# Relationship Leadership, Employee Engagement and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

D. Wahyu Ariani[1]

| ARTICLE INFO | ABSTRACT |
|---|---|
| | Our research focuses on the impact of supportive leadership and employee engagement on the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The research study setting with the individual unit of analysis. A survey was conducted by using questionnaires from previous research. The questionnaires were sent to 300 employees in service organizations in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, 252 completed surveys data were returned anonymously in sealed envelopes. Validity and reliability tests were used to test the questionnaires contents. The structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to test the relationship among variables. The result proved that supportive leadership and employee engagement have direct positive relationship with OCB and employee engagement mediated the relationship between supportive leadership and OCB. A thorough discussion on the relationship among the variables as well as on self-rating is presented in this paper. |

## 1. Introduction

The organizations have been interested in the willingness of employees to dedicate themselves for leadership roles in the organization and how employees think and feel attached to their work. It is understood that the organization wants to increase employee engagement, given that the engaged employees were willing to devote themselves fully in their work by way of a positive role (Kahn, 1990) and remain in them longer work (Saks, 2006; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Employee engagement concerns the extent to which individuals use all the resources of cognitive, emotional, and physical to perform roles associated with the job (Kahn, 1990; Xu & Thomas, 2011) . Employees who feel committed and willing to engage in their work generally is the employee who has the characteristics of an energetic, fun, enjoyable, and effective in carrying out their work (Kahn, 1990; Macey & Schenider, 2008; Xu & Thomas, 2011). The high level of employee engagement is associated with increased return on assets, earnings of each employee higher, better performance, greater sales growth, lower absenteeism, reduced employee turnover, lower cost than the cost of goods, and error because the products are not diminishing quality (Salanova, Agut, and Piero, 2005; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Xu & Thomas, 2011).

Employee engagement is a concept that contains the value of the understanding and improvement of individual and organizational performance and can be influenced by the leader. In theory, the impact of leadership on employee engagement is a leadership style that is adopted to improve employee engagement at work. A leadership style can also improve employee engagement, employee satisfaction, and employee enthusiasm for work (Alok & Israel, 2012). Kahn (1990) suggested that an individual involved is a person who is close to the work-related tasks, so that the employee is willing to give you the ability and energy, and eager to work in an organization that should translate into a higher level of performance in accordance with the role played (in-role performance) and performance that are outside the role played (extra-role performance). When people dedicate themselves to the job role, the individual must have a higher contextual performance and related to the tendency of individuals to behave in a manner that facilitates the tendency to behave in accordance with social and psychological context of an organization (Christian, Garza, & Slaughter, 2011).

Right leadership will lead to higher levels of employee engagement that can drive organizational performance. Previous studies showed a consistent relationship between leadership and construction argued by some to be part of the engagement, such as motivation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, proactive behavior, and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Xu & Thomas, 2011). Empirical studies should find that the influence of leadership among others, can increase public confidence

in the followers of the higher purpose of one's work and improve employee perceptions of their work, so as to obtain positive results, such as organizational citizenship behavior.

According to Saks (2006), a stronger theoretical rationale to explain the stronger employee engagement can be found in the social exchange theory. Employees who have the feeling of getting the support of the organization or supervisor will be more involved in the work and the organization as part of the norm of reciprocity described in the Social Exchange Theory to help the organization achieve its goals (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). In other words, when employees believe that the organization is paying attention to them and care about their well-being , then they are likely to respond by trying to meet their obligations by becoming more involved in the organization. This is due to the employee orientation tends to view them as a supervisor on her organizational support (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

The influence of leadership on organizational citizenship behavior has been widely debated, both direct and indirect influence (Papalexandris & Galanaki, 2009). This article attempts to examine the effect of leadership style on employee engagement. Increasing employee engagement is highly dependent on the leadership to establish two-way communication and transparency between leaders and employees on the job by looking at the individual as well as appreciate and respect the individual (Sahoo & Mishra, 2012). Positive relationship between leadership styles and attitudes, behavior, and performance of followers, has been well documented (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Employee engagement are optimistic and spontaneous, and tend to show a positive attitude and a proactive behavior at work (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008), including helping attitude towards co-workers, or better known as organizational citizenship behavior.

This article is the application of social cognitive theory regarding the relationship between supportive leadership style and organizational citizenship behavior mediated by employee engagement. According to Social Cognitive Theory presented by Bandura (2001), the behavior of employees (in this case, organizational citizenship behavior) is a combination of situational resources (e.g., supportive leadership) and dispositional resources (e.g., employee engagement). This study explores how perceptions of leadership style and employee engagement as individuals can affect subordinate organizational citizenship behavior. This study aims to examine the relationship between perceived leadership style, employee engagement, and organizational citizenship behavior. Employee engagement and leadership supervision or support is very important for all organizations that promote organizational citizenship behavior. There are three reasons why this is an important concern. First, leadership influence and stimulate followers to engage in business or extra activities and is able to perform these activities beyond expectations. This theoretical proposition has been empirically supported by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bacharach, 2000) and Podsakoff and Bommer (1996). Second, leaders can influence followers by creating meaningful work (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Third, employee perceptions of their work called employee engagement positively able to predict their organizational citizenship behavior (Purvanova, Bono, & Dzieweczynski, 2006).

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between supportive leadership style and organizational citizenship behavior of employees fully mediated by employee engagement. The focus of this study is also to explore the impact of supportive leadership style on employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior of employees. Related to these ideas, this study shows that the influence of leadership and how followers think about the work of employees will affect the employee to see it as more useful, challenging, and meaningful. This will affect the extent to which employees are involved in performance beyond the role to be played, or the so-called organizational citizenship behavior. More and more employees are involved in organizational citizenship behavior, the organization will be more successful.

## 2. Theoretical Development and Hypotheses

### 2.1. Employee Engagement
What is meant by employee engagement? Kahn (1990) defined employee engagement as an attempt to avail themselves to the role of organizational members in the work. Employee engagement is the enthusiasm and involvement in the work. People are very attached to their work personally identify with the work and motivated by the work itself. In the attachment, the individual uses and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally for achieving performance in accordance with the role played (in-role

performance). Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter argued that employee engagement is associated with sustainable workload, feelings of being elect, as well as having control, recognition, and rewards the right, the presence of community support work, honesty and fairness, and felt that the work was meant and appreciated (Xu & Thomas, 2011). Engaged employees who feel bound optimistic and spontaneous, tend to show a positive attitude and be proactive behavior at work (Organ, 1994; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) and they are more likely to do things that aim to improve the effectiveness of the organization (Saks, 2008).

Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, and Bakker (2002) defined employee engagement as satisfactory, and the work associated with a positive state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. The essence of engagement are a positive attitude towards the organization and proud of the organization, have the perception that the organization allows employees to perform well, a willingness to behave helpful or altruistically, and be a good team player, and have an understanding of the bigger picture and the willingness to go beyond the requirements of the job (Simon, 2009). Employee engagement is indicated by three characteristics, namely employees who want to say or speak positively about the organization, employees who want to live or have a desire to become members of the organization, and employees who are trying to work beyond what is expected for the organization (Sarangi, 2012).

People want to be involved and committed to the organization because of the three antecedent conditions are fulfilled, namely psychologically feel safe in the presence of another person to perform its role, have sufficient resources to achieve the performance and feel that their work is quite meaningful, and what they do the privately considered valuable (Kahn, 1990). Employee engagement is the level of commitment and employee involvement that leads to the values of the organization. An employee who feels bound to be aware of business context, and works with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization. An employee who is bound employees intellectually and emotionally bound with the organization, was excited at the achievement of organizational goals, and committed to the values of the organization. Employee engagement is the extent to which people enjoy and believe in what they do and feel rewarded by doing it. Employee engagement is a positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and the values espoused by the organization. Employees feel bound when they find personal meaning and motivated in their work, receive positive interpersonal support, and operating in an efficient working environment.

Previous studies have been used to adopt two approaches to understanding the antecedents of employee engagement. One widely used approach is the approach of Kahn (1990) is a psychological condition attachment approach and other approaches are labor demand model approach (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Xu & Thomas, 2011; May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004). The second approach was a resource that can include organizational factors such as job security and interpersonal elements such as supervisor support, role conflict, and autonomy. According to Robinson, Peryman, and Hayday, employee engagement showed characteristics similar to organizational citizenship behavior and employee commitment but not the same. Employee engagement has characteristics similar to organizational citizenship behavior and employee commitment (Mansoor & Aslam, 2012). According to Saks (2006), organizational citizenship behavior is different from employee engagement in the sense that organizational citizenship behavior involves behaviors that are not part of one's job requirements, while employee engagement is a formal role on the performance of the employee's duties.

Engaged employees display greater strength, dedication, and the totality of their work and should demonstrate ever-increasing performance because they focus on the responsibilities and duties of employees (Scaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006). Employee engagement can improve organizational citizenship behavior have focused on employee engagement and increase employee commitment which must lie outside the parameters specified in each organization (Mansoor & Aslam, 2012). Bakker and Demerouti (2008) suggested a positive relationship between employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior.

## 2.2. Supportive Leadership
Supervisor or leader can play an important role in increasing the motivational characteristics of the work environment such as job autonomy. Leaders are most prominent in the context of individual work, so that the leader is the person most likely to represent the organizational culture or climate, as well as having a direct influence on the behavior of subordinates (Zaigham, 2007). A leader is one who guides others toward a common goal and creates an environment in which the other organization members feel actively involved in the process in the organization. Leadership is a process of social influence in which one person affect one

or more followers by explaining what needs to be done, and provide the tools and motivation to achieve the goals set (Babcock-Roberson & Strickland, 2010).

Leadership is situational factors that can affect creativity. Leadership can be attributed to the creativity of individual followers. The results of empirical studies state that the leadership effect occurs with increasing public confidence in the followers of the goals of higher employment and increased perceptions of individuals at work, which in turn will yield positive results such as cohesion, job satisfaction, effort or spirit, psychological well-being, and performance (Jiao, Richards, Zhang, 2011). When leaders promote active thinking in the organization, employees will be more engaged and involved in the organization.

When employees are engaged in their jobs, they will increase the behaviors that promote the good of the organization (Babcock - Roberson & Strickland, 2010). The leader is an important element of the work context can affect how individuals view their work. Macey and Shneider (2008) states that when leaders have clear expectations or fair, and recognize good performance, the leader will have a positive effect on employee engagement by giving birth to a sense of attachment to the job. Leadership can increase the sense of engagement and employee involvement, teamwork, commitment, competence, and performance of employees (Shamir et al., 1993; Yuan, Lin, Shieh, & Li, 2012).

Previous studies suggest a link between the behavior of the leader and follower positive attitude behavior associated with attachment. This study uses a supportive leadership style. Results of previous studies showed that transformational leadership is able to bring the excitement and feeling of identification with one's job (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Supportive leader is a sub-dimension of transformational leadership (Shin & Zhou, 2003), which is called the individualized consideration. Individualized consideration involves personalizing the interaction with followers by providing relevant mentoring, training, and understanding (Grant, 2012). If the leader is an individual who supports (supportive) and attentive and able to stimulate the understanding and motivation, it will be the leader of this will help in getting tasks done by employees efficiently and effectively (Shin & Zhou, 2003).

Employees will engaged in their work or organization when they feel that the leader cares about their well-being as evidenced by the ability to effectively communicate the message that hard, willing to listen to employees, willing to follow up the various problems with the right actions, and able to carry out the organization's values in their behavior itself. When employees have confidence in their leaders, they will be more willing to devote themselves to their work, because they feel psychologically safe (Kahn, 1990). Employee engagement requires active support and commitment from top executives with the mission statement, vision, and values are clear. Kahn (1990) developed a theoretical and empirical evidence of the beginning of the relationship between leadership and employee engagement. Confidence in the leader, the support of the leader, and the creation of an environment that is free of psychological security component that enables employee engagement. Saks (2006) found a positive relationship between supervisory supports underlying the negative effects of job demands on work attachment.

According to Avey, Hughes, Norman, and Luthan (2008), leadership has a positive relationship with employee engagement. Leadership helps create an environment where employees can easily engage in organizational citizenship behavior. Leader behavior has a great impact on the results or performance of employees. Saks (2006) found a positive relationship between supervisor support and employee engagement. Theorist suggested that Social Exchange Theory may be able to provide insight on how leaders influence the results achieved by the organization. Social Exchange Theory suggests that employees will reciprocate the leader's behavior towards them with their own behavior and the presence of a suitable reciprocal relationship as part of a social exchange relationship development process (Soeib, Othman, & D ' Silva, 2013). Leader behavior is a source of motivation and satisfaction for his men. Leadership also influences the attitude and performance of followers (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995). Leadership is an important element in the development of employee engagement.

The drivers of employee engagement will motivate employees to be fully involved in the organization and remain committed to their work, care about the organization and their colleagues, and work on the role that exceed a role to play within the organization to ensure its success. This behavior is also known as organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational citizenship behavior has been widely associated with job satisfaction, fairness, fatigue, and support the leader (Lepine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; Chiu & Tsai, 2006). The relationship between leadership and organizational citizenship behavior has been carried out (Piccolo

& Colquitt, 2006; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990; Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, & Chen, 2005; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 2001). This study suggests that the leadership has the potential to affect organizational citizenship behavior of employees.

Leaders motivate followers by encouraging them to internalize and prioritize greater shared interests above individual interests. Individuals who are intrinsically motivated to fulfill a shared vision may tend to contribute to achieving the goal of work together in a way that is inconsistent with the role played by (Wang et al., 2005). Individuals would make due contribution in this act contained self-esteem and high self-concept. Leadership related to organizational citizenship behavior as a leader influences follower perceptions of followers to their work. Followers will identify themselves with their leader who will motivate them to engage in behavior that is outside the role to be played, or the so-called organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff & Bommer, 1996; Boerner, Dutschke, and Wied, 2008).

Research on leadership showed a consistent relationship between leadership styles or behaviors and constructs that are argued by some people to be a part of the attachment, such as motivation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. According to Avolio and Bass (1995), a supportive leader has a high concern for always watching employees as individuals. Supportive leadership which is a sub-dimension of transformational leadership, it is shown with individualized consideration (Rafferty & Griffin, 2006). Consideration of the individual focuses on the development of followers. When leaders show individualized consideration, they are focused on developing the ability of followers, providing information and resources, and have the wisdom to act (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999; Bass, 1985). Provide leadership and support an environment of mutual trust, will allow employees to fully devote himself to the role of their work. Leadership will help create an environment where employees can easily engage in organizational citizenship behavior. A number of studies have observed a significant positive relationship between supervisor consideration and subordinate performance (Khalid, Murtaza, Zafar, Zafar, Saqib, & Mustaq, 2012).

Hause said that leadership is a behavior support, which focuses on the well-being of employees and has a deep concern for the needs, preferences, and employee satisfaction (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 2000). Research on the relationship between the leadership dimension and engagement is still considered rare or still in the early stages. There is still a lack of studies that look at the direct effect of leadership on job attachment by using a clear measure of engagement. Support leaders also play an important role in promoting organizational citizenship behavior. If the leaders provide support, then this will encourage employee participation in decision-making, motivating employees, and reward employees to improve their performance. The employee will work with a vibrant and fun to do much useful work for the organization.

## 2.3. Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and deviant behavior that are not contained in the formal job description that supports task performance by enhancing the social and psychological work environment. Over the past few decades, organizational citizenship behavior has been one of the most studied topics in management literature. Such behavior incorporates a whole series of activities carried out spontaneously and beyond the requirements specified in the role to be played (Katz & Kahn, 1966). Organizational citizenship behavior is a relatively new concept and is part of organizational behavior. Organizational citizenship behavior is defined as an individual performance element that serves to keep the wider environment, good social environment, organization, and psychologically around core technical functions to operate.

Organizational citizenship behavior has been defined as individual behaviors that promote organizational goals by contributing to the social and psychological environment (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Organizational citizenship behavior is a flexible behavior that is not part of the formal work of the employees, but the organizational citizenship behavior can improve an organization's effectiveness. Organizational citizenship behavior express a form of behavior that is outside the role played by employees where they do go beyond their formal job requirements without expecting recognition in terms of awards either explicit or implicit from his superiors. Organizational citizenship behavior has been known to improve organizational effectiveness, organizational efficiency, and overall performance of the organization using the organization's social engine lubricant, reducing friction and improving efficiency (Podsakoff & Mac Kenzie, 1997; Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Smith et al., 1983).

Mayfield and Taber (2010) categorize the antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior as individual differences, work attitudes, and other contextual variables. Stable individual differences include the nature or values that are constantly making variations among individuals. The attitude of emotion and cognition work is based on the individual's perception of the work environment such as organizational commitment, perceptions of leadership and resources to support the organization, perceptions of perceived justice, the fit between the individual and the organization, and job satisfaction (Allameh, Shahriari, and Mansoori, 2012). Contextual factors are external influences that come from a job, work group, organization, or environment such as task characteristics, leadership styles, group characteristics, construction organization, and culture of the organization (Organ & Ryan, 1995). This study uses the variable employee attitudes toward the organization to access the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors such as employee engagement. This study also uses contextual leadership style as antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior.

Employee engagement is the willingness and ability to contribute to the success of the company. Employee engagement has potential applications for the practices of human resource management such as role definition, support, and flexibility. Individuals are a key component in every company and demonstrate the ability to implement strategies and achieve its objectives. There are many studies that measure the construct of attachment, but not always consistent operational definition (Christian et al., 2011). Kahn (1990) proposed that personal engagement is a condition in which employees "bring in" shows itself in the role in achieving performance, giving abilities, and suffered emotional connection with their work. Employee engagement is primarily a motivational concept that represents the active allocation of resources towards personal tasks associated with the role in the workplace (Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010).

Employee engagement is the desire to work, to make things better, work longer, work harder, achieve more, and speak positively about the organization. Saks (2006) conducted one of the first empirical test of the antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Antecedents of employee engagement including job characteristics, rewards and recognition, perceived organizational support, perceived supervisor support, distributive justice and procedural fairness. The consequences include increased employee engagement job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior, and reduced desire to quit or quit his job. Macey and Schneider (2008) found that job characteristics, leadership, and personal qualities to be directly related to employee engagement and indirectly with the performance of employees.

Organizational citizenship behavior research is generally described as positive and constructive behaviors are driven by supervisors (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Smith et al., 1983). Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Bommer (1996) argues that leadership effects can not be ignored in such behavior. Graham found the most important impact of the leader's behavior must exist on the behavior beyond the role played in excess of the expected role ( Lian & Tui, 2012) .

The selection of this study was driven by the fact that organizational citizenship behavior is not done by establishing a culture free (Blakely, Srivastava, & Moorman, 2005; Farh, Zhong, & Organ, 2004; Rurkkhum & Bartlett, 2012). An important distinction between task performance and organizational citizenship behavior is that the performance of a task has different characteristics are influenced by the type of work performed, whereas organizational citizenship behavior are very similar to each job and another job (Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001). Task performance is based on job analysis and has the goal of finding tasks and task dimensions that distinguish one job from another job. Organizational citizenship behavior as a volunteer and work together with others is largely the same although for different jobs. Previous studies have also reported a relationship between employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior (Bobcock-Roberson & Strickland, 2010; Christian et al., 2011). On the basis of the previous studies, the hypothesis has been developed on this study are :
H1: Supportive leadership affects employee engagement
H2: Supportive Leadership affects organizational citizenship behavior
H3: Employee engagement affects organizational citizenship behavior
H4: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between supportive leadership and organizational citizenship behavior

## 3. Method

### 3.1. Sample and Procedure

The research was conducted on organizations engaged in services especially retail shops in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Selection of the research setting is based on previous studies that stated the difficulty of measuring the performance of a service company. The research was conducted in institutions in several locations in Yogyakarta. This study uses a questionnaire survey conducted themselves. This study use self administered questionnaires were distributed to collect individual data on the respondents. Sample of this research are employees that provide services to customers directly. The survey took approximately three months. Compared with four other survey methods (face-to-face interviews, questionnaires by mail, by telephone questionnaires, questionnaires via electronic media, or a combination of the methods of the survey), which conducted its own survey method is the best method (Cooper & Schindler, 2001, Neuman, 2006, Sekaran & Bougie, 2010).

Research with individuals as the unit of analysis requires a sample with certain criteria or characteristics. Characteristics of the sample are used to convey the characteristics of the sample relative to the population. Samples intended to be representative of the population. Sample size also affects the accuracy or representation of the population, although the large sample would show the highest confidence (the greatest confidence) in the study. The sampling method used in this study is a non probability sampling. In this method, the elements in the population do not have the same probability to be selected as a sample in the study (Sekaran & Bougie, 2008 Cooper & Schindler, 2001). Non probabilistic sampling technique chosen is purposive sampling. The criteria chosen in the sample were permanent employees is directly related to the customer and have worked at least three months. The target population in this study was employees of several retail service shops that have the same job, as employees who deal directly with customers. In addition, this study uses self-assessment. Researchers will only take two employees who meet the established criteria in each agency. The sample consisted of 252 employees (with response rate 84 %) of 300 employees from service industries especially retail shops in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The demographic profile characteristics under investigation include the gender. Respondents of the service retail shops in Yogyakarta Indonesia received pen-and-paper surveys. Respondents were assured of anonymity and completed the survey during working hours.

### 3.2. Measures

The instruments were designed for individual level unit of analysis. Each respondent in the study was required to complete three measures: OCB, supportive leadership, and employee engagement. Questionnaire on the OCB is taken from those developed by previous researchers, such as Organ and Konovsky (1989) on the altruism dimension. Supportive leadership was measured using items from Behling and McFillen (1996) because supportive leadership questionnaire is one of transformational leadership dimensions. Employee engagement was measured using items from Schaufeli et al. (2006) and Salanova et al. (2005). The questionnaires were adopted minor modification as per local requirements of my research in Indonesia. These modifications were in the demographics where the languages of Indonesia were included.

There was no change for questionnaire relating to supportive leadership, employee engagement, and OCB. All of the scales were measured on 5-point Likert Scale ranging from 1. A covering letter explaining the importance of the study was used and questionnaire were distributed to employees of service retail shops in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. This study also used factor analysis as a way to test the construct validity and internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha indicating reliability. With the varimax rotation and loading factor minimum 0.5 as suggested by Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham (2006). Furthermore, to examine the relationship and influence between the independent and dependent variables, researchers used correlation and structural equation modeling with Amos.

## 4. Data Analysis and Results

### 4.1. Validity and Reliability Analysis

This research uses a questionnaire that is developed by some previous researchers by translating from and retranslating it to the original language. To assess the validity of the measurement items of all variables, content validity and construct validity check was carried out. Content validity that is used to assess for the measurement instruments was done in the pre-tested stage by soliciting the expert opinions of professor from a university who are research specialists in quantitative methodology and organizational behavior

disciplines, especially for employee engagement, supportive leadership, and OCB topics.. The scale was then pre-tested on 30 respondents who were the employees that have similar characteristics to the target population as suggested by Sekaran and Bougie (2010). I used factor analysis to check the construct validity. To further simplify the interpretation and seek a simpler structure, the orthogonal technique and the varimax rotation was then performed. Factor analysis (FA) was also performed on the construct under study. Factor extraction was executed and any Eigenvalue that is greater than one (1) will be adopted. The varimax rotated principal component factor revealed each variables. The factor loading recorded loading is above 0.50. Given all the items extracted were recorded above 0.5. With varimax rotation and factor loading 0.50 as suggested by Hair et al. (2006) the result of construct validity testing are practically significant. Factor analysis is carried out to test construct validity. Then, with varimax rotation and factor loading the minimum of 0.5 as suggested by Hairet al. (2006) are achieved as a result of construct validity test which is practically significant. The factor loading recorded loading of between 0.583 and 0.7842. Given all the items extracted were recorded above 0.5, three (3) items were deleted. With varimax rotation and factor loading of minimum 0.5 as suggested by Hair et al. (2006) the results of construct validity testing are practically significant. Then, the items that have the construct validity with the use of factor analysis are tested for their reliability. To assess the reliability of the measurement items of all the variables, an internal consistency check was carried out. The Cronbach alpha from the test yielded a record of 0.8421 for employee engagement, 0.8648 for OCB, and 0.7718 for transformational leadership, which is far above the cut-off line of reliability as recommended by Hair et al. (2006). The result of validity and reliability test show that six items of employee engagement, six items of supportive leadership, and seven items of OCB are valid with the loading factor were higher than 0.5.

## 4.2. Descriptive Statistics and Mean Difference

In order to perform the statistical analysis, I used a series of analysis of relationship among all research constructs with correlation. Inter correlations among three constructs is positively significant. Based on theoretical and empirical estimations relationship between employee engagement and OCB is positive, relationship between employee engagement and supportive leadership is positive. Relationship between supportive leadership and OCB is also positive. Means, standard deviation, scale reliabilities, and inter correlations between all variables are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Inter Correlations among The Study Variables

|  | Mean | SD | A | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OCB | 3.8753 | 0.63989 | 0.8648 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Supportive Leadership | 3.8783 | 0.60484 | 0.7718 | 0.468** | 1.000 |  |
| Employee Engagement | 4.2449 | 0.42709 | 0.8421 | 0.434** | 0.274** | 1.000 |

Notes: correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

All of the obtained correlations are not very strong. Correlation between OCB and employee engagement was positive and significant ($r = 0.434$, $p < 0.01$).  Correlation between employee engagement and supportive leadership was positive and significant ($r = 0.274$, $p < 0.01$). Correlations between supportive leadership and OCB was positive and significant ($r = 0.468$, $p < 0.01$). It can be claimed that in general, the relationship between these two variables of the research is accepted but this relationship is not strong. Based on theoretical and empirical estimations, bivariate correlations between supportive leadership, employee engagement, and OCB are positive. Low correlation between these variables is caused by characteristics of variables.

## 4. 3. Hypothesis Testing Results

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to examine the discriminant validity of the study variables. Specifically, I tested a three-factor model in which the employee engagement, OCB, and supportive leadership items each loaded onto separate latent factors. Relative strength of relationships between supportive supervisors and empowerment with OCB was examined through structural Equation Modeling (SEM). Table 2 provides that supportive leadership affects employee engagement OCB separately.

Table 2. Supportive Leadership Affects Employee Engagement and OCB Separately

| | Beta | Critical Ratio |
|---|---|---|
| Supportive Leadership → Employee Engagement | 0.309 | 4.261 |
| Supportive Leadership → OCB | 0.465 | 6.655 |
| GFI = 0.926<br>p= 0.000<br>Chi Square = 31.826<br>Df= 1 | | |

Structural Equation Models in the present study were designed and tested using AMOS 4.0 software (Byrne, 2001). The structural model was specified by allowing the individual items of each measure to load on a latent factor. I first conducted a dimension-level confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) that included all measures to assess the relationship between the latent variables and the manifest items that served as their indicators. Results showed that the hypothesized factor model fit the data well ($\chi2$ = 31.826; *df* = 1; *p*= 0.000; GFI = .926).

The result of mediating test of employee engagement on relationship between supportive leadership and OCB, I used structural equation modeling with AMOS 4.0. Table 3 provides the result of the mediating model.

Table 3. Mediating Analysis

| | Beta | Critical Ratio |
|---|---|---|
| Supportive Leadership → Employee Engagement | 0.256 | 2.912 |
| Employee Engagement → OCB | 0.395 | 4.970 |
| Supportive Leadership → OCB | 0.312 | 3.481 |
| GFI = 0.733<br>p= 0.000<br>Chi Square= 1077.322<br>Df= 167 | | |

Table 3 shows that employee engagement does not mediate relationship between supportive leadership and OCB. Hypothesis 4 was not supported. Based on two models, hypothesis 1 is supported. Supportive leadership affects employee engagement positively and significantly. Based on two models, supportive leadership also affects OCB positively and significantly. Hypothesis 2 is supported. Employee engagement affects OCB positively and significantly on the second model. Hypothesis 3 is also supported. Based on the second model, employee engagement does not mediate the relationship between supportive leadership and OCB. This is because results showed that the hypothesized factor model does not fit the data well ($\chi2$ = 1077.322; *df* = 167; *p*= 0.000; GFI = .733). Hypothesis 4 is not supported.


## 5. Discussion

These findings add to the belief that employee engagement related to supportive leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. The results of this study showed a positive relationship between employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior, between employee engagement and supportive leadership, and between supportive leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. The results of this study also showed a significant relationship between the three variables, namely supportive leadership, employee engagement, and organizational citizenship behavior. Basic dimensions of employee engagement include intrinsic motivation, which ensures goal-oriented behavior. The high level of engagement will enhance the proactive work behaviors in the sense of personal initiatives such as organizational citizenship behavior (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008). Employee engagement is a combination of organizational aspects such as individual commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and work motivation (Wash, 1999).

Employees who feel bound will likely want to create a conducive social contacts to work together in teams, helping, voice improvement, and showed other positive discretionary behaviors that can increase organizational effectiveness (Podsakoff, Whitting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). Employee engagement is positively related to organizational citizenship behavior because employees who feel attached and engaged

in their work should not only meet the requirements according to their formal role, but will try to exert extra effort to do other activities that go beyond the requirements in accordance with the formal role them. Employees were tied in his work will be excited and more committed to the organization. Employee engagement is the extent to which people enjoy and believe in what they do, and feel rewarded by doing the job.

The results of this study showed a positive association employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior. This study explores the relationship between employee engagement and behaviors that go beyond formal requirements and scope of work of the employee. Deviant behavior is defined in this study is that organizational citizenship behavior refers to the behavior of the employee that go beyond the requirements of the job. Previous studies also have reported a link between employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior (Bobcock-Robertson & Strickland, 2010; Christian et al., 2011), little is known of this potential relationship in other more collective cultures.

The results of this study found an association between supportive leadership and employee engagement. Leadership can affect the meaningfulness of the employee as measured by employee engagement. Leaders influence on motivation and performance of followers. When employees are empowered, they believe that they can influence their work. Employee engagement and leadership are studied closely linked to the context of the work environment and organizational conditions. Leadership can develop and improve employee engagement in the organization (Gafoor, Qureshi, Khan, & Hijazi, 2011). The leaders support the creation of a conducive working environment to foster respect, trust, cooperation, and emotional support (Gibson et al., 2000).

One of the conditions proposed by Kahn (1990) is a psychological security that offer the most potential for influencing the leader in attachment. In particular, the leadership of which provide a supportive environment of trust will allow the employees to fully devote themselves to their job roles. Kahn (1990) developed a theoretical basis and initial empirical evidence on the relationship between supportive leadership and employee engagement. Specific leader behaviors related to employee engagement, especially the behavior of leaders who support the performance of followers. The steps are more common than supervisor support has also shown a positive relationship of leadership and employee engagement. May et al. (2004) showed that supervisors who provide support will be positively correlated with employee engagement. Saks (2006) suggests the existence of a positive relationship between supervisor support and employee engagement.

Increasing employee engagement is highly dependent on the leadership that sets the two-way communication and transparency between leadership and his men. In addition, employees want their work appreciated and respected that. Leaders who act in a way that supports its employees and aims to develop organizational members can expect to have a loyal member of the organization and demonstrate a high level of attachment. Leaders can improve employee engagement by providing opportunities, such as decision-making within their authority and effective task management, and display integrity by demonstrating high ethical standards as well as being open and honest in communicating (Xu & Thomas, 2011). The researchers confirmed the direct effects of supportive leadership on performance. If the leader support, then this will greatly assist employees in getting the tasks to be carried out efficiently and effectively.

Supportive leadership style will be able to motivate, satisfy, perform, and improve the effectiveness of subordinates in the organization. Inspiring people is not easy for a leader. To do so, it takes time, effort, and perseverance. When there are people who inspire, employees will be more enthusiastic, motivated, engaged, and can improve performance. These findings are consistent with the results of Shin and Zhou (2003), Cheung and Wong (2011), and Xu and Thomas (2011) which states that the followers are likely to remain loyal and rely on a leader to encourage and guide him to do the new job. Leadership has a positive effect on the performance of followers (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002). Leaders must develop their interpersonal skills. They may be able to increase engagement followers through inspirational behavior. Leaders need to recognize that they tend to be more engaged and eager to do the job than employees.

The followers of a supportive leader who will identify themselves on their leaders who motivate them to engage in behavior outside the role to be played (Podsakoff & Bommer, 1996; Boerner et al., 2008). Leader holds one of the most important roles in an organization. A number of studies have also found a positive relationship between leader behavior and subordinate performance. Oriented leader will be able to support

compliance and improve employee behavior . Leadership may be an important antecedent to employee mood. Organ and Ryan (1995) found that the consideration for the employee leaders will produce a strong and positive relationship with organizational citizenship behavior, particularly on the dimensions of altruism. Positive relationship between leadership and organizational citizenship behavior that is expected has been supported empirically (Podsakoff et al., 1990). Previous studies demonstrated leadership as an effective approach to encourage employees are able to achieve the expected performance and is able to perform other behaviors such as organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Leaders enhance the identification of followers with a leadership style that is owned and trust followers to leaders. Followers are willing to engage in organizational citizenship behavior because of their favorable perception of the leader. In other words, leadership can affect the helping co-workers behavior through employee's mood such as employee engagement. When employees be committed, engaged, and involved in the organization, they tend to be more optimistic, able to perform the job successfully, and more useful for others. Leaders influence employee perceptions regarding the efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and willingness to sacrifice themselves for the task. The leaders also strengthen relations followers and colleagues. Supportive leadership related to citizenship performance as leaders influence follower perceptions of their work. Supportive leadership is linked to followers' citizenship performance because leaders affect followers' perceptions of their jobs. Supportive leadership should result in more engaged, more devoted, and less self-concerned employees. Supportive leadership will produce larger, more loyal, and reduce employee orientation to himself. Motivational effects of supportive leadership suggest that increasing social identification and internalization of values will lead to high organizational citizenship behavior. Individuals make contributions because in performing these acts their sense of self-worth and self-concept are enhanced.

This study describes the existence of a positive relationship between leadership and employee perceptions of their work. Employees who report to managers who engage in leadership behaviors that support their work rated as more challenging, meaningful, and meaning. Perception of employees on their work mediates the relationship between leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. Leadership inspires followers to view their work as important, meaningful or significant, and useful (Shamir et al., 1993; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1982). Based on the results of this study, I was able to demonstrate that leaders can influence followers by looking at their work. The study also suggests that one of the possible ways to improve the organizational citizenship behavior in organizations is to change the perception of employees towards their work. Previous research has shown that in general the higher supervisor support can improve organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff et al., 2000). From the results of the meta-analysis found a modest positive correlation between the confirmation of supervisor support and organizational citizenship behavior (Lepine et al., 2002, Podsakoff et al., 1996). The results of this study also showed that supervisor support is generally helpful in motivating organizational citizenship behavior of employees.

This research is based on Social Exchange Theory to improve the understanding of how leadership affects employee engagement supportive to perform organizational citizenship behavior. This study shows that the influence of supportive leadership will drive employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior. In addition, the results of this study also suggested that employee engagement can influence employees perform organizational citizenship behavior, particularly for the dimensions of altruism. Supportive leadership affects employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior directly. In other words, employee engagement will not mediate the relationship between supportive leadership and organizational citizenship behavior.

According to Podsakoff et al. (2000), the known antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior can be placed into four categories: (1) individual characteristics, such as attitude and disposition, (2) the characteristics of the task, such as intrinsically satisfying tasks, non-routine tasks, and tasks that provide feedback, (3) organizational characteristics, such as the organizational structure of formal and informal, and (4) leadership behaviors, such as transactional and transformational leadership. Supportive leadership is part of transformational leadership. Organizational citizenship behavior involves voluntary and informal behaviors that can help co-workers and the organization. Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior can also be categorized as individual differences, work attitudes, and contextual variables (Mayfield & Taber, 2010). Individual differences include the nature or values that are constantly making variations between individuals. Work attitude based on individual perceptions of the work environment such as organizational commitment, perceptions of leadership and support of the organization, perceptions

of fairness, the fit between the individual and the organization, and job satisfaction. Contextual factors include task characteristics, leadership styles, group characteristics, and organizational constraints.

The work life of leaders and employees in Indonesia varies depending on the nature of the organization in which they work. Public sector organizations in Indonesia following the typical bureaucratic structure, but the retail services of private sector organizations in Indonesia are very different structure. Work in an office setting habits often affects employees in the organization. Friendly working life can encourage organizational citizenship behavior of employees. Retail services private sector organizations in Indonesia using different time -based strategies such as flextime to reduce the employee's work life conflict.

## 6. Conclusion

Employee engagement is a positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization with his trademark values. The practice of employee engagement can improve organizational citizenship behavior. This study gives an answer that employees who demonstrate higher levels of engagement would much contribute to their organizations with organizational citizenship behavior level higher. Employee engagement is positively related to organizational citizenship behavior. From these results it can be concluded that when employees are empowered, they will show organizational citizenship behavior is the same as when employees have supportive leadership. They will engage in organizational citizenship behavior, even empowerment and support are the two main factors that involve employees in fidelity. The main difficulty is to find the optimal combination of dispositional and situational factors that would lead to the performance of organizational citizenship behavior are most effective (Moorman & Blakely, 1995).

This study suffers from several limitations. The questionnaire items were self -directed by the employee, which may have increased the presence of the so-called variance with common method variance inflated the relationships among these variables. Therefore, it is likely that the method will inflate the variance in the relationship between the study variables. The main limitation of this study is the reliance on a small sample size. Small sample size may limit the generalization of the results of the respondents of this study. The respondents came from a variety of organizations as opposed to a sample taken from one organization. I was not able use a multidimensional measure of organizational citizenship behavior, employee engagement, and supportive leadership. In future research, it would be better if this model was tested with the multidimensional measure of organizational citizenship behavior, employee engagement, and leadership. This study tested the mediation model based on cross-sectional data. The mediation model is a model of longitudinal model (MacKinnon, Coxe, & Baraldi, 2012).

Future research should continue to explain the relationship of dispositional and situational factors to organizational citizenship behavior. Regarding the impact of two factors on the organizational citizenship behavior, the results of this study revealed that supportive leadership directly affect employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior of employees. Similarly to what happens with employee engagement as a mediating variable in the relationship between supportive leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. Further research is necessary to determine the stability of the fully mediated the relationship between supportive leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. This study may be replicated using a larger population and sample. From a practical perspective, the predictive effect of leadership on employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior may have some utility in terms of the selection process.

## References

Allameh, Sayyed Mohsen; Shahriari, Mohsen; and Mansoori, Hossein. (2012). Investigating Employee's Attitude Toward Organization, Organizational Climate and Employee's Engagement as Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Science*, 6(8): 384-393.

Alok, Kumar and Israel, D. (2012). Authentic Leadership and Work Engagement. *The Indian Journal of Individual Relations*, 47(3): 498-510.

Avey, James B.; Hughes, Larry W.; Norman, Steven M.; and Luthans, Kyle W. (2008). Using Positivity, Transformational Leadership, and Empowerment To Combat Employee Negativity. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(2): 110-126.

Avolio, Bruce J. and Bass, Bernard M. (1995). Individual Consideration Viewed at Multiple Levels of Analysis: A Multi-level Framework for Examining The Influence of Transformational Leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(1): 199-218.

Avolio, Bruce J.; Bass, Bernard M.; and Jung, Dong I. (1999). Re-Examining The Components of Transformational and Transactional Leadership among The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(4): 441-462.

Babcock-Roberson, Meredith Elaine and Strickland, Oriel J. (2010). The relationship Between Leadership, Work Employment, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *The Journal of Psychology*, 144 (3), 313-326.

Bakker, Arnold B. and Demerouti, Evangelia. (2008). Towards A Model of Work Engagement. Career Development International, 13(3): 209-223

Bass, Bernard M. (1985), Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations, Free Press, New York, NY.

Bass, Bernard M.; Avolio, Bruce J.; Jung, Dong I.; and Berson, Yair. (2003). Predicting Unit Performance by Assessing Transformational and Transactional Leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2): 207-218.

Behling, Orlando and McFillen, James M. (1996). A Syncretical Model of Charismatic/ Transformational Leadership. *Group & Organization Studies*, 21(2): 163-191.

Blakely, Gerald L.; Srivastava, Abhisek; and Moorman, Robert H. (2005). The Effects of Nationality, Work Role Centrality, and Work Locus of Control on Role Definition of OCB. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 12(1): 103-106.

Boerner, Sabine; Dutschke, Elisabeth; and Wied, Simon. (2008). Charismatic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Examining The Role of Stressor and Strain. *Human Resource Development International*, 11(5): 507-521.

Borman, Walter C. ; Penner, Louis A. ; Allen, Tammy D. ; and Motowidlo, StephanJ. (2001). Personality Predictors of Citizenship Performance. *Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10 (1/2), March/June : 52-69.

Borman, Walter C. and Motowidlo, Stephan J. (1997). Task Performance and Contextual Performance : The Meaning For Personnel Selection Research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 99-109.

Bycio, Peter, Hackett, Rick D., and Allen, Joyce S. 1995. Further Assessments of Bass's (1985) Conceptualization of Transactional and Transformational Leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(4): 468-478.

Byrne, Barbara M. (2001). *Structural Equation Modeling with AMOS: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Cheung, Millissa F.Y. and Wong, Chi-Sum. (2011). Transformational Leadership, Leader Support, and Employee Creativity. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 32(7): 656-672

Chiu, Su-Fen and Tsai, Miao-Ching. (2006). Relationship Among Burnout, Job Involvement, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *The Journal of Psychology*, 140(6): 517-530.

Christian, Michael S.; Garza, Adela S.; and Slaughter, Jerel E. (2011). Work Engagement: A Quantitative Review and Test of Its Relations with Task and Contextual Performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1): 84-136.

Cooper, Donald R and Schindler, Pamela S. (2001). *Business Research Methods*. 7th edition. Singapore : McGraw – Hill/ Irwin.

Dvir, Taly; Eden, Dov; Avolio, Bruce J.; and Shamir, Boas. (2002). Impact of Transformational Leadership on Follower Development and Performance: A Field Experiment. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4): 735-744.

Farh, Jiing-Lih; Zhong, Chen-Bo; and Organ, Dennis W. (2004). Organizational Citizenship Behavior in The People's Republic of China. *Organization Science*, 15(2): 241-253.

Ghafoor, Azka; Qureshi, Tahir Masood; Khan, M.Aslam;  and Hijazi, Syed Tahir. (2011) Transformational Leadership, Employee Engagement and Performance: Mediating Effect of Psychological Ownership. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(17): 7391-7403.

Gibson, James L.; Ivancevich, John M.; and Donnelly, James H. (2000). *Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Process*, 10th edition. Boston: Mc Graw Hill.

Hair, Joseph E.; Black, William C. ; Babin, Barry J. ; Anderson, Rolph E. ; and Tatham, Ronald L. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 6th edition. New Jersey : Prentice-Hall International Inc.

Jiao, Changquan; Richards, David A.; and Zhang, Kai. (2011). Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: OCB-Specific Meanings as Mediators. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 26(1): 11-25.

Judge, Timothy A., and Piccolo, R.onald F. (2004). Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Test of Their Relative Validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5):  755-768.

Kahn, William A. (1990). Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement of Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4): 692-724.

Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert L. (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organization*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

LePine, Jeffrey A. ; Erez, Amir ; and Johnson, Diane E. (2002). The Nature and Dimensionality of Organizational Citizenship Behavior : A Critical Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1) : 52-65.

Lian, Lee Kim and Tui, Low Goan. (2012). Leadership Style and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Mediating Effects of Subordinate Competence and Downward Influence Tactics. *Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, 13(2): 59-96

Macey, William H. and Schneider, Benjamin. (2008). The meaning of Employee Engagement. *Industrial Organizational Psychology*, 1(1): 3-30.

MacKenzie, Scott B.; Podsakoff, Philip M.; and Rich, Gregory A. (2001). Transformational and Transactional Leadership and Salesperson Performance. *Journal of The Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(2): 115-135.

MacKinnon, David P., Coxe, Stefany, and Baraldi, Amanda H. (2012). Guidelines for The Investigation of Mediating Variables in Business Research. *Journal of Business and  Psychology*,  27(1): 1-14.

Mansoor, Narmeen and Aslam, Hassan Daniel. (2012). Exploring Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Its Critical Link To Employee Engagement For Effective Human Resource Management In Organizations. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Science*, 3(1): 567-576.

May, Douglas R.; Gilson, Richard L.; and Harter, Lynn M. (2004). The Psychological Conditions of Meaningfulness, Safety, and Availability and The Engagement of the Human Spirit at Work. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 77(1): 11-37.

Mayfield, Clifton O. and Taber, Thomas D. (2010). A Prosocial Self-Concept Approach to Understanding Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25 (7), 741-763.

Mohd Soieb, Ahmad Zairy; Othman, Jamilah; and D'Silva, Jeffrey Lawrence. (2013). The Effects of Perceived Leadership Styles and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour on Employee Engagement: The Mediating Role of Conflict Management *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(8): 91-99.

Moorman, Robert H. and Blakely, Gerald L. (1995). Individualism-Collectivism As An Individual Differences Predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 16(1) : 127-142.

Neuman, W. Lawrence. (2006). *Social Research Methods : Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. 6th edition. New York : Allyn and Bacon.

Organ, Dennis W. 1994. Personality and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Management*, 20(2): 465-478

Organ, Dennis W. and Konovsky, Mary A. (1989). Cognitive versus Affective Determinant of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1) : 151-164

Organ, Dennis W. and Ryan, Katherine. (1995). A Meta-Analytic Review of Attitudinal and Dispositional Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4) : 775-802.

Papalexandris, Nancy and Galanaki, Eleanna. (2009). Leadership's Impact On Employee Engagement: Differences Among Entrepreneurs and Professional CEOs. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 30(4): 365-385.

Piccolo, Ronald F., and Colquitt, Jason A. (2006). Transformational Leadership and Job Behaviors: The Mediating Role of Core Job Characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2): 327-340.

Podsakoff, Nathan P.; Whitting, Steven E.; Podsakoff, Phillip M.; and Blume, Brian D. (2004). Individual and Organizational Level Consequences of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Meta- Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1): 122-141.

Podsakoff, Philip M. and Bommer, William H. (1996). Transformational Leader Behaviors and Sustitutes For Leadership as Determinants of Employee Satisfaction, Commitment, Trust, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 28 (2): 259-298.

Podsakoff, Philip M. and MacKenzie, Scott B. (1997). Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Organizational Performance : A Review and Suggestions For Future Research. *Human Performance*, 10(2) : 133-151.

Podsakoff, Philip M.; MacKenzie, Scott B.; and Bommer, William H, (1996). Meta-Analysis of The Relationship Between Kerr-Jermier's Substitutes For Leadership and Employee Job Attitudes, Role Perceptions, and Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4): 380-399.

Podsakoff, Philip M.; MacKenzie, Scott B.; Moorman, Robert B.; and Fetter, Richard. (1990). Transformational Leadership Behavior and Their Efects on Followers' Trust in Leader, Satisfaction, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(1): 107-142.

Podsakoff, Philip M.; MacKenzie, Scott B.; Paine, Julie Beth; and Bachrach, Daniel G. (2000). Organizational Citizenship Behavior : Critical Review of The Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3): 513 – 563.

Purvanova, Radostina K.; Bono, Joyce E.; and Dzieweczynski, Jessica. (2006). Transformational Leadership, Job Characteristics, and Organizational Citizenship Performance. *Human Performance*, 19(1): 1-22.

Rhoades, Linda and Eisenberger, Robert. (2002). Perceived Organizational Support: A review of The Literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4): 698-714.

Rich, Bruce Louis; Lepine, Jeffrey A.; and Crawford, Ecan R. (2010). Job Engagement: Antecedents and Effects on Job Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3): 617-635.

Rurkkhum, Suthinee and Bartlett, Kenneth R. (2012). The Relationship between Employee Engagement and Organizational Citizenship Behavior is Thailand. *Human Resource Development International*, 15(2): 157-174.

Sahoo, Chandan Kumar and Mishra, Sukanta. (2012). A Framework Towards Employee Engagement: The PSU Experience. *ASCI Journal of Management*, 42(1): 94-112

Saks, Alan M. (2006). Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7): 600-619.

Saks, Alan M. (2008), The Meaning and Bleeding of Employee Engagement: How Muddy is The Water?. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1): 40-43.

Salanova, Marisa and Schaufeli, Wilmar B. (2008). A Cross-National Study of Work Engagement as a Mediator between Job Resource and Proactive Behavior. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(1): 116-131.

Salanova, Marisa; Agut, Sonia; and Peiro, Jose Maria. (2005). Linking Organizational Resources and Work Engagement to Employee Performance and Customer Loyalty: The Mediation of Service Climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6): 1217–1227.

Sarangi, Swatee. (2012). An Exploratory Study of Employee Engagement Initiatives in The Indian Banking Sector. *SIES Journal of Management*, 8(1): 9-22.

Schaufeli, Wilmar B. and Bakker, Arnold B. (2004). Job Demands, Job Resources, and Their Relationship with Burnout and Engagement: A Multi Sample Study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3): 293-315.

Schaufeli, Wilmar B.; Bakker, Arnold B.; and Salanova, Marisa. (2006). The Measurement Of Work Engagement with a Short Questionnaire: A Cross National Study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4): 701-716.

Schaufeli, Wilmar B.; Salanova, Marisa; Gonzales-Roma, Vicente; and Bakker, Arnold B. (2002). The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: A Two Sample Confirmatory factor Analytic Approach. *Journal of Happines Studies*, 3(1): 71-92

Sekaran, Uma and Bougie, Roger. (2010). *Research methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach*, 5th edition. Singapore: A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Shamir, Boas; House, Robert J.; and Arthur, Michael B. (1993). The Motivational Effects of Charismatic Leadership: A Self-Concept Based Theory. *Organizational Science*, 4(4): 577-594.

Shin, Shung Jae and Zhou, Jing. (2003). Transformational Leadership, Conservation, and Creating: Evidence From Korea. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(6): 703-714

Simon, Simeon S. (2009). *The Essence of Employee Engagement In Organizations*. Working Paper.

Smith, C.Ann ; Organ, Dennis W. ; and Near, Janet P. (1983). Organizational Citizenship Behavior : Its Nature and Antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68 (4): 653-663.

Wang, Hui; Law, Kenneth S.; Hackett, Rick D.; Wang, Doanxu; and Chen, Zhen Xiong. (2005). Leader-Member Exchange as a Mediator of The Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Followers' Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3): 420-432.

Xu, Jessica and Thomas, Helena Cooper. (2011). How Can Leaders Achieve High  Employee Engagement?. *Leadership and Organizational Development*, 22(4): 399-416.

Yuan, Benjamin J.C.; Lin, Michael B.H.; Shieh, Jia Horng; and Li, Kuang-Ping. (2012).  Transforming Employee Engagement into Long-term Customer Relationship: Evidence From Information Technology Salespeople In Taiwan. *Social behavior & Personality*, 40(9): 1549-1554.

Yukl, Garry A., and Van Fleet, David D. (1982). Cross-situational, Multi-method Research on Military Leader Effectiveness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,* 30(1): 87–108.

Zaigham, Nida. (2007). *Impact of Supportive Supervisor, Empowerment, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) in Private Sector of Pakistan*. Working Paper.