R. (2020). Viewing meaningful work through the lens of time. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.585274>
 51. Vaske, J. J. (2019). *Survey research and analysis* (2nd ed.). Sagamore-Venture.
 52. Wall, T., Russell, J., & Moore, N. (2017). Positive emotion in workplace impact: The case of a work-based learning project utilising appreciative inquiry. *Journal of Work-Applied Management*, 9(2), 129-146. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JWAM-07-2017-0017>
 53. Wasilowski, S. (2018). Employee engagement in higher education. *Journal of Social Science Research*, 12(2), 2699-2712. <https://doi.org/10.24297/jssr.v12i2.7435>
 54. Zhang, T., Avery, G. C., Bergstein, H., & More, E. (2014). The relationship between leadership paradigms and employee engagement. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 5(1), 4-21. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JGR-02-2014-0006>
 55. Zondo, R. W. (2020). The influence of employee engagement on labour productivity in an automotive assembly organisation in South Africa. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 23(1), Article a3043. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v23i1.3043>

APPENDIX A

SECTION A. DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Please provide information about yourself by ticking (✓) the appropriate response(s).

1. Please specify your gender.

- Male
- Female

2. Kindly indicate your age category.

- Below 25 years
- 26-35 years
- 36-45 years
- 46-55 years
- 56 years and above

3. What is your highest educational attainment?

- Matric
- Diploma
- Bachelor's degree
- Honor's degree
- Postgraduate degree

4. Kindly indicate your job type at the Durban University of Technology.

- Administration
- Academic

5. Please indicate whether you are a permanent or contract staff member at the Durban University of Technology.

- Permanent
- Contract
- Any other

6. How long have you been working at the Durban University of Technology?

- Below 12 months
- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- 21-25 years
- 26-30 years
- 31 years and above

SECTION B. EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT SURVEY

	1	2	3	4	5
At DUT, I exert high levels of energy in my work.					
I am eager to exert extra effort (discretionary effort) to ensure that institutional goals are achieved.					
During difficult times, I invest persistence in my work.					
The work I do at DUT is full of meaning, purpose, and passion.					
At DUT, I experience positive emotions such as enthusiasm, pride, and involvement.					
My job at DUT inspires me.					
When I am at work, I focus and concentrate on my work.					
At DUT, I am engrossed (immersed) in my work.					
I find it difficult to detach myself from work.					
The work I do at DUT is personally meaningful to me.					
I feel that the work I do is valuable to DUT.					
DUT provides me with a variety of work.					
I have the appropriate physical resources to execute my duties and responsibilities.					
When at work, I am confident about my own capabilities.					
DUT creates a sense of security for its employees.					
I freely express my views and opinions at DUT.					
At DUT, I receive support from co-workers.					
At DUT, I receive support from my superiors.					
The DUT environment is comfortable and welcoming.					