



A STUDY ON THE INTERACTIVE EFFECT OF PERSONALITY AND EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT ON ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Dr.J.J.Savithri

Associate Professor, Department of Management Sciences
D J Academy for Managerial Excellence, Coimbatore Pollachi Highway, Othakkalmandapam(P.O), Coimbatore

ABSTRACT

To augment organizational functioning and effectiveness, it is insufficient, if employees perform only those roles and responsibilities specified in the job description. Lord Krishna says, "one should act without being attached to the results". This can happen only if employees are willing to go the extra mile. Such self driven employees show evidence of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. This idiosyncratic behavior is becoming visible at the workplace. This is altogether a voluntary behavior and is not recognized by the formal reward system. An engaged employee will have a strong emotional bonding with the organization he is working for. This association offers some significant benefits to the organization. One such benefit could be Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Literature also supports the fact that an employee's personality has a major influence on his behavior in the Organization. Hence this study seeks to understand the interactive effect of employee engagement and personality on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Using Univariate analysis, the empirical study examines the interaction effect by analyzing data collected from 50 employees of India's leading producer of watches. The findings of the study have been discussed at both theoretical and practical levels.

KEYWORDS

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Employee Engagement, Personality

INTRODUCTION

Companies need to focus efforts on building commitment in employees - a commitment is the foundation of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour(OCB). Only when this foundation is in place will firms experience high performance. Organizations have always been paying attention to what the employees feel about their jobs and the organization. Literature reveals that employee engagement leads to high job performance (Rich, Lepine & Crawford, 2010). Employee engagement has also been found to be positively related to organizational performance outcomes such as productivity, retention and profitability (Bhatnagar & Biswas, 2010). When employees are engaged in their work, they augment the incidence of behaviors that promote efficient and effective functioning of the organization. These behaviors are known as Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (Ariani, 2013).

Dispositional characteristics such as personality influence individuals' behaviors. One cannot neglect the fact that personality also predicts behavior. As OCB is a type of behavior based on the assumption, that personality influences behavior, it should influence the employees' tendencies to engage in OCB at work (Organ & Ryan, 1995). Within this conceptual framework the researcher intends to study the interactive effect of personality and employee engagement on OCB.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Dennis Organ and his colleagues coined the term "Organizational Citizenship Behavior" (OCB). The definition of OCB was based on Katz's (1964) original work on OCB and was also generated from Chester Barnard's concept (Barnard, 1938) of the "willingness to cooperate". Organ (1988) defined OCB as "the individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization." He was also of the view that, OCB is a matter of personal choice, such that its omission is not generally understood as punishable (Organ, 1988).

Work behavior is seen as in role and extra role behavior. The willingness of an employee to engage in extra role behavior is indicative of organizational citizenship behaviour. This accepts

the fact that employees do not expect recognition or reward for engaging in OCB (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994), the informal meaning of OCB is going the extra mile to help others at work and this understanding helps in conceptualizing OCB. Examples of OCB comprises of helping a new entrant in acclimatizing with his/her role and the organizations culture, helping a colleague who is under deadline pressure, or helping a colleague by swapping shifts. OCB also includes behaviours such as working extra hours without expecting overtime pay or organizing office events.

Managers should concentrate more on increasing OCB because organizational effectiveness & customer perceptions of service quality are positively related with OCB (Torlak & Koc, 2007). Improvement of OCB is vital for managers because they have an effect on organizational outcomes and service quality (Gonzalez & Garazo, 2005). OCB is characterized by the surfeit workload that is produced by the individuals (Schepman, & Zarate, 2008).

Podsakoff et al. (2009) studied the effects of OCB on employee performance and state them as: Firstly, workers who engage in OCB tend to receive better performance ratings from their managers. This may be because people are fond of individuals who engage in OCB and hence are looked at more positively. Managers perceive OCB as a form of employee commitment due to its voluntary nature. Secondly, a better performance rating is linked to gaining rewards- such as increments, promotions or other work-related benefits

Personality- The Big Five Theory

"Personality traits refer to enduring patterns of thought, emotion and behavior that are not likely to change over time and explain people's behavior across different situations." (Costa and McCrae, 1989). In the 1960ies the researchers reanalyzed the results of other researchers (Cattell and Fiske) and found that there was support for five factors: "Surgency", "Emotional Stability", "Agreeableness", "Dependability" and "Culture". Later it turned out that these factors were quite similar to those accepted by researchers today. (Barrick and Mount, 1991) Even though Tupes and Christal found similar factors to describe personalities as the five factors commonly used nowadays, their work had little impact on personality research as

it was published in an insignificant Air Force technical report. (Digman, 1990)

The Big Five Theory was confirmed by several studies, the most important among them conducted by Norman. Norman named the personality factors as follows: "Extraversion", "Emotional Stability", "Agreeableness", "Conscientiousness" and "Culture". His factors are commonly used and therefore are named "Norman's big five" or simply the "Big Five".

The Big Five Theory became a standard model for assessing personality in research, thus confirming its robustness. Nevertheless there are non-supporters too, one of them, Hogan (1986), lists six main factors of personality. The main difference to the common five-factor concept is the splitting of the "Extraversion" dimension into "Sociability" and "Ambition". While the majority of researchers agree on the number of factors, their interpretation has led to disagreement among researchers. (Barrick and Mount, 1991).

According to Hogan, who has split "Extraversion" into "Sociability" and "Ambition", the latter one includes components such as initiative and impetuous, while expressiveness and exhibitionism are included in "Sociability". (Barrick and Mount 1991)

The second dimension "Emotional Stability" is also called "Neuroticism" and includes traits such as anxiety, depression, anger, embarrassment, emotionality, insecurity and worries. (Barrick and Mount 1991)

The third dimension is most commonly referred to as "Agreeableness" or "Likeability" and includes traits such as "courteous, flexible, trusting, good-natured, cooperative, forgiving, soft-hearted, and tolerant." (Barrick and Mount 1991)

The fourth dimension has been given very diverging names and has been interpreted quite differently. It is most commonly called "Conscientiousness" or "Conscience" (Norman 1963, Costa and McCrae, 1985). The essence of this dimension has not been agreed upon. It is sometimes understood to be linked to dependability and thus includes being careful, responsible and organized. Others interpret it more in the direction of volition and describe it through traits like "hard-working, achievement-oriented, and persevering". (Barrick and Mount 1991)

The most difficult definition to agree upon was the one of the last dimension. It has most frequently been called "Intellect" or "Intelligence". Others label it "Openness to experience" (McCrae and Costa, 1985) or "Culture" (Norman, 1963). Traits commonly associated with this dimension are imagination, curiosity, broad-mindedness, intelligence and artistic sensitivity. (Barrick and Mount 1991)

For the assessment of linkages between OCB and personality factors the researchers chose the following five factors: "Extraversion", "Emotional Stability", "Agreeableness", "Conscientiousness" and "Openness to Experience". (Barrick and Mount 1991)

Employee Engagement

Kahn(1990) defined employee engagement as the harnessing of organization members' selves to their work roles. Kahn's engagement concept is motivational because it refers to the allocation of personal resources to role performance and also to how intensely and persistently those resources are applied. The engagement focuses on the positive aspects of a person's job. Employee engagement is employee willingness and ability to help their company succeed, largely by providing discretionary effort on a sustainable basis (Little & Little, 2006).

Kahn (1990) found that there were three psychological conditions associated with engagement or disengagement at work: meaningfulness, safety, and availability. Workers were more

engaged at work in situations that offered them more psychological meaningfulness and psychological safety. Employee engagement is a positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its value. Engagement focuses on work performed at a job and represents the willingness to dedicate physical, cognitive, and emotional resources to this work. As Kahn (1990), an engaged individual is one who approaches the task associated with a job with a sense of self-investment, energy, and passion, which should translate into higher levels of in-role and extra-role performance. Engaged employee will be more vigilant and more focused on their work or tasks, thus, engagement should be positively related to task performance.

Objectives

- To study the relationship between Employee Engagement and OCB
- To study the relationship between Personality and OCB
- To study the interactive effect of Personality and Employee Engagement on OCB

Hypothesis

Each of the big five personality factors is supposed to influence OCB in varying intensity. Agreeableness that consists of a friendly and pleasant manner towards others, is supposed to correlate positively with the OCB. Another personality factor that is supposed to predict OCB is conscientiousness. This dimension includes traits such as being dependent, persevering organized and self-disciplined. Neuroticism (respectively emotional stability) is also supposed to have connections to OCB, because emotionally stable people are more open to problems of others than emotionally unstable people who are often overstrained with their own problems and are, less likely to exhibit helping tendency. One can also claim that the personality factor of extraversion might have a link to OCB, because extroverts generally respond more to their social surroundings than introverts do (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 2006). Elanain (2007), found strong support for the positive linkage between openness to experience and OCB. Therefore the hypothesis can be stated as:

H01: The relationship between Personality and OCB is positive

In recent researches employee engagement has been examined as a potential predictor in several OCB studies (Rich et al., 2010). OCB contributes to goals of the organization by contributing to its social and psychological environment (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002).

Based on that literature review and the previous researches, it can be said that the higher the employee engagement higher will be the OCB. Therefore the hypothesis can be stated as:

H02: The relationship between employee engagement and OCB is positive

The researchers have also attempted to know if both Personality and Employee Engagement have an interactive effect on OCB. Therefore the hypothesis can be stated as:

H03: The interactive effect of Personality and Employee Engagement on OCB is positive

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sampling Design: The study was based on primary data which were collected from 50 employees of a manufacturing company in India. The data were collected by means of questionnaires.

Measures Used for the Study: For the purpose of the study the researcher used the following inventories

- Employee Engagement questionnaire the internal consistency of the Employee Engagement questionnaire was $\alpha=.90$.
- Organization Citizenship Behavior inventory (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter, 1990) the internal consist-

ency of the questionnaire was $\alpha=.85$

c) Big five personality Inventory (John, O.P & Srivastava, 1999): the internal consistency of the questionnaire was $\alpha=.94$

Statistical Tools: Data Analysis was done using statistical software, SPSS. The statistical tools used for analysis of data include Correlation and Univariate analysis

Results

H01: The relationship between employee engagement and OCB is positive

Correlations

		Engagement Score	OCB Score
Engagement Score	Pearson Correlation	1	.041*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.042
	N	50	50
OCB Score	Pearson Correlation	.041*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.042	
	N	50	50

The Correlation value between Employee Engagement score and OCB score is 0.041, which shows a positive correlation between the variables studied. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between Employee Engagement score and OCB score. The relationship is significant at 95% and the hypothesis Ho 1.1 is accepted.

It could be inferred that if an employee is engaged in his job he will exhibit Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

H02: The relationship between Personality and OCB is positive

Correlations

		OCB Scores	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Emotional Stability	Openness
OCB Scores	Pearson Correlation	1	-.207(**)	-.353	.095(**)	.112	-.337(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001	.080	.004	.076	.000
	N	50	50	50	50	50	50
Extraversion	Pearson Correlation	-.207(**)	1	.187(**)	-.038	.017	.198(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001		.003	.553	.785	.002
	N	50	50	50	50	50	50
Agreeableness	Pearson Correlation	-.353	.187(**)	1	.037	.060	.115
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.080	.003		.559	.342	.068
	N	50	50	50	50	50	50
Conscientiousness	Pearson Correlation	.095(**)	-.038	.037	1	-.062	.171(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.553	.559		.326	.007
	N	50	50	50	50	50	50
Emotional Stability	Pearson Correlation	.112	.017	.060	-.062	1	-.068
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.076	.785	.342	.326		.284
	N	50	50	50	50	50	50
Openness	Pearson Correlation	.337(**)	.198(**)	.115	.171(**)	-.068	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.002	.068	.007	.284	
	N	50	50	50	50	50	50

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The Correlation value between the Big Five Personality factors and OCB is studied. It could be inferred that Personality factors like Extraversion, Conscientiousness and openness have a positive correlation with OCB. There is no correlation between OCB and the other factors such as Agreeableness and Emotional Stability.

H03: The interactive effect of Personality and Employee Engagement on OCB is positive

H031: The interactive effect of Personality (Extraversion) and Employee Engagement on OCB

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behavior						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Intercept	Hypothesis	72794.033	1	72794.033	11734.488	.006
	Error	6.203	1	6.203 ^a		
EEGr	Hypothesis	34.867	1	34.867	7.134	.008
	Error	4.888	1	4.888 ^b		
EGr	Hypothesis	6.203	1	6.203	1.269	.462
	Error	4.888	1	4.888 ^b		
EEGr * Gr	Hypothesis	4.888	1	4.888	.183	.671
	Error	1229.244	46	26.723 ^c		

The sum of square 4.888 for the interaction effect (Employee engagement and extraversion) on OCB is not significant (F=0.183, P= 0.671). It reveals that the interaction between Employee Engagement and Extraversion does not affect Organization Citizenship Behavior

H032: The interactive effect of Personality (Agreeableness) and Employee Engagement on OCB

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behavior						
Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intercept	Hypothesis	62055.389	1	62055.389	698.444	.024
	Error	88.848	1	88.848 ^a		
EEGr	Hypothesis	81.106	1	81.106	1.491	.007
	Error	54.383	1	54.383 ^b		
AGr	Hypothesis	88.848	1	88.848	1.634	.423
	Error	54.383	1	54.383 ^b		
EEGr * AGr	Hypothesis	54.383	1	54.383	2.181	.147
	Error	1146.838	46	24.931 ^c		

The sum of square (54.383) the interaction effect (Employee Engagement and Agreeableness) on Organization citizenship Behavior is not significant (F=2.181) interaction between Employee Engagement and Agreeableness does not affect Organization citizenship Behavior

H033: The interactive effect of Personality (Conscientiousness) and Employee Engagement on OCB

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour						
Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intercept	Hypothesis	60182.962	1	60182.962	71396.042	.002
	Error	.843	1	.843 ^a		.192
EEGr	Hypothesis	26.588	1	26.588	4.446	.002
	Error	5.980	1	5.980 ^b		
CGr	Hypothesis	.843	1	.843	.141	.001
	Error	5.980	1	5.980 ^b		
EEGr * CGr	Hypothesis	5.980	1	5.980	.227	.636
	Error	1212.656	46	26.362 ^c		

The sum of square (5.908) the interaction effect (Employee Engagement and Conscientiousness) on Organization citizenship Behavior is not significant (F=0.227), interaction between Employee Engagement and Conscientiousness does not affect Organization citizenship Behavior

H034: The interactive effect of Personality (Emotional Stability) and Employee Engagement on OCB

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour						
Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intercept	Hypothesis	73119.678	1	73119.678	2605.133	.012
	Error	28.068	1	28.068 ^a		
EEGr	Hypothesis	34.594	1	34.594	61.137	.008
	Error	.566	1	.566 ^b		
ESGr	Hypothesis	28.068	1	28.068	49.603	.090
	Error	.566	1	.566 ^b		
EEGr *	Hypothesis	.566	1	.566	.022	.883
ESGr	Error	1191.273	46	25.897 ^c		

The sum of square (0.566) the interaction effect (Employee Engagement and Emotional Stability) on Organization citizenship Behavior is not significant (F=0.022) interaction between Employee Engagement and Emotional Stability does not affect Organization citizenship Behavior

H035: The interactive effect of Personality (Openness) and Employee Engagement on OCB

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behavior						
Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intercept	Hypothesis	73170.153	1	73170.153	8828.007	.007
	Error	8.288	1	8.288 ^a		
EEGr	Hypothesis	38.641	1	38.641	1.128	.001
	Error	34.250	1	34.250 ^b		
OGr	Hypothesis	8.288	1	8.288	.242	.009
	Error	34.250	1	34.250 ^b		
EEGr * OGr	Hypothesis	34.250	1	34.250	1.314	.258
	Error	1199.036	46	26.066 ^c		

The sum of square (34.250) the interaction effect (Employee Engagement and openness) on Organization citizenship Behavior is not significant (F=1.314) interaction between Employee Engagement and openness does not affect Organization citizenship Behavior

DISCUSSION

The results of the research conducted to study the interactive effect of Personality and Employee Engagement on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour reveals that there is no interactive effect. The results highlight the fact that an employee who is engaged will exhibit Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. The other findings from the study are only three of the five Personality factors such as Extraversion, Conscientiousness and openness influences OCB and the other two factors do not have any influence on OCB.

Though Employee Engagement and Personality factors show significant relationship with OCB, there is no interactive effect between the three variables. The findings are consistent with assumption that Personality is not a necessary condition for OCB and there could also be other factors that contribute to OCB.

CONCLUSION

The study sampled 50 employees; the findings pertain to these employees Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. The results of the study suggest that Engagement has a significant relationship with Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. The results also reveal important findings that Extraversion, Conscientiousness and Openness have significant relationship with the Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. The variables Employee Engagement and Personality have significant relationship with the Organizational Citizenship Behaviour when studied independently. But, there is no interactive effect between the three variables.

Organizations should recognize the relationship between Employee Engagement and Organisation citizenship behavior and take efforts to enhance the Employee Engagement drivers, which will contribute to better performance. Managers can consider those Organizational Citizenship Behavior favorable personality factors like Extraversion, Conscientiousness and Openness while selecting people for their organizations

REFERENCES

- Barrick, Murray R. / Mount, Michael K. (1991): The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology* 44 (1), 1-26. | • Bhatnagar, J., & Biswas, S. (2010). Predictors and Outcomes of employee Engagement: Implications of the Resource-Based View Perspective. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 46(2), 273-288. | • Cattell, R.B. (1943): The description of personality: basic traits resolved into clusters. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology* 38, 476-506. | • Costa, Paul T. Jr. / McCrae, Robert R. (1985): Updating Norman's "adequate taxonomy": Intelligence and personality dimensions in natural language and questionnaires. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology* 49, 710-721. | • Digman, John M. (1989): Five robust trait dimensions: Development, stability and utility. *Journal of personality* 57, 195-214. | • Digman, John M. (1990): Personality Structure: The emergence of the five-factor model. The annual review of the department of psychology of the University of Hawaii 41, 417-440. | • Fiske, D. W. (1949): Consistency of the factorial structures of personality ratings from different sources. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology* 44, 329-344. | • Kahn, W.A. (1990). Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement of Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724. | • Little, B., & Little, P. (2006). Employee Engagement: Conceptual Issues. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication, and Concept*, 10(1), 111-120. | • Mackenzie, Scott.B. Podsakoff, Philip M. Fetter, Richard. (1993). "The Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour on Evaluations of Salesperson Performance", *Journal of Marketing*, 57 (1), 70-81. | • Min-Huei, Chien. (2004). "An Investigation of The Relationship of Organizational Structure: Employees Personality and Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Journal of Academy of Business*, 5(1/2), 428-432 | • Norman, W. T. (1963): Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology* 66, 574-583. | • Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Mackenzie, S. B. (2006). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences. USA: Sage Publications, Inc. | • Podsakoff, P.M., & Mackenzie, S.B. (1997). Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Organizational Performance: A Review and Suggestions for Future Research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 133-151. | • Robert, D.R., & Davenport, T.O. (2002). Job Engagement: Why It's Important and How to Improve It. *Employment Relations*, 24(3), 21-29. | • 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 | • Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P.R. (2002). The Relative Importance of Task, Citizenship, and Counterproductive Performance to Global Ratings of Job Performance: A Policy-Capturing Approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 66-80. |