

EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT ON ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR RESULTS TO VOLUNTARISM

Ramarajan. P* and Sujatha**

Abstract: Employee Engagement is the term widely used in the field of Human Resources Management and it is considered as a workforce approach. It was initially termed as work engagement, a business management concept where employees should contribute their time very usefully and enthusiastically during their working hours. It is a two way relationship between an employer and their employees working in an organization. Many organizations are adopting various strategies to equip employees during their working hours and on other job related matters. Each and every employee should feel proud working for their organizations as their own inheritance so that they can come forward to take more responsibilities to explore further. This in turn will create mentorship among employees and help their colleagues to take more challenges in their tasks, professionally referred as Organizational Citizenship Behaviour - an informal work approach aiming to promote behaviour towards other employees and behaviour that is directed towards the organization. This paper tries to pull the required subject matter to study the relationship that exists between Employee Engagement and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour conceptually.

Keywords: Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Voluntarism.

INTRODUCTION

Employee Engagement is a strategy aiming to make employees more commitment towards their work. Soon after the recruitment and selection process it is the duty of the human resources department or the respective managers to take care of skilled employees who are willingly show their readiness to take stretch for the success of the organization. It is therefore promoting business hours very productively by fair means of employee involvement in their duty hours. Hence managing the skilled professionals and taking them towards management is one of the best mechanisms that the senior managers or the human resource personnel's can do for the growth of the organizations. Employee Engagement is multi- facet, where phases such as trust, loyalty, commitment and motivation are taking place. Employee Engagement varies and measures from one organization to other by facilitating expectation, development, environment, encouragement, recognition and feedback. Hence proper engagement strives to achieve improved productivity and increased profitability very efficiently. The features of a fully engaged employee involves a good relation between an employee-employer, optimism, problem solving skills, team spirit and motivation towards their peers and all these aspects together leads to Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB). Also Saks (2006) defines that a friendly or casual

* Research Associate, VIT Business School, VIT University, Vellore. Email: ramarajan.p2015@vit.ac.in

** Associate Professor, VIT Business School, VIT University, Vellore

approach leads to mentorship which involves all level of employee's participation can pay way for OCB in organizations. The purpose of this study is to collate sufficient information to enhance the relationship that exists between Employee Engagement and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.

Employee Engagement

The phrase Employee Engagement was first introduced by Kahn (1990) defines Employee Engagement as personal engagement which means binding of organization employees in their work roles with cognitively, emotionally and behaviorally fit and at the same time personal disengagement refers to unbinding of employees from their work roles and employees withdraw themselves cognitively, emotionally and behaviorally from their working roles. Again Kahn (1990, 1992) illustrates Employee Engagement as psychologically present when involving in an organization's work. Saks (2006) defines employee engagement can be expressed as discrete unique concept and that is made by cognitive, emotional and behavioural constituents related to individual role performance. Robinson et. al., (2004) stresses that researches on employee engagement made both on academic literatures as well as empirical studies were very little but came into existence very amazingly. Rothbard (2001) defines Employee Engagement as physically present in their workplaces but involves two mechanisms one is attention and the other is absorption. Attention refers to cognitive accessibility and the time taken to think on the role undertaken and at the same time absorption refers to immersed in a role and refers to the concentration of one's role. Psychological conditions revealed by Kahn such as meaningfulness, safety and availability that can either affect employee in his/her work engagement or disengagement. Meaningfulness relates to the sensation that an employee is getting as a return to what he/she has contributed such as tasks, safety refers that an employee is working under safe conditions and prompting to interpersonal skills. Availability refers to one's ownership on physical, emotional and psychological properties required on a job. Supporting Kahn's psychological conditions validated significantly that meaningfulness, safety and availability is related to Employee Engagement by May et. al., (2004) Again Kahn studies further illustrates engagement on three dimensions namely vigour, dedication and absorption. Schaufeli and Bakker's (2001) reveals based on in-depth interviews explains although vigour and dedication are referred as main dimensions of employee engagement whereas absorption is considered as an appropriate dimension.

Employee Engagement can be classified into three types:

- Engaged employees – strive towards the goals of the organisations
- Not engaged – work without passion
- Actively disengaged – totally not involving in their work

Organizations cannot tell or force their employees always to be active in their work places because there are number of reasons eg., personal and professional relations in and out of the organisations, environment issues, money, material and other social needs. Considering as a fundamental reason for enhancing Employee Engagement in organisations these studies are very important supported by (Little & Little, 2006) which explores that more attention are given nowadays concerning such studies.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Researchers, Bateman and Organ (1983) were the ones who first introduced the term Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) but the origination could be founded from Barnard's idea of 'Willingness to cooperate' and Daniel Katz's (Katz, 1964; Katz & Kahn, 1966, 1978) dependable role performance and 'innovative and natural behaviours'. Organ (1998) defines Organisational Citizenship Behaviour as informal way of approach rather than formal job needs which relates to employees can make a decision making on their own and to the level of degree to which they can perform the task where employee's individual behaviour is defined as optional and not directly or clearly recognized by formal remuneration system.

Organ (1998) employees can exhibit their Citizenship behaviour in five ways:

- Altruism – a behaviour that leads to a specific person with an organizational relevant task
- Conscientiousness – a behaviour that goes beyond the minimum level of requirement or what is expected
- Sportsmanship – a behaviour that leads to accept inconvenient situations without grievances
- Courtesy – a behaviour which leads to prevent problems in advance and follows 'prevention is better than cure style'
- Civic virtue – a behaviour that leads to make participation in overall organizational issues and discussing on all organizational issues.

Relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Employee Engagement

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour has a significant relationship with engagement in shaping employees towards the goal of the organization. Organ (1998) illustrates OCB as behaviours that enables and maintain societal and psychological facts that supports task performance. Rotunda and Sackett, 2002 reveals OCB is a behaviour that contributes to the goal of the organization by contributing to social and psychological environment. Shaffer, 2005 defines OCB as mutual trust enhances

employees and supervisors, more willingly exhibiting OCB. Lin, 2008 refines that male gender are generally proactive and act braver and perform positive high risk citizenship behavior than female. Employees who are engaged in their job activity should not only fulfill their formal role requirements but carry forward extra effort to achieve other activities that spread to create volunteers resulting to more OCB's. Rich et. al., (2010) in his empirical studies proved that there is a strong relationship between employee engagement and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) and is significantly related.

Implications

Relationship that exists between Employee Engagement and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour can be more proved in different sector of industries and to promote more mentorship for successful business activities. More studies can be made by enhancing OCB culture and to find out the differences before and after such implementation.

CONCLUSION

Thus the present study collates information relating to Employee Engagement resulting to more engaged and more productive as outcomes also well enhanced and appreciated in organizations results to produce more Voluntarism. This can be represented as Volunteering and if it seen in the future generations can result to organizations success and make organizations to travel for its strategic growth. Therefore extra role behaviour plays a vital role for overall growth of the organizations and creates professional relationships between the employees and their employers.

References

- Chen, Y.J., Lin, C.C., Tung, Y.C., & Ko, Y.T. (2008). Associations of organizational justice and ingratiation with organizational citizenship behavior: The beneficiary perspective. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 36(3), 289-302.
- Demerouti, E. Bakker, A.B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 86(3), 499.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behaviour. *Behavioral Science*, 9(2),
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*.
- Little, B., & Little, P. (2006). Employee engagement: Conceptual issues. *Journal of Organizational Cultures, Communications and Conflicts*, 10(1), 111-120.
- Macey, W.H., & Schneider, B. The Meaning of Employee Engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, (2008), 1(1), 3-30.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter, M.P. Job Burnout. *Annual review of Psychology*, (2001), 52(1), 397-422.

- Mone, E., Eisinger, C., Guggenheim, K., Price, B., & Stine, C. Performance management at the wheel: Driving employee engagement in organizations. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, (2011), 26(2), 205-212.
- May, D.R., Gilson, R.L. And Harter, L.M. "The Psychological Conditions of Meaningfulness, Safety And Availability And The Engagement of the Human Spirit at Work", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational psychology*, (2004), 77(1), 11-37.
- Language Translator and Platform Comparator, is Presented in Springer International conference on Communication, Cloud and Big Data (CCB2016), Organized by Department of Information Technology, Sikkim Manipal Institute of Technology, Sikkim manipal Institute on November 2016, and Proceedings will be Published in Springer Lecture Notes on Networks & Systems (Indexed by EI and SCOPUS).
- 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: Institute of Employment Studies Report 408.
- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P.R. The Relative Importance of Task, Citizenship, and Counterproductive Performance To Global Ratings of Job Performance: A Policy-Capturing Approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, (2002), 87(1), 66.
- Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). The drivers of employee engagement. Report- Institute for Employment Studies.
- Rothmann, S., & Rothmann Jr, S. Factors Associated With Employee Engagement In South Africa. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, (2010), 36(2), 1-12.
- Rodopman, O.B. (2006). Proactive personality, stress and voluntary work behaviors.
- Rothbard, N.P. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(4), 655-684.
- Saks, A.M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
- "Public Control Algorithm for a Multi Access Scenario comparsing GPRS and UMTS ",at Department of Computer Science and Engineering, National Conference on "Intelligent computing With IoT on April 16 2016 in Dhirajlal Gandhi College of Technology.
- Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B., & Van Rhenen, W. How changes in job demands and resources predict burnout, work engagement, and sickness absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, (2009), 30(7), 893-917.
- Saks, A.M., & Gruman, J.A. What Do We Really Know About Employee Engagement? *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, (2014), 25(2), 155-182.
- Watt, D., & Shaffer, M.A. (2005). Equity and relationship quality influences on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: The mediating role of trust in the supervisor and empowerment.

