

## Work self-efficacy and job performance of business educators in public universities

Chika Ile<sup>1</sup>, James Edokpolor<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>Benson Idahosa University, Benin City, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>jedokpolor@biu.edu.ng

---

### Artikel history

*Received*

2022-02-10

*Revised*

2022-02-17

*Accepted*

2022-02-24

*Published*

2022-02-28

---

### Keywords :

business educators,  
contextual performance, job  
performance, task  
performance, work self-  
efficacy

### Abstract

The study examined the correlation between work self-efficacy and job performance of business educators in public universities. A correlational design was adopted and data were collected from a randomly selected sample of 142 business educators (12 HODs and 130 lecturers) using a structured psychological scale. Data were analyzed using Pearson correlation matrix and linear regression. Pearson correlation matrix was employed to answer the research question while linear regression was used to test the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. The result showed a significant but low correlation between work self-efficacy and task performance ( $r = .263$ ;  $p = .002$ ). The result also showed a significant but low correlation between work self-efficacy and contextual performance ( $r = .238$ ;  $p = .007$ ). The results also showed a significant but low correlation between work self-efficacy and overall job performance ( $r = .315$ ;  $p = .000$ ). These findings suggest that if university administrators and managers create or implement a challenging and resourceful work environment, it will help increase and sustain high level of work self-efficacy among business educators in public universities which, in turn, further increase their task performance and contextual performance..

---

*How to cite:* Ile, C., & Edokpolor, J. (2022). Work self-efficacy and job performance of business educators in public universities. *Insight: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 24(1), 01-12. doi: <https://doi.org/10.26486/psikologi.v24i1.2314>

---

## INTRODUCTION

Business education is conceptualized as a planned and organized program of learning experience which aimed to equip students with skills and knowledge required to confidently be gainfully employed and engaged in lifelong learning tasks upon graduation. This definition reflects the mission of business education program in equipping students with skills and knowledge to secure gainful employment in professional and occupational sub-disciplines (Office Management and Technology, Marketing and Accounting), or in related fields in the industry and to progress in professional and occupational careers. To achieve these obligations, competent business educators are required. The need for competent business educators in tertiary institutions is of great concern to major stakeholders of business education programme because of their salient role in preparing students for career progressions in various professions and occupations upon graduation (Oonk et al., 2020). The need for competent business educators in the university system may be due to their salient role in performing high job-related activities.

Job performance of business educators could be referred to as execution of different job activities that contribute to the achievement of the goals of business education programme, which represent two broad aspects: task performance and contextual performance. Task performance can be defined as the behaviours that directly contribute to core technical activities (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994), which include teaching, research and administration. Contextual performance, on the other hand, consists of the behaviours that go beyond core technical activities that may impact the culture and climate of the work environment (Demerouti et al., 2015).

Teaching task is usually carried out in the classrooms, workshops and laboratories where modern technologies are utilized for instructional purposes. Teaching tasks vary widely and include the use of PowerPoint, Internet, Skype, among others and various “hands-on” activities. Business educators also conduct scientific research through which they grow academically and professionally and contribute meaningfully to economic growth and development. Research tasks include the use of special software packages to develop research models, the use of anti-plagiarism software to check similarities in research manuscripts, the use of PROCESS macro, LISTREL, AMOS, GEN STAT and other statistical packages for data analyses. Business educators also carry out some administrative task in order to accomplish the objectives of business education. Administrative tasks include heading a unit, department, faculty or an institution, involving in admission exercises, functioning as a course adviser as well as planning, organizing, leading and controlling resources. Business educators also perform other jobs, which fall within the confines of contextual performance. Such contextual performance include voluntarily helping colleagues to complete their job tasks, putting in extra effort and extra time to complete given tasks, disclosing illegal practices to staff who are authorized to take action, voluntarily attending meetings or corporate functions, endorsing institutional goals, diffusing conflict, encouraging interpersonal trust, among others.

For business educators to perform their job effectively, there is need for administrators and managers of universities to implement a challenging and resourceful work environment that would sustain and increase high level of work self-efficacy among business educators. Work self-efficacy represent a cognitive factor which appear to be responsible fostering better job performance among business educators. Therefore, work self-efficacy may help to foster better job performance among business educators. The implication is that business educators who believes they are capable of executing specific work goals and objectives are more likely to perform better on the job. On the other hand, poor job performance may occur when business educators experience low level of work self-efficacy. In order words, when work self-inefficacy is high, business educators may perform poorly on the job. This could be why Hobfoll (2001) in the conservation of resources theory (CRT) held that employees must invest their resources to forestall resources loss, recover from resources loss and gain resources. For this reason, business educators who are prone to low work self-efficacy are not only likely to experience resource decrease but their previous resource decrease are

more likely to lead to future loss and, in turn, exposed them to poor job performance. Similarly, business educators who exert high work self-efficacy may gain more resources and their previous resource gain may beget future resource gains and, in turn, lead to better job performance.

Work self-efficacy represent a positive and motivational pathway of personal resources and appear to be the major factor leading to better job performance. A major aspect of personal resources adopted for this study is work self-efficacy, which involve peoples' beliefs about their capabilities to perform job-related activities (Bandura, 1986, 2000a; Carter et al., 2016; Pepe et al., 2010; Schaufeli & Taris, 2014). A study by Del Libano et al., (2010) showed that workers who are self-strong are bound to experience better work-related outcomes. However, a positive and motivational aspect of personal resources such as work self-efficacy could be linked to a better work-related outcomes. It, therefore, means that business educators who are self-efficacious may perform better on the job than business educators who are self-inefficacious. Taken together, job demands-resources (JD-R) theory (Bakker & Demerouti, 2013, 2014, 2017) argued that people who exert high work self-efficacy perform better on the job than people who exert low self-efficacy.

Since work self-efficacy involves the belief one holds regarding the amount of control one has over work environment (Bandura, 2000b, 2010), it is presumed in this study, that business educators' experiences of better job performance could be realized through work self-efficacy. On the basis of this interplay, it can be said that business educators' who experience better job performance exert high work self-efficacy, that is, if work self-efficacy of business educators' increases, their job performance would increase as well. Based on the positive and motivational roles of the JD-R theory, the authors hold the view that work self-efficacy may likely evoke a sense of relevance on business educators. It, therefore, implies that high work self-efficacy exert by business educators could be considered as an important asset for tertiary institutions in Nigeria. Despite the existence of enormous empirical literature in developed countries that examine the correlation between work self-efficacy and job performance, there seem to be nonexistent of such literature in developing countries that investigate whether correlation exist. It is on this note that this study is set out to examine the correlation between work self-efficacy and the two broad dimensions of job performance of business educators in universities in South-South, Nigeria. Based on the review of the related literature, the following hypotheses were proposed as follows:

1. Work self-efficacy is a significant positive predictor of task performance of business educators in public universities.
2. Work self-efficacy is a significant positive predictor of contextual performance of business educators in public universities.
3. Work self-efficacy is a significant positive predictor of overall job performance of business educators in public universities.

## METHOD

A correlational survey research design was adopted for the study. This design was suitable for the study because it determines the interplay between work self-efficacy and job performance of business educators in different public universities. The participants comprised of 142 business educators (12 HODs and 130 lecturers), which were used for the study without sampling because the size can be managed by the authors. Demographic characteristics of business educators measured in this study comprised gender, job tenure, academic qualification, area of specialization and age. Gender was represented as male (86, 60.6%), and female (56, 39.4%). Work experience was grouped as less than 10 years (43, 30.3%), 10 to 20 years (47, 33.1%), 21 to 30 years (44, 30.10%), and 31 years and above (08, 5.6%). Academic qualification was grouped as Bachelor's degree (42, 29.6%), Master's degree (60, 42.3%), and doctorate degree (40, 28.2%). Area of specialization was grouped as office technology and management education (68, 47.9%), accounting education (48, 33.8%), marketing education (16, 11.3%) and entrepreneurship education (10, 7.0%). Finally, age was grouped as less than 26 years (16, 11.3%), 26 to 35 years (36, 25.4%), 36 to 45 years (34, 23.9%), 46 to 55 years (24, 16.9%), 56 to 65 years (22, 15.5%), and 66 years and above (10, 7.0%).

The instruments for data collection were structured into two psychological scales, one were administered to lecturers and one were administered to HODs. The instrument for lecturers is titled "Questionnaire on Work Self-Efficacy of Business Educators (QWSEBE)" and the instrument for HODs is titled "Questionnaire on Job Performance of Business Educators (QJPBE)". The instrument for lecturers consists of 3 items, which was in line with the variables covered. Lecturers will rate their own experiences of work self-efficacy on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 4 = always to 1 = never. The instrument for HODs comprised of 30 items; 25 items measure task performance which cover teaching, research and administration and 5 items measure contextual performance which cover school community services. HODs rated their own experiences of job performance of business educators on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 4 = very rarely to 1 = not at all. Work self-efficacy were measured using items constructed by the authors. Task performance were measured using 25 items constructed by the authors. The scale developed by Goodman and Svyantek (1999) were adapted to measure the contextual performance of business educators

The instruments for data collection were subjected to face validity by three experts, two in business education and one in measurement and evaluation. The face validity of the instrument was done with respect to relevance, sentence structure and adequacy. To establish the reliability of the instrument, copies were administered on 20 business educators who were not part of the sample used for the present study. Similarly, copies of the instrument were administered on HOD, who were not part of the sample used for the present study. Thereafter, Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the internal consistency of the items of both instruments. The coefficients alpha values provided the reliability for each variables such as work self-efficacy ( $\alpha = .829$ ), task performance

( $\alpha = .953$ ), contextual performance ( $\alpha = .952$ ) and overall job performance ( $\alpha = .953$ ). Therefore, the coefficients gotten from the analysis meet the base rule worth of .600 edges to guarantee sufficient dependability measure on the inward consistency as suggested by Creswell & Poth (2018).

Instruments were distributed personally to the respondents, with the help of six research assistants who were briefed on the procedure to follow. The respondents were contacted via letters before the research instruments were administered on them using direct contact mode. They were allowed to complete the instruments and were given the chance to submit them within two weeks.

The questionnaire on work self-efficacy were administered on the business educators since the scales that measure the constructs are self-report measures. Conversely, the questionnaire on task performance and contextual performance were administered on the HODs to respond about the business educators since the scale is an alternate measure. In all, for approximate matching, the questionnaire were assigned codes. Such code in a particular business educator's questionnaire corresponds with the one the HOD filled about the business educator. The coding were achieved by working with the HOD using the staff list of the business educators in the department and units.

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0. The statistical tools employed are inferential statistics such as Pearson product moment correlation co-efficient (PPMCC), linear regression and bias corrected bootstrap estimate. PPMCC were utilized to address the research questions. Simple linear regression were utilized to test the speculations on prediction. The decision rule for the use of correlation matrix was based on a range of a coefficient value ( $r$ ) as recommended by Uzoagulu (2011) in the following order: Coefficients  $r$ -value between  $\pm .8$  and  $\pm 1.0$  means very high correlation;  $\pm .6$  and  $\pm .8$  means high correlation;  $\pm .4$  and  $\pm .6$  means moderate correlation;  $\pm .2$  and  $\pm .4$  means low correlation;  $\pm .0$  and  $\pm .2$  means very low correlation;  $\pm 1.0$  means perfect correlation; and coefficient  $r$ -value of 0 means no correlation. Note that when a coefficient  $r$ -value is a negative value, it is a negative correlation; which means also that as one variable increases the other decreases. When a coefficient  $r$ -value is a positive value, it is a positive correlation; which means that as one variable increases the other increases. For linear regression estimates, probability  $p$ -value less than or equal to .05 implies significant (reject  $H_0$ ) while probability  $p$ -value greater than .05 implies not significant (accept  $H_0$ ).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

**Table 1.** Pearson Correlations between Work Self-Efficacy, Task Performance, Contextual Performance and Overall Job Performance of Business Educators

S/N	Variables	1	2	3	4
1.	Work Self-Efficacy	1			
2.	Task Performance	.263**	1		
3.	Contextual Performance	.238**	.342**	1	
4.	Overall Job Performance	.315**	.945**	.568**	1

Note. \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$ ,  $N = 142$ .

Table 1 shows the data on the Pearson correlation between work self-efficacy, task performance, contextual performance and overall job performance of business educators. Table 1 shows that the correlation coefficient of between variables ranged from .238 to .945. The Table also shows that the correlation between work self-efficacy and task performance is positively low ( $r = .263$ ). The Table also shows that the correlation between work self-efficacy and contextual performance is positively low ( $r = .238$ ). The Table also shows that the correlation between work self-efficacy and overall job performance is positively low ( $r = .315$ ). In all, there is generally positively low relationship between work self-efficacy and overall job performance of business educators.

Research Hypothesis 1: Work self-efficacy is a significant positive predictor of task performance of business educators in public universities.

**Table 2.** Coefficients of Linear Regression for the Aggregated Work Self-Efficacy Predicting Task Performance

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		<i>P</i>	Decision
	<i>B</i>	SEB	Beta ( $\beta$ )	<i>T</i>		
Constant	21.978	1.956		11.235	.000	Accept H0
Work Self-Efficacy	.992	.308	.263	3.251	.002	

$R^2 = .069$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = .063$ ,  $F(1, 139) = 10.335$

Results of the data presented in Table 2 shows the estimates of coefficient of correlation between work self-efficacy and task performance. The Table shows the significant coefficients ( $F = 10.335$ ,  $\beta = .263$ ,  $t = 3.251$ ,  $p < .01$ ), which is also a confirmation of the results obtained in Table 2. The corresponding adjusted r-square (.065) reveals that 6.5% of variations in task performance is brought about by work self-efficacy. In all, work self-efficacy is found to be a significant but low predictor of task performance of business educators.

Research Hypothesis 2: Work self-efficacy is a significant positive predictor of contextual performance of business educators in public universities.

**Table 3.** Coefficients of Linear Regression for the Aggregated Work Self-Efficacy and Contextual Performance

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		<i>P</i>	Decision
	<i>B</i>	SEB	Beta ( $\beta$ )	<i>T</i>		
Constant	8.354	3.605		11.651	.000	Accept H0
Work Self-Efficacy	3.269	.308	.238	2.730	.007	

$R^2 = .051$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = .044$ ,  $F(1, 140) = 7.450$

Results of the data presented in Table 3 shows the estimates of coefficient of correlation between work self-efficacy and contextual performance. The Table shows the significant coefficients ( $F = 7.450$ ,  $\beta = .225$ ,  $t = 2.730$ ,  $p < .01$ ), which is also a confirmation of the results obtained in Table 3. The corresponding adjusted r-square (.044) reveals that 4.4% of variations in contextual performance is brought about by work self-efficacy. In all, work self-efficacy is found to be a significant but low predictor of contextual performance of business educators.

Research Hypothesis 3: Work self-efficacy is a significant positive predictor of overall job performance of business educators in public universities.

**Table 4.** Coefficients of Linear Regression for the Aggregated Work Self-Efficacy Predicting Overall Job Performance

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		<i>P</i>	Decision
	<i>B</i>	SEB	Beta ( $\beta$ )	<i>T</i>		
Constant	42.354	3.175		13.339	.000	Accept H0
Work Self-Efficacy	1.959	.501	.315	3.912	.000	

$R^2 = .099$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = .093$ ,  $F(1, 139) = 15.300$

Table 4 shows the estimates of coefficient of the correlation between work self-efficacy and overall job performance. The Table shows the significant coefficients ( $F = 15.300$ ,  $\beta = .315$ ,  $t = 3.912$ ,  $p < .01$ ), which is also a confirmation of the results obtained in Table 4. The corresponding adjusted r-square (.093) shows that 9.3% of the variations in overall job performance is determined by work self-efficacy. In all, work self-efficacy is found to be a significant but low predictor of overall job performance of business educators.

## Discussion

The study examined the correlation between work self-efficacy and job performance of business educators in public Universities in South-South Nigeria. The outcome of the review has contributed not exclusively to the investigation of job performance, but also provide support for the assumptions of JD-R theory. Using the inferential statistics of PPMCC, the results showed a positive but low correlation between work self-efficacy and task performance ( $r = .263$ ), work self-efficacy and contextual performance ( $r = .238$ ) and work self-efficacy and overall job performance

( $r = .315$ ). In all, there is generally positive but low correlation between work self-efficacy and job performance of business educators.

Hypothesis 1 showed a significant but low correlation between work self-efficacy and task performance of business educators, as work self-efficacy accounts for 6.5% of variations in task performance. Therefore, work self-efficacy is found to be a significant but low predictor of task performance of business educators in Universities in South-South Nigeria. This finding implies that when business educators exert high levels of work self-efficacy, their task performance will appear better. This further means that individual's belief in their capabilities to execute and control a particular task can then foster effective work behaviour such as high task-related performance. However, the finding from proposed hypothesis agree with the postulations of Bandura (1986, 1997) that individuals who perceive themselves as possessing high self-efficacy believe in their own capabilities to perform a targeted behaviour. Similarly, Bandura and Cervone (1986) assume that individuals who perceive themselves as possessing high self-efficacy tends to exert more effort and persist longer during task execution, thereby sustaining higher levels of task performance until the desired results are met. The finding support the study by Mustafa Glavee-Geo, Gronhaug and Mustafa et al. (2019) who found that self-efficacy is positively related to better task performance. The finding also concur with a study of Biron and Bamberger (2010) who found that self-efficacy has a predictive value on work-related outcomes which include task performance. The finding is specifically in line with a study by Chukwuemeke and Igbinedion (2021) who found that there is a significant positive correlation between self-efficacy and task performance of business educators.

Hypothesis 2 showed a significant but low correlation between work self-efficacy and contextual performance of business educators, as work self-efficacy accounts for 4.4% of variances in contextual performance. Therefore, work self-efficacy is found to be a significant but low predictor of contextual performance of business educators in Universities in South-South Nigeria. This finding implies that when business educators exert high work self-efficacy, their contextual performance can become better. This further means that business educator's belief in their abilities to execute and control a particular task can influence effective work behaviour such as contextual-related performance. However, authors such as Bakker and Demerouti (2014) and Xanthopoulou et al. (2009b, 2009a) are of the view that the interplay between work self-efficacy and work behaviour which include contextual performance has been supported by several studies. Bandura (1986, 1997) propose that people who perceive themselves as possessing high self-efficacy believe in their own abilities to perform a targeted behaviour. Similarly, Bandura and Cervone (1986) assume that people who perceive themselves as possessing high self-efficacy tends to exert more effort and persist longer during task execution, thereby sustaining high job performance until the desired results are realized. The finding support studies by Speier and Frese (1997) and Morrison and Phelps (1999) who reported that self-efficacy is a strong predictor of personal initiative and "taking charge" behaviour, which include contextual performance. The finding support the



assumption of the JD-R theory (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014) who proposes that personal resources such as self-efficacy at work can be crucial to initiate a motivational process that leads to enhanced work outcomes such as contextual performance of employees. Furthermore, the finding specifically concur with a study by Ingusci et al. (2019) who found that there is a significant positive interplay between work self-efficacy and contextual performance of employees.

Hypothesis 3 showed a significant but low correlation between work self-efficacy and overall job performance of business educators, as work self-efficacy accounts for 9.3% of the variations in job performance of business educators. Therefore, work self-efficacy is found to be a significant but low predictor of overall job performance of business educators in Universities in South-South Nigeria. This implies that when business educators possess high levels of work self-efficacy, their overall job performance will appear better. This invariably implies that individual's belief in their capabilities to control and perform a particular task can then foster high levels of overall job performance. This finding agree with the postulation of Bandura (1986, 1997) that employees who exert high level of self-efficacy believes in their own capabilities to execute a target behaviour. Bandura and Cervone (1986) also propose that employees who possess high level of self-efficacy tends to exert more effort and persist longer on the job, thereby sustaining higher levels of overall job performance until the desired results are accomplished. The finding also support the study of Mustafa et al. (2019) who found that self-efficacy is significantly related to better performance on the job. The finding also concur with the studies of Xanthopoulou et al., (2007, 2009b) and Biron and Bamberger (2010) who found that self-efficacy has a potential influence on job performance. The result also support the perception of Griffin et al. (2007) who argued that employees who exert high level of self-efficacy experience a greater degree of effective performance at work. The result also corroborate with the study by Tims et al. (2012) who found that employees who are self-efficacious on a given task were more likely to experience greater job performance on that day.

## **CONCLUSION**

The present study focuses on the correlation between work self-efficacy, task performance, contextual performance and overall job performance, which is a moderately unfortunate area of request in work and organizational psychology literature, particularly with regards to developing countries including Nigeria. The research contributes to JD-R theory by providing a framework that examined the interplay between work self-efficacy and overall job performance. For instance, the JD-R theory proposes that work self-efficacy is part of a motivational process useful to foster better work-related outcomes such as task and contextual performance. The study showed that work self-efficacy can play a crucial in predicting the two key aspects of job performance, namely: task performance and contextual performance. Therefore, future studies should deeply focus on this

relation, examining the different aspects of personality resources including work self-confidence and the increasing of better work-related behaviours.

The discoveries of the research give a few practical implications for university managers and administrators. Managers and administrators could increase business educators' task performance and contextual performance through the increase levels of work self-efficacy. They could help to sustain high level of work self-efficacy among business educators by ensuring the implementation of challenging and resourceful work environments, which are more likely to influence better job performance. As a result, challenging and resourceful work environments should be carefully implemented for business educators to constantly experience better job performance. In spite of the commitments of the current research to existing investigation, several restrictions were seen out in the research. However, the study focused on two aspects of job performance, namely task performance and contextual performance, not the entire behavioural outcomes of business educators, as task performance and contextual performance are found to be potential outcomes of work self-efficacy.

A correlational survey research approach was adopted for the study, furthermore as such causal prediction need not to be made in the research. In this manner, longitudinal and practical techniques are prescribed to clarify the thorough process or course of increasing better job performance of business educators. If not, what are the personal resources that can significantly and positively predict better job performance of business educators? The subjects were purposively attracted from universities in the South-South zone of Nigeria; accordingly, caution need to be practiced in summing up the discoveries of the research. Thusly, future exploration should zero in on utilizing the corresponding/proportional sampling method in order to cover broader Senatorial Zones (such as North-East, North-West, North-Central, South-West and South-East Senatorial Zones of Nigeria), to give additional decent outcomes from every one of the universities in the zone. The subjects are likewise homogenous, truly intending that business educators just were utilized in the research; subsequently, the authors of the research need to be careful in summing up the discoveries of the research, particularly to business educators in other higher institutions. Business educators were utilized in the research since they are the were utilized in the review since they are the most appropriate people to give a helpful information concerning work self-efficacy, which focused on increasing their task performance and contextual performance. As such, there is need for further studies that includes business educators from other senatorial zones. Furthermore, as the study was conducted in a developing country such as Nigeria the authors need to be very careful in summing up the discoveries to other developing nations. All the more thus, future investigations should cover other non-industrial nations so as to give more adjusted results or findings. Based on the research findings, the authors concluded that work self-efficacy is a significant positive predictor of task performance, contextual performance and the overall job performance of business educators.

## REFERENCES

- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2013). *Job demands–resources theory*. In C. Cooper & P. Chen (Eds.), *well-being: A complete reference guide* (pp. 1-28). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2014). *Job demands-resources theory*. In P. Y. Chen and Cooper, C.L. (Eds.), *Work and well-being: A complete reference guide* (pp. 37-64).
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(2), 273–285.
- Bandura, A. (1986). The explanatory and predictive scope of self-efficacy theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 4(3), 359–373.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (2000a). *Cultivate self-efficacy for personal and organizational effectiveness*. In E. A. Locke (Ed.), *Handbook of principles of organization behaviour (1st Ed.)* (pp. 120-136). Blackwell.
- Bandura, A. (2000b). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9(3), 75–78.
- Bandura, A. (2010). *Cultivate self-efficacy for personal and organizational effectiveness*. In E. A. Locke (Ed.), *Handbook of principles of organization behaviour (2nd Ed.)* (pp. 179-200). Wiley.
- Bandura, A., & Cervone, D. (1986). Differential engagement of self-reactive influences in cognitive motivation. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 38, 92–113.
- Biron, M., & Bamberger, P. (2010). The impact of structural empowerment on individual well-being and performance: Taking agent preferences, self-efficacy and operational constraints into account. *Human Relation*, 63, 163–191.
- Carter, W. R., Nesbit, P. L., Badham, R. J., Parker, S. K., & Sung, L. K. (2016). The effects of employee engagement and self-efficacy on job performance: A longitudinal field study. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 34(3), 1–20.
- Chukwuemeke, H. E., & Igbinedion, V. I. (2021). Relationship between knowledge dissemination, learning self-efficacy and task performance of business educators. *NAU Journal of Technology & Vocational Education*, 6(1), 13–21.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Del Líbano, M., Llorens, S., Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W. (2010). About the dark and bright sides of self-efficacy: Workaholism and work engagement. *Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 15(2), 688–701.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Gevers, J. M. (2015). Job crafting and extra-role behavior: The role of work engagement and flourishing. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 91, 87–96.
- Goodman, S. A., & Svyantek, D. J. (1999). Person-organization fit and contextual performance: Do share values matter. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 55(1), 254–275.

- Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*, 327-347.
- 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.
- Ingusci, E., Callea, A., Cortese, C. G., Zito, M., Borgogni, L., Cenciotti, R., Colombo, L., Signore, F., Ciavolino, E., & Demerouti, E. (2019). Self-efficacy and work performance: The role of job crafting in middle-age workers. *International Journal of Business and Society*, *20*(2), 533–551.
- Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extra-role efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal*, *42*(4), 403–419.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*(4), 475–480.
- Mustafa, G., Glavee-Geo, R., Gronhaug, K., & Almazrouei, H. S. (2019). Structural impacts on formation of self-efficacy and its performance effects. *Sustainability*, *11*, 1–24.
- Oonk, C., Gulikers, J. T. M., den Brok, P. J., Wesselink, R., Beers, P., & Mulder, M. (2020). Teachers as brokers: Adding a university-society perspective to higher education teacher competence profiles. *Higher Education*, *80*(1), 701–718.
- Pepe, S. J., Farnese, M. L., Avallone, F., & Vecchione, M. (2010). Work self-efficacy scale and search for work self-efficacy scale: A validation study in Spanish and Italian cultural contexts. *Revista de Psicología Del Trabajo y de Las Organizaciones*, *26*(3), 201–210.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2014). *A critical review of the job demands-resources model: Implications for improving work and health*. In G. Bauer & O. Hammig (Eds.), *Bridging occupational, organizational and public health* (pp.43–68). Springer.
- Speier, C., & Frese, M. (1997). Generalized self-efficacy as a mediator and moderator between control and complexity at work and personal initiative: A longitudinal field study in East Germany. *Human Performance*, *10*(2), 171–192.
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). Daily job crafting and the self-efficacy – performance relationship. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *29*(5), 490–507.
- Uzoagulu, A. E. (2011). *Practical guide to writing research project report in tertiary institutions*. Enugu: Cheston Ltd.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the job demands-resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *14*(2), 121–141.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009a). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, *74*(3), 235–244.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009b). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *82*(1), 183–200.