

# **The Role of Engagement in Relationship to Organization Citizenship Behavior in Pakistan**

Hazrat Bilal<sup>\*</sup>, Abdul Mateen<sup>†</sup> and Muhammad Sohail<sup>‡</sup>

## **Abstract**

*The study sought to examine influence of work engagement on organization citizenship behavior of the employee. A survey design was used for collecting data from 325 employees working in universities. The results were based on both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. The outcome of the analysis determines a positive relationship between employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior. Furthermore, the result also confirms that employee engagement significantly predict organizational citizenship behavior.*

**Keywords:** Work Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behavior

## **Introduction**

In today's fast growing and knowledge based economy, it is believed that organization cannot grow without the skill employees and the loss of such employees is harmful for an organization. Due to saturated market, it becomes very difficult to attract and maintain skilled employees. However, employees having the essential skills are not alone adequate to achieve organizational goals, unless these skilled employees are properly managed to execute enthusiastically and positively, and are engaged in their job and organization activities. Just showing up by employees is not enough, until they work to the high level of their potential (Pradeep Kumar & Swetha, 2011). Employees who are engaged in their tasks are familiar with organizational environment and works with companions to expand performance inside the work for the advantage of the organization (Robinson, Perryman & Hayday, 2004).

The competence, commitment, engagement and contribution are important qualities of an employee, leading an organization to success. This success of an organization not only depends on competence and

---

<sup>\*</sup> Hazrat Bilal, PhD, Assistant Professor, Center for Management and Commerce, University of Swat. Email: hbilal@uswat.edu.pk

<sup>†</sup> Abdul Mateen, Lecturer, Center for Management and Commerce, University of Swat

<sup>‡</sup> Muhammad Sohail, PhD scholar, Qurtuba University of Science and IT / Lecturer, Center for Management and Commerce, University of Swat.

cognitive skills of workers but also on the way workers react sensitively to their job and organization. Therefore, in management and psychology, work engagement is an essential subject as research has endorsed that engaged employees are motivated more by being treated impartially, being appreciated and having chances for professional development rather than monetary incentives and extrinsic motivations (Bhatt, 2012). Hence, employee engagement is gradually observed as one factor in determining the condition of an organization, beside with the traditional processes of sales, profit, cash flow, and customer satisfaction. Employee engagement continued a matter of interest for academic and practitioners since 1990s and is usually considered as one important factor in determining the health of an organization.

Engaged employees are highly committed to their jobs and are required for survival of an organization in today's competitive environment and to achieve an organization stated standards. Sometimes to meet these standards organizations expect more from their workers, ultimately leading employees to frustration and dissatisfaction at work. In addition, frequent organizational changes like downsizing and restructuring, and increased pressure on employees to execute at higher level of performance without the surety of job security, may have rooted a negative environment for employees in organizations. In other words, employees find fluctuating psychological bonds amongst themselves and their organizations (Saks, 2006). Nowadays employees know that for hard work and loyalty they cannot secure job and career advancement. Therefore, it is essential to statute a study that direct towards understanding of employee engagement, boosting employee to be highly-engaged at job in an existing and new economic environment (Robinson, Perryman & Heyday, 2004). Therefore, this study is an effort to understand the impact of engagement on organizational citizenship behavior.

### **Literature**

Employees remain ambassador of an organization at all points of time. An engaged employee increases the organization efficiency by utilizing maximum energy and minimum resources of the organization and hence increases business outcome. Engaged employees always try to advance the ranks of performance through emotional and rational commitment, dedication, giving value to others feelings and obeying organization rules and policies (Shuck & Wollard, 2010). It is hard for an organization to survive without having employees who are highly engaged and committed to their jobs in order to achieve the organization stated standards and improve performance against their competitors. It is clear

as stated by Kahn (1990) that engagement is psychological settings encouraging employees of an organization to actively participate in their own and organization's tasks. Consequently engaged employees are optimistic, accomplishing and having work related state of attention characterized by means of vigor, absorption and dedication (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzales, & Bakker, 2002). Vigor is the high levels of energy, resilience and the willingness to invest effort in one's job, not easily fatigued. Dedication is the strong involvement in one's work accompanied by feelings of enthusiasm and significance, and by a sense of pride and inspiration, whereas absorption is the pleasant state of total immersion in one's work which is characterized by time passing quickly and being unable to detaching oneself from the job.

The employee engagement is a critical factor for progression of any organization. Engaged employees are more committed (Newman & Harrison, 2008), creative (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008) and have less turnover intentions (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) leads an organization for success. Basically, there are three kinds of organizational outcomes of employee engagement in order to study overall organizational performance of engagement. First, employees' individual level of engagement can be link with the individual output that is appropriate to organization (e.g. Organizational Citizenship Behavior). Second, average engagement levels of team work can be associated with team performance. Third, average levels of whole organization can be connected with organization level outcomes like profit and productivity.

Kahn (1992) and Rich, LePine & Crawford (2010) revealed engagement of employees leads towards higher achievements at both individual and organization level. Engagement at individual's level leads to great quality of worker's effort, their capability of execution specific job and reduce stages of stress towards better work-life balance, while leads to high growth of an organization, decrease turnover intentions of employees and actual turnover of employees, increase overall productivity (Truss et al 2006).

Employees who are highly engaged always attached themselves fully to perform their jobs emotionally, physically and cognitively. They do their best for their respective organization and try to deliver superior performance as well as to go beyond formal job requirements. Engaged employees show better work behavior than the labor behavior, expressed in their work description and likewise go far beyond formal job necessities causes increase in the organization output. (Wright & Sablinski, 2008).

Performance of an employee cannot be only measured by the output produced but by the effectiveness with which they are loyal, faithful, participate for the drive of organization supremacy and proper

service delivery (Bettercourt, Gwinner & Meuter, 2001). In contextual view of performance, job performance is similar to Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and therefore, job performance is measured through OCB, as adopted representative of job performance in some previously studies (Rich et.al., 2010; Amjad & Usman 2011). Many research studies have demonstrated that there exists a relationship between, employees' engagement and OCB, and these studies have not investigated this phenomenon in teaching faculty. Therefore, this study is an effort to investigate this relationship in the context of staff working in universities.

### **Organization Citizenship Behavior**

Organization Citizenship Behavior is a well research concept of Human Resource Management, organizational behavior and psychology. Research affirmed that employee's performance is a role of employee work behaviors, which is essential as it shape the organizational, social and psychological context that serves as the catalyst for the task activities and processes (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997) and suggested that Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is an important aspect of employee's job performance. Graham (1991), classified OCB as a representative of job performance, into three sub categories, such as

- Organizational Obedience is accepting rules, guidelines, instruction and dogmas develop by top ranked management.
- Organization loyalty is preferring to organization objectives rather than individual objectives and recognizing organizational leadership.
- Organizational Participation is actively participating in organizational activities.

In this study we used OCB as interchangeable with job performance, as being taken by some previous researchers in their studies. (Rich, LePine and Crawford 2010; Schaufeli, Taris, & Bakker, 2006; Kahya, 2007; Amjad & Usman 2011). Hence job performance has many degrees recognized by several researchers, however as university teaching is concerned with services job, consequently, the service-oriented conceptualization grounded on the effort of Bettercourt, Gwinner and Meuter (2001) is adopted in this study have three paradigms (a) loyalty employees' faithfulness to organization over inspiring its benefits and status to foreigners (b) employee participation is their readiness and the dearth to involved in the expansion and supremacy of the companies (c) service delivery is their hardworking role performance in the organization.

Nurturing employee engagement leads toward high levels of performance by focusing on engagement of employees as a proximal consequences and basic element of job performance. Campbell et. Al.,(1990) stated that performance is a behavioral action and is allied to organizational goals. This can positively or negatively affect employees behavior that might be a part of job or distinct from their obligations.. Employee performance is all about financial or non-financial outcomes of the employee, which is eventually connected to the success of an organization. Studies show that encouraging engagement improves employee performance (Aslam & Sarwar, 2010). Empirical evidences obtained other than educational institute also propose that the presence of greater levels of engagement enhances job performance and organizational productivity (Demerouti and Cropanzano, 2010) Therefore, on the basis of literature the following proposed hypothesis:

*H1: Predictors are significantly correlated with Criterion Variables*

*H2: OCB is predicted by the employee engagement*

### **Operationalization of the Concepts**

The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) adopted from Schaufeli and Bakker (2003) has been used to measure the employee engagement. The Bettercourt, Gwinner, and Meuter (2001) questionnaire of organizational citizenship behavior has been applied for measuring OCB. Based on their questionnaire, the operational definitions of both the concepts are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Variables & Attributes (measurements)

Concepts (Variables)	Attributes
Engagement	Energetic, vigorous, work hours, willing to go for work, willing to work for long period, resilient, meaningful work ,enthusiasm about work, inspiration from work, pride about work, nature of work, dedication to work
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	Positive image, symbolize good things, generate goodwill, encourage others for using its services, promotion of the university, obeying University rules , quick response to problems, avoid mistakes, positive attitude, polite and humble, guidance from coworkers, performance of duties, attitude at work, encouragement to participation, suggestions from employees, solution to the problems

### Research Methodology

The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) questionnaire adopted from Schaufeli & Bakker (2003) of employee engagement having dimensions of Vigor, Absorption and Dedication was applied. In questionnaire a total of seventeen questions were connected to engagement including 6 questions each about Vigor and Absorption respectively, while subsequently 5 questions were about Dedication. The overall score of the 17 items ranged from 17 to 85; the high score demonstrating employees' higher level of work engagement.

This scale was previously validated in some countries of the world such as Spain (Schaufeli et al., 2002) and Netherlands (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). Along with validation of the scale, they have also proved the three subscales internal consistencies comprise of Vigor, Dedication and Absorption.

The Bettercourt, Gwinner, and Meuter (2001) questionnaire of service oriented organizational citizenship behavior was embraced for this study to measure OCB. It is characterized by loyalty, conscious behavior and participation. In questionnaire, five questions each are about loyalty and participation, whereas six questions are about conscious behavior.

### Analysis

The population for this study was 1006 including teaching faculty members of private universities recognized by HEC and chartered by Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Pearson Correlation and Regression analysis were applied to test the hypothesis. The Krejcie and Morgan (1970) formula for sample calculation was used and got a sample size of 345.

The experience of respondents ranging from five years to more than fifteen years has shown in the following Table 2.

Table 2: Experience-wise Descriptive Statistics

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	75	23.1	23.1	23.1
Five years	110	33.8	33.8	56.9
Ten years	94	28.9	28.9	85.8
Fifteen years	46	14.2	14.2	100
More than Fifteen years	325	100	100	

The following Table 3 shows that 81.2 percent males and 18.8 female responded to the questionnaire.

Table:3 Gender-wise Statistics

			Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	264	81.2	81.2	81.2
	Female	61	18.8	18.8	100
	Total	3215	100	100	

### Descriptive Data on Predictors & Criterion Variables

The below Table 4 portrays that the strongest average is 3.99 of 'Engagement' variable which is an independent factor in the research model and average 3.82 belongs to organization citizenship behavior which is the criterion variable in this research study.

Table4: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Engagement	325	2.00	5.00	3.9937	.51994
Job Performance	325	1.81	4.88	3.8223	.59594

Cronbach's alpha test was applied to know the reliability of the scales. The scales were both reliable and the results are depicted in Table 5.

Table 5: Alpha Reliability Statistics of Variables

Variable Name	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha
Work engagement	0.891	17
OCB	0.907	16

### Testing of the Hypotheses

#### *Association between Predictors & Criterion Variables (H1)*

A significant correlation ( $r=0.555$  with  $0.000$  p-values) is found between engagement and OCB. It is noteworthy that the responses on employee engagement are greatly correlated with the criterion variable and therefore Hypothesis No: 1 is accepted as true and substantiated.

Table 6: Table of Correlations

		ENGAGEMENT
OCB	R	.555**
	P	.000
	N	325

#### *OCB is predicted by the work engagement (H2)*

To test and know the strength of the correlation between engagement and OCB, Regression and Coefficient are calculated as shown below in Table 7 and 8.

Table: 7 Model Summary (Predictor on job performance)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.457 <sup>a</sup>	.209	.206		.80875

a. Predictors: (Constant), eng

Table: 8 Coefficients of Regression (Predictor on Job Performance)

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>					
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t
1	(Constant)	.009	.348		.025
	Eng	.797	.086	.457	9.226

a. Dependent Variable: performance Evaluation

The regression analysis shows in above Table 7 & 8, that engagement is the predictor of job performance which is explaining 20.9% ( $R^2=0.209$ ) of variation in the OCB of teachers with a Beta value of .457 having significant level of 0.000 and t value 9.22.  $R^2$  of 20.9% suggests accepting the second hypothesis of the study as true and accepted.

### Discussion and Conclusion

On the basis of previous studies conducted on the relationship between predictors and criterion variables, a significant positive correlation was expected. In the present study a positive correlation between criterion and predictor was hypothesized and was tested and analyzed through applying Pearson correlation analysis. The results indicated a significant positive relationship ( $r = .555$ ,  $P=.000$ ) between employee engagement (Independent variable) and organizational citizenship behavior (Dependent variable). Similar results were found by Babcock-Roberson & Strickland (2010), where work engagement was significantly positively correlated with job performance represented by OCB ( $r = .41$ ,  $p < .01$ ). This significant positive relationship was further confirmed by Ariani (2013) study, who concluded that relationship between engagement and OCB ( $r = 0.312$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) was positive and significant. Furthermore, our findings also supported the results of Rich, Lepine and Crawford (2010), who have empirically validated and concluded positive significant relationship between engagement and Job performance or OCB.

Employees' score on work engagement significantly predict employee job performance or OCB was the second hypothesis of this study. Based on the regression analysis, the slope value 0.457 of Work engagement to predict the Job Performance and coefficient of Dependent



Variable and Independent Variable was calculated as 0.86. Thus  $\beta = .46$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $R^2 = .209$  means that work engagement executed 20.9% variance in Job performance represented by OCB for present study. Thus it is confirmed that engagement is the predictor of OCB. The previous studies have predicted a coefficient of variance quite predictability of OCB through employee engagement. According to Dalal, Baysinger, Brummel and LeBreton (2012), work engagement significantly predicts Job Performance represented by OCB. Dalal et al., (2012) accounted  $\beta = .30$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $R^2 = .06$ , predicted that work engagement accounted for 6 % variance in OCB. Babcock-Roberson & Strickland (2010) conducted regression analysis for work engagement and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. They found that EE (Independent variable) significantly predict Job Performance (Dependent Variable) with  $\beta = .41$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $R^2 = .16$ , stating that EE accounted 16% variance in OCB, which is lower than the variance calculated for the current study. This low R square value might be due to change in culture and environment as Babcock-Roberson study was conducted in developed country of California, USA, while the current study was conducting in developing country of Pakistan. Besides this his sample was consist of the undergraduate students who studied only Psychology, while the sample of the current study were employees of the University studied in different disciplines. In addition to these the other reasons for low R square value may be Babcock-Roberson measured OCB of employees by using the scale developed and used by Organ and Near (1983), 24-item, 7-item Likert Scale, while in the current study we have used Bettercourt, Gwinner, and Meuter (2001) questionnaire of 16-item, 5-point Likert Scale of service oriented citizenship behavior characterize by Loyalty, Conscious Behavior and Participation. Our result suggests that university administration can increase employee's job performance by nurturing and encouraging employee's vigor, dedication and loyalty.

## References

- Ariani, D. W. (2013). The relationship between employee engagement, organizational citizenship behavior, and counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 4(2), 46.
- Aslam, H. D., & Sarwar, S. (2010). Improving performance management practices in IT firms of Pakistan. *Journal of Management Research*, 2(2).
- Babcock-Roberson, M. E., & Strickland, O. J. (2010). The relationship between charismatic leadership, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Journal of psychology*, 144(3), 313-326.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career development international*, 13(3), 209-223.
- Bettencourt, L. A., Gwinner, K. P., & Meuter, M. L. (2001). A comparison of attitude, personality, and knowledge predictors of service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(1), 29.
- Bhatt, K. (2012). Employee Engagement: A Tool to Achieve Sustainable Growth"-A Case Study Of GNFC. *International Journal of Research in Management, Economics and Commerce*, 2(6), 92-105.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human performance*, 10(2), 99-109.
- Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance. *Personnel selection in organizations*, 3570, 35-70.
- Chaudhry, A. A., & Usman, A. (2011). An investigation of the relationship between employees' emotional intelligence and performance.
- 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.
- Demerouti, E., & Cropanzano, R. (2010). From thought to action: Employee work engagement and job performance. *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*, 65, 147-163.

- González-Romá, V., Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Lloret, S. (2006). Burnout and work engagement: Independent factors or opposite poles?. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 68(1), 165-174.
- Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4(4), 249-270.
- Kahn, R. L., & Byosiére, P. (1992). Stress in organizations.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of management journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Kahya, E. (2007). The effects of job characteristics and working conditions on job performance. *International journal of industrial ergonomics*, 37(6), 515-523.
- Kumar, D. P., & Swetha, G. (2011). A prognostic examination of employee engagement from its historical roots. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, 2(3), 232.
- Newman, D. A., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Been there, bottled that: Are state and behavioral work engagement new and useful construct "wines"? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 31-35.
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of management journal*, 53(3), 617-635.
- Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). The drivers of employee engagement. *Report-Institute for Employment Studies*.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). Utrecht work engagement scale: Preliminary manual. *Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University, Utrecht*, 26.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 25(3), 293-315.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness studies*, 3(1), 71-92.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & Bakker, A. B. (2006). Dr. Jekyll or Mr. Hyde: On the differences between work engagement and

- workaholism. ), *Research companion to working time and work addiction*, 193-217.
- Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human resource development review*, 9(1), 89-110.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of applied psychology*, 68(4), 653.
- Truss, K., Soane, E., Edwards, C. Y. L., Wisdom, K., Croll, A., & Burnett, J. (2006). *Working life: employee attitudes and engagement 2006*. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Wright, C. W., & Sablinski, C. J. (2008). Procedural Justice, Mood, and Prosocial Personality Influence on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 10(2).