
IMPACT OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT ON ORGANIZATION CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Anusha Sridhar

Post Graduate Student, SSN School of Management, SSN Engineering College,
Kalavakkam, Chennai.

Dr. T. Thiruvankadam

Associate Professor, SSN School of Management, SSN Engineering College
Kalavakkam, Chennai. E-mail: thiruvankadamt@ssn.edu.in.

Abstract

This article is commissioned to study the level of Engagement in a construction organization located in Chennai, India and its impact on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. It is highly important to know the level of Engagement in an Organization and act upon the results for growth of the Organization. Engagement is often related to productivity and Turnover. But less importance is given to the Behavioural impact of Employee Engagement. Therefore this study focuses on the impact of Employee Engagement on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. A sample of 194 Respondents were chosen from the total Population using simple random sampling. Statistical tools like Regression and Correlation were used and Percentage Analysis was done. It was found that Employee Engagement has a very significant impact on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.

Key words: Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

1. Introduction

An "engaged employee" is one who is fully absorbed by and enthusiastic about their work and so takes positive action to further the organization's reputation and interests. Engaged employees believe that they can make a difference in the organizations they work for. Confidence in both themselves and others on the knowledge, skills, and abilities — is a powerful predictor of behaviour and subsequent performance. Engaged employees would make a big difference if organizations by creating positive psychological climate, job resources, good organizational support, and working conditions to inspire them to give their best and go extra-mile to enhance the the organization's overall performance. In addition, employees do better when they experience optimistic practices at work place for instance, provided with opportunities to develop their career, being treated with respect, adequate reward and recognition for high performance etc. Actually, employees' positive feelings about their work experiences may exceed global attitudes of commitment or job satisfaction. The involvement of engaged employees will be very high and experience their work as interesting and something to which they can devote their

full attention (Bakker et al., 2010, 2011). Therefore, engagement is inferred as a positive experience in itself which has positive consequences for the organizations (Bhatnagar, 2012) in terms of high commitment, less employee turnover, less absenteeism, higher task proficiency, higher productivity, and as a result, increased performance of the organization. Organization Citizenship Behaviour means the range of cooperative behaviours that are positive, intended, non-obligatory, and goes beyond the set requirements of a job. These are behaviours that are not directly related to the main task activities but are significant because they support the organizational, social, and psychological context that serves as the critical catalyst for tasks to be accomplished.

2. Need and Objective of the Study

Employee Engagement is an important indicator of Organizational success. Engaged employees work with passion and feel a profound connection to the company whereas an Actively Disengaged employees aren't just unhappy but act out their unhappiness. Therefore it is highly essential to know if an Organization has an Engaged workforce. Engagement is often related to

productivity, profitability etc. However little is known about the behavioural impact of Engagement. Therefore this study is focussed on finding the impact of Employee Engagement on Organization Citizenship Behaviour.

3. Review of Literature

There are plenty of studies were found in the literature on the topic employee engagement and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour. The selective reviews given below explore the key constructs under investigation in this study. Kahn and William (1990) provided the first formal definition of employee engagement. He defines employee 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 performances”. Employee engagement deals with the employees’ beliefs about the working conditions, the leaders and about the organisation. The emotional aspect looks at how employees feel about each of those three factors and whether they have positive or negative attitudes toward the leaders and the organisation. The physical aspect of employee engagement concerns the physical energies exerted by individuals to carry out their roles. Therefore, according to Kahn (1990), engagement means to be psychologically as well as physically present when occupying and performing an organisational role. In a recent study by Bates (2004) gave an overview of major thinking and recent research on the topic of employee engagement. This article provides a discussion of major social trends that affect employee engagement, and the impact of engagement on company performance, and suggests some management and communications strategies for encouraging and enhancing employee engagement. The tacit definition of employee engagement that the article uses is the emotional connection between the employee and his/her job, his/her manager, and the organization, driven by such factors as the opportunities for personal and professional growth, and trust in senior leaders, a personal relationship with his/her manager, and ride in the reputation of his/her company. Supporting this argument, Michael Cardus (2013) says that managers are often mistaken that psychology or personality is what affects Engagement.

He says in reality work system drives Engagement. He defines the five levers as: Competent Managers, Contextual Goals, Objective Metrics, Resources and autonomy. Gubman (2004) used his article to call for acknowledgement of “passion”, a hard-wired personality characteristic that multiplies the effects of engagement and serves as a contagion or others’ enthusiasm. He indicates that, since passion is a personality characteristic and therefore cannot be taught, it should be used for selecting new employees and in promotion decisions. Gubman’s definition of employee engagement is “a heightened personal connection with the organization that goes beyond satisfaction.”

The following studies will explain the relationship between employee engagement and Organisational behaviour. Ed Snape and Tom Redman (2010) examined the relationship between HRM practices, conceptualized at the workplace level, and individual employee attitudes and behaviour. The focus was on two possible explanations for the relationship: social exchange and job influence/employee discretion. The paper suggests that there is a positive impact of HRM practices on organizational citizenship behaviour, through an effect on perceived job influence/discretion. It was also found that no such effect for perceived organizational support. These findings provide support for a job influence and opportunity explanation of HRM effects on employee attitudes and behaviour. Kataria et al., (2012) suggests that organizations, apart from task proficiency are becoming increasingly reliant on employees’ discretionary efforts at workplace. This paper intends to explore employee engagement and OCB literatures to investigate the interrelationships between employee engagement, OCB, and organizational effectiveness. Findings in this paper indicate that employee engagement has potential to drive OCB. Engaged employees also have the greatest potential to augment organizational effectiveness through their higher levels of OCB. This study suggests that value-based organizations through their HR architecture should adopt high performance HR practices to sustain high levels of employee engagement, since the psychological mechanism of engagement drives OCB by which an organization achieves effectiveness. In a recent study by

Rurkkhum and Bartlett (2012) examined the relationship between employee engagement and OCB with the use of employee perceptions of HRD practices as moderators: organizational support, access to training and development opportunities, support for training and development opportunities, benefits of training, and formal career management support. The results did not find support for the predicted moderating effect as expected, the study revealed the findings of a positive relationship between employee engagement and discretionary employee behaviours that go beyond formal job requirement. This is considered an important finding given that employee engagement is a new concept of increasing interest in Thailand. Reichheld (2001) identified six major principles for creating high levels of loyalty among employees. These principles include: Preach what you practice, Play to win-win, Be choosy, Keep it simple, Reward the right results, and Listen hard, talk straight. While this article is focused on employee engagement's ancillary topic of employee loyalty, Reichheld explores the behaviours that managers can exhibit to build trust and integrity with their employees, which has been shown to be a significant driver of engagement.

Previous studies have found a relationship between employee engagement and OCB. Most of these studies were done in western countries and a very small is known of this potential relationship in other Asian countries such as India. Also, given the rapidly changing employment and workplace management practices in many international business settings, it is important to further confirm the linkages between employee engagement and OCB. Thus, the first hypothesis of the study was: Hypothesis 1: There is a positive relationship between employee engagement and OCB.

4. Research Methodology

The study is descriptive in nature. The data have been collected using structured questionnaire administered to the various Cadres of Employees working in a Major Construction Company Head-Quarters located in Chennai. Total of 250 respondents were selected from the list of employees and the questionnaires were mailed to them individually with a covering letter. Out of 250

respondents, 194 respondents replied with filled up questionnaire and the response rate was 77%. The demographic profile of the respondents is given below:

Table No: 1. Demographic Profile of Respondents

S. No.	Demographic Profile	Frequency	Percentage
I	Age		
1	<20 years	22	11
2	20-29 years	114	59
3	30-39 years	40	21
4	>40 years	18	9
	Total	194	100
II	Experience (in years) in the Company		
1	Less than 1 year	68	35
2	1-5 years	104	54
3	More than 5 years	22	11
	Total	194	100
III	Cadre Composition		
1	Senior Executives	24	12
2	Managers & Executives	58	30
3	Supervisors	50	26
4	Permanent Employees	46	24
5	Temporary employees & Trainees	16	8
	Total	194	100

Source: Primary Data

The above table indicates the demographic profile of the respondents. Out of 194 respondents 59 percent are between 20 to 29 years of age, 21 percent are between 30 to 39 years, 11 percent are below 20 years (most of them are trainees) and 9 percent are above 40 years. 54 percent of respondents are having one to five years experience, 35 percent are having less than one year experience and 11 percent are having more than 5 years experience in the company. In the total respondents, 12 percent are senior executives, 30 percent are managers and executives, 26 percent are supervisors, 24 percent are permanent employees and 8 percent are temporary employees and trainees.

4.1 Research Instrument

Structured Questionnaire was used as the Research Instrument. A five point Likert Scale was employed. The Questionnaire consists of two Parts. Part-A contains

Questions pertaining to Organization Citizenship Behaviour. The Following important Dimensions of Employee Engagement are taken for the study: Recognition, Opportunity for growth, Organisation's Leadership and Planning, Work Life Balance, Work Nature, Job Role Management Support and Working Environment.

Part-B contains Questions for measuring Employee Engagement. The Following important Dimensions of Organization Citizenship Behaviour are used in the study: Altruism, Conscientiousness, Civic Virtue, Courtesy and Sportsmanship. Pilot study was done on a Sample of 40 Respondents to check the Reliability of the Scale. Both the Employee Engagement and Organization Citizenship Behaviour Scale were tested for reliability. The Cronbach's Alpha value which is an indicator of Reliability of the scale was determined using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. The results are given below:

4.1.1. Scale Reliability: Employee Engagement

Table No: 2. Reliability Statistics for Employee Engagement

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.934	8

Source: Primary Data

From the above Table, The Cronbach's Alpha Value for Employee Engagement is found to be 0.934 (>0.7). This shows that the scale has high reliability.

4.2.2. Scale Reliability: OCB

Table No: 3. Reliability Statistics For Organization Citizenship Behaviour

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.895	6

Source: Primary Data

From Table 3 that The Cronbach's Alpha Value for Organization Citizenship Behaviour is found to be 0.895 (>0.7). This shows that the scale has high reliability. Statistical tools like Percentage Analysis, Multiple Regression and Bi-Variate Correlation were used to analyse the data.

5. Results and Discussions

5.1. Bi-Variate Correlation: Employee Engagement

The value of the Sig. for all the Dimensions and Employee Engagement is 0. Therefore it is found that all the Dimensions (Recognition, Growth, Org. Leadership, Work Life Balance, Work Nature, Job Role, Mgmt. Support and Work Environment have a significant impact of Employee Engagement. Opportunity to Grow has the highest

Correlation with Employee Engagement (0.943) followed by Work Environment (0.920), Job Role (0.979) and Organization Leadership (0.819), Work Life Balance has the lowest Correlation with Employee Engagement (0.262). It is also found the Cadre and Employee Engagement are negatively Correlated (0.388)

5.2. Multiple Regression Analysis: Employee Engagement

Table No: 4. Multiple Regression (EE) : ANOVA table

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	282486.673	8	35310.834	3049.388	.000 ^b
	Residual	2142.234	185	11.580		
	Total	284628.907	193			

The table shows that the independent variables statistically significantly predict the dependent variable. $P < 0.05$

Table No: 5. Multiple Regression(EE) : Model Summary Table

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.996 ^a	0.992	0.992	3.40289

$R^2 = 0.992$ i.e 99.2% of the variation in Employee Engagement can be explained by the factors.

Table No: 6. Multiple regression (EE): Coefficients Table

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(Constant)	5.441	1.158		4.697	0	3.156	7.726
Recognition	5.207	0.466	0.178	11.168	0	4.287	6.127
Opportunity for Growth	5.068	0.596	0.195	8.51	0	3.893	6.243
Organizational Leadership	3.529	0.388	0.118	9.1	0	2.764	4.294
Work Life Balance	2.184	0.487	0.032	4.481	0	1.222	3.146
Work Nature	4.156	0.496	0.143	8.375	0	3.177	5.135
Job Role	3.132	0.453	0.108	6.909	0	2.238	4.027
Management Support	4.762	0.457	0.148	10.423	0	3.861	5.664
Work Environment	4.635	0.497	0.174	9.334	0	3.655	5.614

The Regression Equation is

Employee Engagement = (5.207*Recognition) + (5.068 * Growth) + (3.529 * Org. Leadership) + (2.184 * Work Life Balance) + (4.156 * Work Nature) + (3.132 * Job Role) + (4.762 * Mgmt. Support) + (4.63 * Work Environment).

Therefore, there is a significant relationship between the Independent Variables (Recognition, Growth, Organization Leadership, Work Life Balance, Work Nature, Job Role, Management Support and Work Environment) and Dependent variable (Employee Engagement).

5.3. Contribution by Individual Dimensions to OCB

Table No: 7. Contribution of different Dimensions to OCB

S.NO	Dimension	Percentage
1	Altruism	21.59%
2	Conscientiousness	25.41%
3	Civic Virtue	16.42%
4	Courtesy	20.90%
5	Sportsmanship	15.68%

Conscientiousness (25.41 %) and Altruism (21.59) are found to be the major contributors to OCB, Sportsmanship contributes the least (15.48%) to Engagement.

5.4. Percentage Analysis: Impact of Employee Engagement on OCB

Table No: 8. Relationship between Employee Engagement and OCB

S. No	Employee Engagement	Low OCB	Moderate OCB	High OCB	Total
1	Disengagement	49	24	27	100
2	Moderate Engagement	0	58	42	100
3	High Engagement	8	18	75	100

Out of 194 respondents 49 % of the Disengaged Employees have low OCB. Only 27 % of the Disengaged Employees have high OCB. It is also found that OCB is as high as 75% for Highly Engaged Employees. Only 8% of the Highly Engaged Employees have low OCB.

5.6. Bi-Variate Correlation: Employee Engagement & OCB

Table No: 9. Bi-variate Correlation between Employee Engagement & OCB

		OCB	Recognition	Growth	Org. Leadership	Work Life Balance	Work Nature	Job Role	Mgmt. Support	Work Environment	EE
OCB	Pearson Correlation	1	.451**	.487**	.477**	.194**	.498**	.446**	.451**	.468**	.506**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.007	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Recognition	Pearson Correlation	.451**	1	.898**	.759**	.147*	.780**	.797**	.839**	.833**	.870**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.040	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Growth	Pearson Correlation	.487**	.898**	1	.839**	.263**	.881**	.866**	.861**	.909**	.943**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Org. Leadership	Pearson Correlation	.477**	.759**	.839**	1	.074	.794**	.747**	.709**	.828**	.819**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.303	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Work Life Balance	Pearson Correlation	.194**	.147*	.263**	.074	1	.238**	.227**	.251**	.213**	.262**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.007	.040	.000	.303		.001	.001	.000	.003	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Work Nature	Pearson Correlation	.498**	.780**	.881**	.794**	.238**	1	.880**	.834**	.886**	.909**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194

Job Role	Pearson Correlation	.446**	.797**	.866**	.747**	.227**	.880**	1	.801**	.884**	.879**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Mgmt. Support	Pearson Correlation	.451**	.839**	.861**	.709**	.251**	.834**	.801**	1	.827**	.884**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Work Environment	Pearson Correlation	.468**	.833**	.909**	.828**	.213**	.886**	.884**	.827**	1	.920**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.003	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Employee Engagement	Pearson Correlation	.506**	.870**	.943**	.819**	.262**	.909**	.879**	.884**	.920**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194

The value of the Sig. for all the Dimensions and OCB is 0. Therefore it is found that all the Dimensions of Employee Engagement have a significant impact on Organization Citizenship Behavior. The Persons Correlation for Employee Engagement and OCB is .506, which proves that Employee Engagement has a positive impact on OCB. It is also found that Nature of Work, Opportunity for Growth and Organizational Leadership has high Correlation with OCB.

6. Discussions

Organisations massively focusing on attracting and retaining the highly productive employees should focus on improving the Engagement level of the Employees. Only an “engaged employee” will put extra effort to improve the organisational performance, not only by improving his own performance, rather, by focusing also on the overall development of the organisation. Only the organisations having more number of employees with OCB can excel in its performance and also can develop and retain competitive advantage over other firms. In the present study, literature review was conducted to explore the factors contributing to Employee Engagement and OCB. Bates (2004) supports the argument that there will be an impact of engagement on company performance. Studies such as Kataria et al., (2012) as well indicate that employee engagement has potential to drive OCB. Thus,

on the basis of theoretical evidences and support from the literature review, the outcomes of the present study reinforce the relationship between employee engagement and OCB.

7. Conclusion

The research paper examined Employee Engagement and its impact on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. The study reveals that there is a very significant relationship between Employee Engagement and Organization Citizenship Behavior. Although OCB may not be able to directly impact business outcomes, this type of highly-valued workplace behaviours can facilitate organizational performance through the impact on organizational culture and individual productivity. Therefore Employee Engagement not only has Quantitative benefits by highly valued Organisational Citizenship Behaviour. The study strongly recommends that organizations can develop OCB by focussing on Employee Engagement. The present paper analyzes only the connection between Employee Engagement and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. In future, this study could also be extended to examine the other organisational factors such as Motivation, Organisational Structure, Culture, Leadership Style, Power and Politics etc to study OCB. The study also can be extended to interlink the individual factors such as

personality, perception, attitude, values and satisfaction to study Employee Engagement and OCB. Pragmatic study of employee engagement would help to understand the best ways to improve the fit between the job and the performer and also to enhance the organisational performance and productivity.

References

1. Bakker, Arnold B.; Albrecht, Simon L.; Leiter, Michael P. (2011), "Work engagement: Further reflections on the state of play", *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*. Feb2011, Vol. 20 Issue 1, p74-88.
2. Bakker, Dollard, Maureen F.; Arnold B. (2010), "Psychosocial safety climate as a precursor to conducive work environments, psychological health problems, and employee engagement" *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*. Sep2010, Vol. 83 Issue 3, p579-599.
3. Bates, S. (2004). "Getting Engaged," *HR Magazine*, Society for Human Resource Management, Vol. 49, No. 2, February, pp. 44-51.
4. Bhatnagar, Jyotsna. (2012), "Management of innovation: role of psychological empowerment, work engagement and turnover intention in the Indian context", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Mar2012, Vol. 23 Issue 5, p928-951.
5. Ed Snape and Tom Redman (2010), "HRM Practices, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, and performance: A Multi-Level Analysis" *Journal of Management Studies* 47:7. Vol. 47 Issue 7, p1219-1247.
6. Fleming, J.H., C. Coffman & J.K. Harter (2005), "Manage your human Sigma", *Harvard Business Review*, 83 (7), 106-115.
7. Gubman, E. (2004), "From Engagement to Passion for Work: The Search for the Missing Person," *Human Resources Planning*, The Human Resource Planning Society, Vol. 27.3, September. Vol. 27 Issue 3, p42-46.
8. Kahn, William A. (1990), "Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work" *The Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 33 Issue 4, p692-724.
9. Kataria, Aakanksha; Garg, Pooja; Rastogi, Renu. (2012-13), "Employee Engagement and Organizational Effectiveness: The Role of Organizational Citizenship Behavior" *International Journal of Business Insights & Transformation*. Oct2012-Mar2013, Vol. 6 Issue 1, p102-113.
10. Kreitner, R. & A. Kiniki, (2004), *Organizational Behavior* 5e. New York, NY: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.
11. Michael Cardus (2013), "The Five levers of Employee Engagement", *The Journal of Quality and Participation*. Jul2013, Vol. 36 Issue 2, p28-31.
12. Nancy R. Lockwood, SPHR, GPHR, M.A. (2007), "Leveraging Employee Engagement for Competitive Advantage" *SHRM Research Quarterly*.
13. Podsakoff, P.M., S.B. MacKenzie, & W.H. Bommer (1996), "Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfactions, commitment, trust and organizational citizenship behaviours", *Journal of Management*, 22 (2), 259-98.
14. Rurkkhum, S and K.R. Bartlett, (2012), "The relationship between employee engagement and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in Thailand" *Human Resource International*, 15(2); 157-174.
15. Reichheld, F. (2001), "Lead for Loyalty", *Harvard Business Review*, July-Aug. pp. 76-84.

Table No: 3. Bivariate Correlation for Employee Engagement

		Age	Experience	Cadre	Recognition	Growth	Org. Leadership	Work Life Balance	Work Nature	Mgmt. Support	Job Role	Work Environment	EE
Age	Pearson Correlation	1	.565 **	-.479 **	.275 **	.331 **	.235 **	.129	.310 **	.329 **	.387 **	.363 **	.315 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.073	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Experience	Pearson Correlation	.565 **	1	-.437 **	.379 **	.470 **	.300 **	.259 **	.434 **	.452 **	.488 **	.446 **	.463 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Cadre	Pearson Correlation	-.479 **	-.437 **	1	-.330 **	-.383 **	-.144 *	-.158 *	-.382 **	-.374 **	-.454 **	-.341 **	-.388 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.045	.027	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Recognition	Pearson Correlation	.275 **	.379 **	-.330 **	1	.898 **	.759 **	.147 *	.780 **	.839 **	.797 **	.833 **	.870 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.040	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Growth	Pearson Correlation	.331 **	.470 **	-.383 **	.898 **	1	.839 **	.263 **	.881 **	.861 **	.866 **	.909 **	.943 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Org. Leadership	Pearson Correlation	.235 **	.300 **	-.144 *	.759 **	.839 **	1	.074	.794 **	.709 **	.747 **	.828 **	.819 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.045	.000	.000		.303	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
WorkLifeBalance	Pearson Correlation	.129	.259 **	-.158 *	.147 *	.263 **	.074	1	.238 **	.251 **	.227 **	.213 **	.262 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.073	.000	.027	.040	.000	.303		.001	.000	.001	.003	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
WorkNature	Pearson Correlation	.310 **	.434 **	-.382 **	.780 **	.881 **	.794 **	.238 **	1	.834 **	.880 **	.886 **	.909 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Mgmt. Support	Pearson Correlation	.329 **	.452 **	-.374 **	.839 **	.861 **	.709 **	.251 **	.834 **	1	.801 **	.827 **	.884 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
JobRole	Pearson Correlation	.387 **	.488 **	-.454 **	.797 **	.866 **	.747 **	.227 **	.880 **	.801 **	1	.884 **	.879 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
WorkEnvironment	Pearson Correlation	.363 **	.446 **	-.341 **	.833 **	.909 **	.828 **	.213 **	.886 **	.827 **	.884 **	1	.920 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.003	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
EE	Pearson Correlation	.315 **	.463 **	-.388 **	.870 **	.943 **	.819 **	.262 **	.909 **	.884 **	.879 **	.920 **	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194

Source: Primary Data

