

The Relationship between Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Counterproductive Work Behavior

Dorothea Wahyu Ariani

Dept. of Management, Atma Jaya Yogyakarta University

Jl Babarsari No. 43 Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Tel: 62-274-487-711 E-mail: dwariani@gmail.com

Received: October 27, 2012

Accepted: November 20, 2012

Online Published: March 14, 2013

doi:10.5430/ijba.v4n2p46

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/ijba.v4n2p46>

Abstract

Organization have long been interested in the role of management on how employees think and feel about their jobs, as well as what employees are willing to dedicate to the organization. This study tested the relationship between employee engagement, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and counterproductive work behavior (CWB). The author administered 507 participants employee engagement scale, organizational OCB scale, and CWB scale of service industries in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Validity and reliability tests were used to evaluate the questionnaire contents. The result indicated a significant positive relation between employee engagement and OCB and a significant negative relation between employee engagement and CWB and between OCB and CWB. This result also indicated no differences between employee engagement of female and male. This result shows that there is a different in mean score of OCB and CWB between male and female.

Keywords: Employee engagement, Organizational citizenship behavior, Counterproductive work behavior

1. Introduction

Organizations have long been interested in how employees think and feel about their jobs and what employees are willing to dedicate to the organization. Researchers have argued that engagement, as a motivational variable should lead to high levels of job performance (Kahn, 1990; Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010; Christian, Garza, & Slaughter, 2011). Engagement is a motivational construct that can be also shared by employee in the workplace. Employee engagement is fundamentally a motivational concept that represents the active allocation of personal resources toward the task associated with a work role (Christian et al., 2011). Employee engagement has been found to be positively related to individual job performance. Studies have found positive relationship between employee engagement and organizational performance outcomes: employee retention, productivity, and profitability. Employee engagement would be a predictor to organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and may lead to intention to leave (Bhatnagar & Biswas, 2010).

Kahn (1990) formally defined engagement as “the simultaneous employment and expression of a person’s preferred self in task behaviors that promote connections to work and to others, personal presence (physical, cognitive, emotional) and active, full performances”. Based on the perspective of Kahn, employee engagement is the best description of a multidimensional motivational concept reflecting the simultaneous investment of an individual’s physical, cognitive, and emotional energy in active and full performance. Employee engagement is a positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its value. When employees are engaged in their work, they increase the occurrence of behaviors that promote efficient and effective functioning of the organization. These behaviors are known as (OCB) which can be defined as individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly and explicitly recognized by the formal reward system. OCB promote the efficient and affective functioning of the organization as well as employee performance.

Employee performance or job performance is aggregated value to an organization of the set of behaviors that an employee contributes both directly and indirectly to organization goals (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Job performance consists of task performance or in-role performance and contextual performance or extra-role performance. Several researchers e.g. Rotundo and Sackett (2002) and Viswesvaran and Ones (2000) have speculated that overall job performance is a function not only of task performance but also of contextual behavior

such as OCB and counterproductive behavior (CWB). OCB and CWB have been linked in opposite directions. These constructs are likely to be so strongly negatively related that they may be considered “opposites” (Bennet & Stamper, 2001; Organ & Paine, 1999). OCB will be increased when CWB is decreased, and vice versa.

Kahn (1990) did not explicitly outline a relationship between employee engagement and job performance, but theoretical research has linked employee engagement to job performance. Employees who are highly engaged in their work roles not only focus their physical effort on the pursuit of role-related goals, but are also cognitively vigilant and emotionally connected to the endeavor (Kahn, 1990; Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995). In contrast, employees who are highly disengaged in their work roles withhold their physical, cognitive, and emotional energies, and this is reflected in task activity that is at best, robotic, passive, and detached (Kahn, 1990). This study attempts to examine the relationship between employee engagement, OCB and CWB of service organization in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Consequently, this study also examines relationship model of employee engagement to OCB, and CWB of organizational members.

Many studies have been conducted in an attempt to establish the relationship between CWB and OCB, especially since both of these are said to be dimensions of job performance. The previous researchers found that the relationship between OCB and CWB have been contradictory. On one hand, OCB and CWB are said to be the extremes on a single continuum; and this would be reflected by a strong negative correlation between them. If this is the case, then it would suggest that if an individual engages in OCB, she or he will not engage in CWB or vice versa. Based on gender socialization and social role theory, suggested that women are inherently more relationship oriented than success oriented and engage organizational citizenship than men (Cloninger, Ramamoorthy, & Flood, 2011; Farrel & Finkelstein, 2007). But men are generally expected to be more heroic and perform more positive high-risk citizenship behaviors than women (Lin, 2008). Therefore, the objective of this study is also to examine whether gender affects employee engagement, OCB and CWB.

2. Literature Review and Hypotheses

Employee engagement is a person's enthusiasm and involvement in his or her job. Kahn (1990) defined job engagement as the harnessing of organization members' selves to their work roles. In engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performance. 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). Employee is also defined as the involvement with and enthusiasm for work.

Kahn (1990) found that these 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, and when they were more psychologically available. 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.

Engagement is a persistent and positive affective – motivational state of fulfillment in employees, characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Vigor is high energy, resilience, a willingness to invest effort on the job, the ability to not be easily fatigued, and persistence when confronted with difficulties. Dedication is a strong involvement in work, enthusiasm, and sense of pride and inspiration. Absorption is a pleasant state of being immersed in one's work experiencing time passing quickly, and being unable to detach from the job. People who are highly engaged in their jobs identify personally with the job and are motivated by the work itself. They tend to work harder and more productively than others and are more likely to produce the results their customers and organizations want.

Employee engagement is a construct that captures the variation across individuals and the amount of energy and dedication they contribute to their job (Kahn, 1990). Employee engagement has been defined in many different ways and the definitions and measures often sound like other better known and established constructs like organizational commitment and OCB, but they are different. Employee engagement is related to organizational commitment, but the two have important differences (Robert & Davenport, 2002). Job commitment is most commonly defined in

terms of an individual's identification with the organization's goals and values, willingness to exert effort for the organization and desire to continue as part of the organization. People who are engaged in their jobs tend to be committed to their organizations, and vice versa. Organizational commitment differs from engagement in that it refers to a person's attitudes and attachment towards their organization. Engagement is not an attitude.

In theory, employee engagement and job satisfaction are distinct constructs although there is evidence for overlap in the definition. The main difference is that engagement emphasizes the cognitive aspect of involvement with job task, whereas satisfaction focuses on affect (Wefald & Downey, 2009). A stronger theoretical rationale for explaining employee engagement is found in social exchange theory (SET). SET provides a theoretical foundation to explain why employees become more or less engaged in their work and organization. Engagement is the degree to which an individual is attenuate and absorbed in the performance of their roles (Saks, 2006).

As a relatively new construct, employee engagement is becoming a frequent topic of research ranging from job performance and organizational commitment to job resources and job burnout (Babcock-Roberson & Strickland, 2010). The focus of engagement is on one's formal roles performance rather than extra-role and voluntary behavior (Saks, 2006). Recent research has found that employee engagement is related to increased job performance (Hakanen, Baker, & Schaufeli, 2006). Organizational researchers have traditionally focused on task or in-role performance which represents the extent to which employees effectively perform their official job duties (William & Anderson, 1991; Bowling, 2010). Individual job performance consists of distinct sets of activities that contribute to an organization in different ways. The narrow aspect of job performance is task performance and contextual performance. Recently, attention of researchers has been given to extra-role or contextual performance, which refers to behavior not included as part of an employee's official job duties that affect the well-being of the organization or its members.

Contextual performance is the less formal "emergent" behaviors that contribute to organizations less directly (Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmitt, 1997). These types of behaviors do not contribute directly to organization's technical core, but rather, they contribute to the organization by fostering a social and psychological environment conducive to the accomplishment of work involved in the organization's technical core. When individuals invest energy into their work roles, they should have higher contextual performance, which relates to an individual's propensity to behave in ways that facilitate the social and psychological context of an organization (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Engagement is thought to be an indicator of employee willingness to expend discretionary effort to help the employer. Contextual performance was defined as performance that is not formally required as part of the job but that helps shape the social and psychological context of the organization (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997).

There are two performance related behaviors that go beyond the assigned tasks and responsibilities: the positive and negative behavior (Miles, Spector, Borman, & Fox, 2002). On the positive side, researchers have looked at voluntary behavior that goes beyond the core tasks which are labeled OCB and contextual performance. On the negative side, there is an independent stream of research concerning detrimental, potentially destructive acts that hurt organization or coworkers, which are labeled CWB. Perceptions of the work environment relate to positive emotion which is positively correlated with the occurrence of OCB. Conversely, negative perception of the work environment relates to negative emotion, which is positively correlated with the occurrence of CWB.

OCB involves voluntary and informal behaviors that can help coworkers and the organization. Recent researches also indicate that OCB are important parts and predictors of employee engagement in that OCB is conceptualized as positive behavior and willingness to exert energy for success of the organization. Most researchers have found that to lead employee engagement are non-financial in their nature. In fact, performance should be linked with reward, but human resource is not motivated by money alone. OCB can benefit coworkers or the organization's effectiveness by influencing the social and psychological commitment of the organization. OCB is behavior that contributes to goals of the organization by contributing to its social and psychological environment (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002).

OCB contribute indirectly to the organization through the maintenance of organization's social system that supports task performance (Organ, 1997). OCB has been the many topics of empirical works (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002), however, the taxonomy of OCB throughout the years has not been completely consistent. Constructs that have overlapped with OCB include prosocial organizational behavior (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986); contextual performance (Motowidlo, 2000); organizational spontaneity (George & Brief, 1992); and extra role behavior (Mayfield & Taber, 2010). OCB is behavior that is voluntary and not part of formal role requirements and not directly recognized by the formal reward system. OCB has been known to enhance an organization's effectiveness, efficiency, and overall performance by lubricating the social machinery of the organization, reducing friction and increasing efficiency.

(Podsakoff & Mac Kenzie, 1997; Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Research from a social exchange perspective has viewed OCB as a contribution to the organization (Organ & Paine, 1999).

Konovsky and Organ (1996) identified five dimensions belonging to OCB: altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, civic virtue, and generalized compliance. Altruism refers to voluntary actions that help another person with a problem. Courtesy includes efforts to prevent a problem with others and to avoid abusing the rights of others. Sportsmanship refers to any behavior demonstrating tolerance of less than ideal circumstances without complaining. Civic Virtue refers to constructive behaviors indicating a willingness to participate responsibly in the life of the organization. Finally, generalized compliance involves discretionary actions beyond the minimum requirements of the organization in areas of attendance. Empirical and conceptual work in this area suggests two broad categories: OCBO-behaviors and OCBI-behaviors (William & Anderson, 1991). OCBO is behaviors that benefit the organization and OCBI is behaviors that immediately benefit specific individuals. The dimensions of OCBO are generalized compliance and civic virtue, whereas the dimensions of OCBI are altruism, courtesy, and sportsmanship. This study uses three of five dimensions from Organ and Konovsky (1989) that we can be defined as OCB.

Employee engagement has been examined as a potential predictor in several OCB studies (Rich et al., 2010). One explanation for why employee engagement related to OCB based upon social exchange theory and the principle of reciprocity. Employees may perform OCB because it includes an emotional component (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). This possibility is consistent with models suggesting that extra role behavior is the direct result of employee emotion (Miles et al., 2002). The social exchange and the emotion-based explanations may be related, because the desires to reciprocate and positive emotion are both the result of favorable treatment from one's organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Employee engagement is one of the potential predictor of OCB. Individual who are high in employee engagement have a tendency to engage in constructive and responsible behavior at work (i.e. OCB).

Extra-role behavior consists of OCB and CWB, but they are different. OCB is extra-role behavior that helps organizations and their members, CWB is extra-role behavior that are performed with the intention of harming organizations and/ or their members. OCB has been defined as employee behavior that is at least somewhat volitional and that improve the functioning of an organization (Organ & Paine, 1999); whereas CWB is defined as volitional employee behavior that harms, or at least is intended to harm, the legitimate interests of an organization (Dalal, Lam, Weiss, Welch, & Hulin, 2009). Those individuals who engage in OCB are unlikely to engage in CWB and vice versa. CWB refers to negative employee behavior that is harmful to the organization or other employees (Lee & Allen, 2002).

CWB refers to voluntary behavior in that employees either lack motivation to conform to or become motivated to violate. CWB also means that employee is not motivated to conform and/ or is motivated to act against accepted organizational norms. These CWB acts at work can take different forms, for example theft, fraud, sabotage, absenteeism, physical aggressive and verbal aggressive. Robinson and Bennett (1995) argued that an important distinction between types of deviance was whether the deviance was directed or targeted at either the organization (organizational deviance) or at members of the organization (interpersonal deviance).

CWB is overlapped with antisocial behavior, counterproductive behavior, dysfunctional behavior, and organizational misbehavior (Sacket, 2002; Bennett & Robinson, 2000). CWB is also defined as voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well being of organizations, its members, or both. Social exchange theory and reciprocity theory also provide possibility explanation. Employees who are have low employee engagement might engage in CWB as means of retaliating against their employees for proving an unpleasant work environment. Employees who are low in employee engagement care relatively little about losing their jobs and are willing to engage in behaviors that could potentially jeopardize their employment. Based on that literature review and the previous researches, I can say that the higher employee engagement, the higher OCB and the lower CWB. Therefore hypotheses can be concluded as below:

H1: The relationship between employee engagement and OCB is positive

H2: The relationship between employee engagement and CWB is negative

H3: The relationship between OCB and CWB is negative

According to the gender socialization theory, women tend to be more relationship oriented. From a social-role theory perspective, men value success whereas women value relationship. Females cooperated much more than males and more likely to act in prevent harm and to help around negative outcomes. The results of Kong's study show that there exist differences in employee engagement between male and female employees in the company (Kong, 2009). Female employees value more their jobs than male ones. Research has suggested that the level of employee

engagement is general is affected by demographic characteristics, the work place, and job demand (Kahn, 1990; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Female employees value more their jobs than male ones. Sarwar and Arwan (2010) found that there was significant difference in male workplace deviation, and organizational deviation of male and female primary school teachers. Based on that literature review and the previous researches, a hypothesis can be concluded as below:

H4: There is no significant gender difference in all variables in this research

3. Method

3.1 Sample and Procedure

This study use self administered questionnaires were distributed to collect individual data on the respondents. The survey took approximately three months. The sample consisted of 507 employees (with response rate 92 %) of 550 employees from service industries in Yogyakarta Indonesia. The demographic profile characteristics under investigation include the gender. Of the 507 respondents, 276 were female and 231 were male. Respondents of the service industries 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, CWB, and employee engagement. Questionnaire on the OCB and CWB is taken from those developed by previous researchers, such as Dalal et al. (2009) and Organ and Konovsky (1989). Employee engagement was measured using items from Schaufeli, Bakker, and Salanova (2006) and Salanova, Agut, and Piero (2006). All of the scales were measured on 5-point Likert Scale ranging from 1.

3.3 Reliability and Validity Analysis

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 0.7330 for employee engagement, 0.7537 for OCB, and 0.6676 for CWB, which is far above the cut-off line of reliability as recommended by Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham (2006). Content validity that is used to assess for the measurement instruments was done in the pre-tested stage by soliciting the expert opinions of two professors from a university who are research specialists in quantitative methodology and organizational behaviour disciplines. 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). 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. To further simplify the interpretation and seek a simpler structure, the Orthogonal technique and the Varimax rotation was then performed. The varimax rotated principal components factor revealed one structure factor. The factor loading recorded loading of between 0.538 and 0.729. 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.

4. Result

This research uses a questionnaire that is developed by some previous researchers by translating from and retranslating it to the original language. Factor analysis is carried out to test construct validity. Then, with varimax rotation and factor loading the minimum of 0.5 as suggested by Hair et al. (2006) are achieved as a result of construct validity test which is practically significant. Then, the items that have the construct validity with the use of factor analysis are tested for their reliability. Based on theoretical and empirical estimations relationship between employee engagement and OCB is positive, relationship between employee engagement and CWB and relationship between OCB and CWB are negative. Means, standard deviation, scale reliabilities, and inter correlations between all variables are provided in Table 1.

The result of validity and reliability test show that six items of employee engagement, six items of CWB, and eight items of OCB are valid with the loading factor were higher than 0.5. The internal consistency reliabilities were 0.7330 for employee engagement, 0.7537 for OCB, and 0.6676 for CWB. Correlation between OCB and employee engagement was positive and significant ($r = 0.312$, $p < 0.01$). As shown in the table, hypothesis 1 was supported. Correlation between employee engagement and CWB was negative and significant ($r = 0.179$, $p < 0.01$). As shown in the table, hypothesis 2 was supported. Correlations between CWB and OCB was negative and significant ($r = -0.245$, $p < 0.01$). As shown in the table, hypothesis 3 was supported. The low correlation between these variables is

caused by characteristics of variables. 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 CWB items each loaded onto separate latent factors. As expected, this three factor model yielded good fit [χ^2 (N= 507)= 27.391; $p < 0.000$; GFI= 0.966].

<Insert Table 1 Here>

An independent sample t-test was conducted to determine whether there are any significant differences in the mean scores of the respondents in three variables. T-tests were also conducted to see if gender has any bearings on employee engagement, OCB, and CWB, and the results are shown in Table 2. Interestingly, it was found that gender has not effect on employee engagement, but gender has an effect on OCB and on CWB. It was found that females tend to engage in higher OCB ($t(231) = 22.669$, $p < 0.05$) and male tend to engage in higher CWB ($t(276) = 4.359$, $p < 0.05$). As shown in the table, hypothesis 4 was partially supported.

<Insert Table 2 Here>

5. Discussion

This finding is at adds with the belief that engagement is predominantly associated with OCB are extra role behavior. This is because, engaged employees experience a high level of connectivity with their work tasks. Employees strive toward task-related goals that are intertwined with their in role definitions and scripts. Engaged employees are likely to perform extra role behavior because they are able to “free up” resources by accomplishing goals and performing their task efficiently, enabling them to pursue activities that are not part of their job descriptions. Engaged employees also consider all aspects of work to be part of their domain, and then, they step outside of their roles to work toward their goals.

Employee engagement covers the basic dimensions of intrinsic motivation, which ensures goal oriented behavior. High level of engagement increase proactive work behaviors in the sense of personal initiative such as proactive behavior (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008). Employees, when they engaged, will be more likely to create a social context that is conducive to teamwork, helping, voice, and other discretionary behaviors that can lend to organizational effectiveness (Podsakoff, Whitting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2004). Engagement should be positively related to OCB because employees who are engaged in their job should not only fulfill their formal role requirements, but should put forth extra effort to perform other activities that extend beyond their formal role requirement. Engaged employee works with passion and is more committed to the organization. Employee engagement is the extent to which people enjoy and believe in what they do, and feel valued by doing it.

Employee engagement focuses on work performed at a job and represents the willingness to do dedicated physical, cognitive, and emotional resources to this work. An engaged individual is one who approaches the tasks 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 (Christian et al., 2011). When individuals invest energy into their work roles, they should have higher contextual performance. Employee engagement is one of the indicators of an employee’s willingness to expend discretionary effort to help the employer. Employee engagement is predominantly with extra-role behavior. Engaged employees are likely to perform extra-role behaviors perhaps because they are able to accomplish goals and to perform their tasks efficiently, enabling them to pursue activities that are not part of their job descriptions.

Rioux and Penner (2001) examined the motivation for OCB and identified three underlying motives: prosocial values motives, organizational concern motives, and impression management motives. Prosocial values motive is a desire to help others, be altruistic, and gain acceptance. Organizational concern motive is a pride in and care for the organization. Impression management motive is a desire to create and maintain a positive image and avoid negative perceptions from others. Each of these motivational factors includes some kind of reward for the individual, thus supporting the belief that employees engage in OCB because they believe that such behavior will result in a favorable outcome for themselves (Finkelstein & Penner, 2004). Rioux and Penner (2001) argued that individuals choose to engage in OCB because actions meet their own needs and enable them to attain desired outcomes. Motives to perform OCB are one’s pride in their organization.

Using social exchange theory and organizational support theory as a theoretical basis, the researcher hypothesized that employees who feel that their place of employment is providing a safe are more likely to become engaged and display OCB. Social exchange theory provides a theoretical foundation to explain why employees choose to become more or less engaged in their work and organization. Employee engagement has positive and negative consequences for organizations. There is some empirical research that has reported relationships between engagement and work behavior. Employee engagement has been found to be positively related to OCB and negatively related to CWB.

A relationship between employee engagement and CWB is likely to exist. Employees are likely to demonstrate deviant behavior in response to negative perceptions of the work situation (Judge, Scott, & Illes, 2006). Positive perceptions of the work situation were negatively related to workplace deviance. Individuals who are engaged in their job maintain a positive perception of the work (i.e. proud, enthusiastic, interested) whereas, individuals who are not engaged may have negative perceptions of the work situation (i.e. hostile, upset, irritable). When employee have unfavorable perceptions of their situations at work, they are more likely to engage in CWB (Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, & Barrick, 2004). Employee engagement as a positive affective state should be negatively related to CWB.

Engaged individuals are likely to show more positive and less deviant work behaviors (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2012). Employee engagement comes with high levels of energy and activities as vigor is an important component of engagement. This energy encourages proactive behavior like OCB. Employee engagement is a positive emotional state that increase level of OCB and decrease level of CWB. OCB and CWB are separate constructs and that it is indeed possible to engage in both types of behavior at any one time. This result clearly shows a negative relationship between OCB and CWB, but also that the magnitude of the relationship is relatively small. The research finding is consistent with the findings of Dalal (2005), Kelloway, Loughlin, Barling, and Nault (2002), and Sackett, Berry, Wiemann, and Laczko (2006), where all of these researches found only a moderate negative relationship between the two constructs.

Previous studies on gender differences provided inconsistent findings. For example, Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova (2006) found a weak but vague relationship between work engagement and gender. Previous researchers have also pointed out that men are socialized to promote themselves whereas women are socialized to be modest in this regard (Farrell & Finkelstein, 2007). The result of this study said that there is no gender difference was observed in employee engagement in service industries in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. In our study, there are significant differences in mean score of male and female were found in OCB and CWB. Mean score of male's OCB is higher than mean score of female's OCB. Bolino (1999) said that the more individual engages in OCB the more likely he or she is to be seen as good soldier. Men employees are better soldier than women employees in service industries in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. In the present study we found male employees more dedicated than female. Mean score of male's CWB is also higher than mean score of female's CWB. There is a significant difference in mean score of male and female employees. This is the Indonesian culture that male is more courageous to do the deviant behavior in the work than female.

Employee engagement research can benefit from methodological refinements especially with regard to time. Within person studies need to be conducted to better understand state engagement, and longitudinal research is needed to measure employee engagement. Future research should continue to expand work engagement's nomological network, in particular with regard to work-related criteria. My findings also have potential implications for practice. I have illustrated that employee engagement might indeed help employers to improve or maintain their competitive advantage. My results show that employee engagement has positive significant relation with OCB and has negative significant relation with CWB.

This finding is at odds with the belief that employee engagement is predominantly associated with extra-role behavior. This is because engaged employee experience a high level of connectivity with their organization. Managers might be able to increase engagement by designing jobs that include motivating characteristics, particularly with regard to the significance and variety the task performance. Future research could investigate whether engagement simultaneously leads to task and contextual performance, or whether engaged employees tend to prioritize in-role task. In order to shed light on the compound relationship between employee engagement, OCB, CWB, and gender, there are need for empirical studies that use diverse research methods (e.g. qualitative research, quantitative research, action research) in conjunction with the study of comprehensive theoretical models including power relations and cultural patterns, using gender as analytical framework.

6. Conclusion

Employee engagement is a positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its values. Practices engagement among employees can improve OCB. My research provides one answer in that employees who exhibited higher levels of engagement were found to contribute to their organizations with higher levels of individual OCB and lower levels of CWB. Employee engagement is related positively to OCB and negatively to CWB. OCB and CWB are the separate constructs. Organizationally directed OCB and CWB are different types of behavior. CWB is opposed to OCB. Relationship between OCB and CWB requires further research to truly understand and explain the relationships between these two extra-role behaviors. Gender affects OCB and CWB, but not employee engagement. My research result may partly be influenced by common method variance because self-report

questionnaires were used to measure employee engagement, OCB and CWB. Therefore, it is likely that method variance inflated the relationships among these variables. The primary limitation of the study is its reliance on a small sample size. The small sample size of respondents may limit the generalization of my results. My respondents came from a variety of organizations as opposed to a sample drawn from a single organization.

References

- Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1995). Emotion in the Workplace: A Reappraisal. *Human Relations*, 48, 97–125. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001872679504800201>
- Babcock-Roberson, M.E., & Strickland, O.J. (2010). The relationship Between Leadership, Work Employment, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *The Journal of Psychology*, 144(3), 313-326. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00223981003648336>
- Bennett, R.J., & Robinson, S.L. (2000). Development of Measure of Workplace Deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 349-360. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349>
- 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.
- Bolino, M.C. (1999). Citizenship and Impression Management: Good Soldiers or Good Actors? *Academy of Management Review*, 24(1), 82-98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1999.1580442>
- Borman, W.C., & dan Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task Performance and Contextual Performance: The Meaning For Personnel Selection Research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 99-109. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_3
- Bowling, N.A. (2010). Effects of Job Satisfaction and Conscientiousness on Extra-Role behaviors. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25(1), 119-130. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9134-0>
- Brief, A.P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial Organizational Behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 710-725. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1986.4283909>
- Christian, M.S., Garza, A.S., & Slaughter, J.E. (2011). Work Engagement: A Quantitative Review a Test of Its Relations with Task and Contextual Performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89-136. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x>
- Cloninger, P.A., Ramamoorthy, N., & Flood, P.C. (2011). The Influence of Equity, Equality, and Gender on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *S.A.M. advanced Management Journal*, 76(4), 37-47. [Online] Available: <http://search.proquest.com/docview/923757319?accountid=44396>
- Colbert, A.E., Mount, M.K., Harter, J.K., Witt, L.A., & Barrick, M.R. (2004). Interactive Effects of Personality and Perceptions of The Work Situation on Workplace Deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 599-609. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.599>
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A Meta-Analysis of The Relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241–1255. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241>
- Dalal, R.S., Lam, H., Weiss, H.M., Weich, E.R., & Hulin, C.L. (2009). A Within-Person Approach to Work Behavior and Performance: Concurrent and Lagged Citizenship-Counter Productivity Association and Dynamic Relationship With Affect and Overall Job Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(5), 1061-1068. [Online] Available: <http://search.proquest.com/docview/199835901?accountid=44396>
- Den Hartog, D.N., & Belschak, F.D. (2012). Work Engagement and Machiavellianism in The Ethical Leadership Process. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107, 35-47. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1296-4>
- Farrell, S.K., & Finkelstein, L.M. (2007). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Gender Expectations and Attributions for Performance. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 9(1), 81-96. [Online] Available: <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=17&hid=118&sid=ef9a2084-f9e7-4c92-8f00e6df62d67161%40sessionmgr13&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=buh&AN=24646185>
- Finkelstein, M.A., & Pennner, L.A. (2004). Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behavior Integrating the Functional and Role Identity Approaches. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 32(4), 383-398. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2004.32.4.383>

- George, J.M., & Brief, A.P. (1992). Feeling Good, Doing Good: A Conceptual Analysis of the Mood of Organizational Spontaneity Relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(2), 310-329. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.2.310>
- Hair, J.E., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E., & dan Tatham, R.L. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (6th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International Inc.
- Hakanen, J.J., Baker, A.B., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2006). Burnout and Work Engagement among Teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43, 445-513. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001>
- Judge, T. A., Scott, B. A., & Ilies, R. (2006). Hostility, Job Attitudes, and Workplace Deviance: Test of a Multilevel Model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 126-138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.126>
- Kahn, W.A. (1990). Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement of Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256287>
- Kelloway, E. K., Loughlin, C., Barling, J., & Nault, A. (2002). Self-Reported Counterproductive Behaviours and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours: Separate but Related Constructs. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1-2), 143-151. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00201>
- Kong, Y. (2009). A Study on the Job Engagement of Company Employees. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 1(2), 65-68. [Online] Available: <http://search.proquest.com/docview/840751735?accountid=44396>
- Konovsky, M.A., & Organ, D.W. (1996). Dispositional and Contextual Determinant of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17(3), 253-266. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(199605\)17:3<253::AID-JOB747>3.0.CO;2-Q](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199605)17:3<253::AID-JOB747>3.0.CO;2-Q)
- Lee, K., & Allen, N.J. (2002). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Workplace Deviance: The Role of Affect and Cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 131-142. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.131>
- LePine, J.A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D.E. (2002). The Nature and Dimensionality of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Critical Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 52-65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.52>
- Lin, C.P. (2008). Clarifying the Relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Gender, Knowledge Sharing in Workplace Organizations in Taiwan. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 22, 241-250. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-008-9067-z>
- Little, B., & Little, P. (2006). Employee Engagement: Conceptual Issues. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication, and Concept*, 10(1), 111-120.
- Mayfield, C.O., & Taber, T.D. (2010). A Prosocial Self-Concept Approach to Understanding Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(7), 741-763. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683941011075283>
- Miles, D.E., Spector, P.E., Borman, W.E., & Fox, S. (2002). Building An Integrative Model of Extra Role Work Behavior: A Comparison of Counterproductive Work Behavior with Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1/2), 51-57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00193>
- Motowidlo, S.J. (2000). Some Basic Issues Related To Contextual Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Human Resource Management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10(1), 115-126. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(99\)00042-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(99)00042-X)
- Motowidlo, S.J., Borman, W.C., & Schmit, M.J. (1997). A Theory of Individual Differences in Task and Contextual Performance. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 71-83. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_1
- Organ, D. W., & Paine, J. B. (1999). A New Kind of Performance for Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Recent Contributions to The Study of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 14, 337-368. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1007713412780>
- Organ, D.W. (1997). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: It's Construct Clean-Up Time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85-97. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2
- Organ, D.W., & Konovsky, M.A. (1989). Cognitive versus Affective Determinant of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 151-164. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.74.1.157>

- Podsakoff, N.P., Whiting, S.E., Podsakoff, P.M., & Blume, B.D. (2009). Individual and Organizational Level Consequences of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Meta- Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122-141. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013079>
- 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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_5
- Rhoades, L., & dan Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2010.51468988>
- Rioux, S.M., & dan Penner, L.A. (2001). The Causes of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Motivational Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1306-1314. [Online] Available: <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=8&hid=118&sid=ef9a2084-f9e7-4c92-8f00e6df62d67161%40sessionmgr13&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZW hvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=buh&AN=12129188>
- Robert, D.R., & Davenport, T.O. (2002). Job Engagement: Why It's Important and How to Improve It. *Employment Relations*, 24(3), 21-29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ert.10048>
- Robinson, S., & Bennett, R. (1995). A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multi-Dimensional Scalling Study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 555-572. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256693>
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.66>
- Sackett, P.R. (2002). The Structure of Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Dimensionality and Relationships with Facets of Job Performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 5-11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00189>
- Sackett, P. R., Berry, C. M., Wiemann, S. A., & Laczko, R. M. (2006). Citizenship and Counterproductive Behaviour: Clarifying Relations between The Two Domains. *Human Performance*, 19(4), 441-464. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1904_7
- Saks, A.M. (2006). Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
- Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W.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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585190701763982>
- Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiro, J. M. (2005). Linking Organizational Resources and Work Engagement to Employee Performance and Customer Loyalty: The Mediation of Service Climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1217-1227. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1217>
- Sarwar, M., & Awan, R.N. (2010). Location and Gender Differences in Deviant Behavior among Primary School Teachers. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 97-101. [Online] Available: <http://search.proquest.com/docview/821639966?accountid=44396>
- Schaufeli, W.B., & Baker, A.B. (2004). Job Demands, Job Resources, and The Relationship with Burnout and Engagement: A Multi-Sample Studies. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293-315. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
- Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The Measurement of Work Engagement with a Short Questionnaire: A Cross-National Study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701-716. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
- Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W., & Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653-663. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653>
- Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on Models of Job Performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8, 216-226. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00151>

Wefald, A.J., & Downey, R.G. (2009). Construct Dimensionality of Engagement and Its Relation with Satisfaction. *The Journal of Psychology*, 143(1), 91-111. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/JRLP.143.1.91-112>

Williams, L.J., & dan Anderson, S.E. (1991). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and In-Role Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700305>

Table 1. Means, standard deviations, and inter correlations among the study variables

	Mean	SD	α	1	2	3
OCB	3.9246	0.42768	0.7537	1.000	-0.245**	0.312**
CWB	2.5750	0.51682	0.6676		1.000	-0.179**
Employee Engagement	3.0947	0.57413	0.7330			1.000

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

Table 2. t-test analysis for employee engagement, OCB, and CWB based on gender

Domain	Gender	N	Mean	SD	df	t	Sign.
Employee Engagement	Male	231	3.0758	0.61121	505	0.994	0.319
	Female	276	3.1105	0.54176			
OCB	Male	231	3.9448	0.48180	505	22.669	0.000
	Female	276	3.9076	0.37653			
CWB	Male	231	2.6688	0.46741	505	4.359	0.037
	Female	276	2.4964	0.54327			