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Abstract

Employee engagement in the corporate world, as well as in the academia, is an area of inquiry and exploration of its virtual importance. The objective of this research study is to present a conceptual model designed to probe the key antecedents and consequences of employee engagement, which determine the impact of empowering leadership, psychological capital, and job characteristics as antecedents, and employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior as consequences related to employee engagement. This thesis replicates and expands Kahn’s theory of engagement by integrating various variables designated as core antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. This research study is intended to contribute substantial knowledge to the argumentative literature on the employee engagement for academic researchers and business experts, which has mostly remained under the shadow of burnout concept based on Job Demand – Resource Model. The findings of this research study and significant suggestions, relevant to the banking sector will oblige leaders to re-evaluate their strategies and policies accordingly.

Simple random sampling technique has been applied to select banks to collect requisite data through self-administered questionnaire from 1200 employees of the banking sector working in different banks posted in various cities located in all provinces of the Pakistan. The Analysis of a Moment Structures has been applied for confirmatory factor analysis and SPSS has been used to examine and determine inter-relationships among the study variables. PROCESS macro method developed by Hayes (2013) in SPSS has been applied to test the hypotheses. Empirical findings of the research study demonstrated positive and significant relationship among antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Similarly, the results confirmed the partial mediation of employee engagement between aforementioned antecedents and consequences. Overall, this research study establishes and concludes that Kahn’s theory of employee engagement is a sound conceptual basis for further research on this subject and guides future researchers to consider application of this theory for exploration of other relationships in the purview of employee engagement.

**Key words:** Empowering Leadership, Psychological Capital and Job Characteristics, Employee Service Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Banking Sector in Pakistan.
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Chapter 1

Introduction
1 Introduction

1.1 The premise of the research

Almost all humans, who possess intellectual sense of reasoning, have been conceded a unique quality of being preoccupied in constructive, positive and beneficial activities of variegated nature during major portion of their lives. An “Employee” is a person who devotes or directs himself towards a particular activity investing all his energies advantageously on a job or services, reciprocated by payment of wages or a salary by a company. In the state of his involvement, so-called “engagement”, he is expected to exhibit emotional, cognitive and physical commitment to his accredited responsibilities. Prior to broaching the main topic of discourse, it is appropriate to define the nomenclature “Employee Engagement” in the perspective of involvement regarding its function in any kind activities.

It has been globally observed that low employee performance has remained a critical subject of importance and attention for organizations because of its direct concomitant link with an organization’s overall performance. The employee in an organization is the fundamental factor entrenched in the evolution of all management theories postulated by Mary Parker Follett acclaimed as “mother of modern management”. The employee, the leader and the organization have remained under important discussions and argumentations for researchers and managers. The development of modern technologies and extensive demanding and competitive business environments have urged business leaders to consider and explore suitable employee management as a driving force for successful business through the lens of employee performance (Baily et al., 2017). Employee performance, either productive or unproductive, is the outcome of work performed by employees by any means at workplace (Cardy, 2004). Rastogi, Pati, Krishnan & Krishnan, (2018) reported in their research study that many companies in the USA were facing a cost of almost US$450 to US$550 billion owning to their 70 % employees showing poor performance and disengagement at their workplaces. Baily et al., (2017) highlighted employee performance as a key outcome of engaged employees, whereas, Rastogi et al., (2018) argued that employees’ poor performance could be ascribed to their disengagement at workplace. Many studies reported employee engagement as being an important determinant of employee’s greater level of job performance.

Companies in Pakistan are focusing on employee engagement to get maximum performance from employees to become market champions like: Tetra Pak, P & G Pakistan, Pakistan Tabaco Company who have adopted an approach to develop a culture of employee engagement through yearly surveys. ICI Pakistan Limited was ranked among 39 worldwide companies in year 2018 for “Gallup Great Workplace Award” for promoting culture of employee engagement. Hay Group, a consulting firm issued a report in year 2018 titled: “Engaged Performance Framework” by taking responses from 47 different countries including Pakistan and concluded that employee engagement with employee enablement were important factors for getting solid contribution in overall company performance. Crosby (2018) in an article written in The Wall Street Journal highlighted the important role of employees in company performance.

Employees are definitely the key contributors towards organizational performance, and the engaged workforce is the exceptional asset of every organization (Lockwood, 2007). Kahn (1990) initially presented the idea of employee related “personal engagement & personal disengagement” in literature. He defined it while explaining personal 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”. On the other hand, Kahn (1990) particularized personal disengagement as “the isolation of selves from work-roles”. In disengagement attitude, people extract them and defend their positions in terms of “physically, cognitively, emotionally during role-performance”. The second notion of engagement was extended by burnout theorists (Maslach and leiter, 1997) who construct the engagement is the opposite of the burnout. After seven years, when Kahn (1990-1992) introduced the buzzword “engagement” in literature, researchers working on burnout domain integrated burnout factor with job engagement (Maslach and leiter, 1997). Subsequently other researchers bracketed engagement with burnout, like Schaufeli (2002,

Eldor and Vigoda-Gadot (2017), while discussing employee-organization-relationships, in their research article, stated that the concept of employee engagement gained dramatic interest of researchers and business experts/executives for its implementation within organizations to generate various benefits. The term “employee engagement”, being a productive driving force for employees and organizations, both, attracted much attention as a focal point of practice along with extensive research studies that alluded to its fruitful outcomes (Shuck & Wollard 2010, Shuck & Reio, 2011). Many researchers reported positive and significant relationships existing among employee engagement with workplace attitudes, workplace relationships, job satisfaction, reduced turnover and improved performance at individual and group level (Alarcon, Lyons & Tartaglia, 2010; Bakker, Emmerik & Euwema, 2006; Harter, Schmidt & Hays, 2002; Salanova, Agut, and Peiro, 2005; Sanchez and McCauley, 2006). It was also reported that engaged employees accepted responsibility to accomplish required tasks, and exhibited high commitment to optimum performance discerning their own discretionary efforts (Britt 2003; Christian, Garza, and Slaughter 2011; Crawford, Pine, & Rich 2010; Shuck & Reio 2011).

1.2 Viewpoint of corporate world about employee engagement

Employee Engagement is not a one-time activity in any specific current year, but actually, is a continuous process to get sustained performance from employees. Report, published by Deloitte University Press as “2017 Deloitte Global Human Capital Trends”, highlighted the importance of employee’s experience that resulted from company’s culture and employee engagement. Josh Bersin, Principal and Founder, Deloitte Consulting LLP, in his research report, said that employee engagement, organizational culture and employee retention occupied priority areas for company leaders and HR Consultants. This report highlighted a two-way phenomenon that encompasses: (i) company’s expectations from highly engaged employees along with healthy culture (ii) employees’ expectations for being engaged, productive, satisfied juxtaposed with enjoyable healthy workplace experience. Josh Bersin (Deloitte
Consulting LLP) emphasized to improve employee engagement through better employee experience, rather than narrowly assessing employee engagement, that could only be possible by consolidating better workplace design practices and influential on-the-job management styles. This report concluded that leaders needed to improve employee engagement, employee empowerment and workforce solutions related to job or development effectuating increased productivity for corporations and personal benefits for employees. Gallup survey report (2017) on banking sector, across the globe, highlighted that appreciation and recognition from managers helped banking employees to align themselves with overall bank’s objectives, whereas, recognition motivated them to remain engaged at workplace and, therefore, exhibited better customer experience.

![Figure 1-1: Factors for Positive Employee Experience](image)


“Deloitte’s 2016 Human Capital Trends Report”, published by Deloitte University Press, in the perspective of workplace culture versus employee engagement, commented that companies’ executives considered both factors as highly important and productive, but some executives accorded acute importance to these factors on day-to-day basis. In
another research finding, conducted by Bersin on “Unlocking the Secrets of Employee Engagement” published by Deloitte in 2018, highlighted that there were only two buzz words in the minds of leaders; one was employee retention and second was employee engagement which shifted engagement from a training tool to core business strategy.

Figure 1-2: Employee Engagement Trends

Source: Deloitte’s 2016 Human Capital Trends Report

Mann & Harter (2016) in their article, published by Gallup, argued that “employee engagement crisis” prevailed worldwide. They referred to the latest Gallup survey, 2016 on employee engagement, revealing that only 32% US employees were engaged, whereas, a documented report written by Steve Crabtree (2013) on Gallup survey of 142 countries worldwide, revealed that only 13% employees were engaged. In the South Asia region, the position is depicted below:

i. Engaged employees…….10%

ii. Disengaged employees……61%

iii. Almost completely disengaged employees….29%
Report titled “The impact of employee engagement on performance” published by Harvard Business Review in year 2013, it was concluded that:

i. Engagement was the top-priority for leaders.

ii. Engaged employees could optimize bottom-line performance.

iii. Leaders (550 Companies) recognized importance of engagement.

iv. 71% respondents rated engagement as top-priority, 72%, rated recognition as a core factor, which influenced engagement, and 24% responded that their workforce was highly engaged.

Graber (2015), in his article published in Harvard Business Review, highlighted that business enterprises were spending billions of dollars every year to ameliorate employee engagement, but without any palpable success, considering employee engagement merely as a discretionary effort or as mind-bending. He argued that employee performance must be adjudged in the context of their perceptions and behavior, whereas, companies simplified job satisfaction as a substitute of employee engagement, ignoring very important aspects of employee’s behavior. In 2017, a survey conducted by Harvard Business Review on employee engagement interestingly concluded regarding viewpoints of leaders relevant to employee engagement. The survey results showed that 71% leaders expressed that employee engagement was crucially important, but ironically, only 24% of them commented that their employees were engaged. In an article, focusing on the comparison of expenditure, that management is doing on employee engagement and evaluation of returns that companies are receiving from those engaged employee, which was published by Jacob Morgan in year 2017, stressed to rethink and redesign employee experiences at workplace in order to educate and motivate them, not to come for one-day need, but to deliver for every day.
AON PLC is the globally recognized name entrusted to issue various types of reports/surveys on different Human Resource Solutions. In a research study of more than 1000 companies including banks, covering thousands of employees in 60 industries, focusing on various workplace aspects, AON PLC published a report on “2017 Trends in global Employee Engagement”. This report highlighted a significant decrease in employee engagement level world-wide, which obliged CEOs, HR Leaders, and Managers for taking remedial steps requiring thought and skill to arrive at proper conclusive decision. The Boston Consulting Group (BCG, 2010) in an article stressed to improve middle and front-line employees’ engagement working at banks and recommended to empower them for better customer satisfaction. Willis Towers Watson (WLTW, 2018) issued a report on a survey of 17 industries in Europe and concluded that engaged employees go extra miles as compared to disengaged employees.

More specifically, as per Gallup survey (2013), in Pakistan, 15% employees were engaged at work in the year 2013 without any considerable improvement yet. In a recent Pakistan National Human Development Report, 2016, published by UNDP highlighted the three key impulsive factors that could possibly stimulate Pakistani youth in enhancing their proficiency in (i) Education, (ii) Employment and (iii) Employee Engagement.
Considering this situation regarding employee engagement (Gallup Survey and UNDP Report 2016) has constrained corporate leaders and researchers in Pakistan to deeply probe the employee engagement issue, either by carrying out surveys or by arranging seminars to highlight the critical antecedents that influence engagement level leading to employee work productivity, and frame recommendations to enhance their efficacy level for an organization. Visualizing the geo-political strategic importance and subsequent development activities, emanating from China Pakistan Economic Corridor (C-PEC), the role of engaged workforce would become critically challenging, and henceforth, it would increase multi-dimensionally.

1.3 Viewpoint of Researchers about Employee Engagement

Wahyuningsih, Sudiro, Troena & Irawanto, (2018) states that employee engagement is now a strategic agenda for HR Managers. While screening previous research and increasing interest of consulting firms, policy makers and corporate leaders on employee engagement, Bailey, Madden, Alves & Fletcher (2017) states that it is the focused area now a days to leverage employee and organizational performance. Bailey et al., (2017) argues that after elapsing 27 years, when Kahn (1990) introduced the term “personal engagement”, this concept is still under consideration of researchers to reach at consensus, as how to describe, conceptualize, and approve a single theory identifying a compact and sound measuring scale (Macey & Schneider, 2008) which reflects the importance of this construct. Mackay, Allen & Landis (2016) in a recent empirical research study about employee engagement, linked with employee effectiveness, revealed that employee engagement was pre-eminently an effective construct and a standard measure for employees’ job- related attitudes, which successfully estimated employee’s effectiveness and anticipated performance. Knight, Patterson & Dawson (2016) indicated in their research study that low work engagement may contribute towards declining employee’s well-being and poor employee work performance at workplace, which compelled companies to undertake and evaluate sustainable employee work engagement accordingly. Visualizing the positive impacts of employee engagement on organizations, it is still deemed as a valued construct to examine and study in the context of management research (Liu, Cho, Putra, 2017; Knight et al., 2016). Saks &
Gruman (2014) in their research study about features of employee engagement highlighted the importance of engagement concept that had been the theme of interest for managers and researchers since its introduction by Kahn in 1990. They indicated that this area of research was being pursued actively owing to many research publications contributed by academicians and business surveys carried out by consulting firms. Andrew & Sofian (2012) termed employee engagement, as “win-win state of affairs” for organizations because highly engaged employees resiliently ascertained and anticipated the success of their organizations through their own dedicated and committed contributions. Lawler – III (2017) in his criticism on employee engagement highlighted the diverse nature of consensus on its operationalization and measurement. He also appreciated that engagement survey was a much powerful tool and reliable mechanism to study employee’s performance.

Shuck, Osam, Zigarmi, and Nimon, (2017), while comprehensively analyzing the construct of employee engagement, stated that besides many research studies relating the concept of employee engagement, and its interchangeable terms (e.g. work engagement, job engagement and organizational engagement) with other similar thought notions; like: employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment, this concept was unanimously affirmed as an entirely distinctive construct. Since emergence of this concept, the meaning and definition of employee engagement was unclear and vague which needed further elaboration (Baily et al., 2017). Over the years, a serious disagreement among researchers and business experts, regarding the concept and theory of employee engagement, remained a persistent challenge (Bakker et al. 2011; Cole et al., 2012; Saks & Gruman, 2014; Shuck et al. 2017; Alagaraja and Shuck, 2015). It also remained under misinterpretation because of its conceptual similarity with various other well-known constructs in literature, like employee job satisfaction, commitment and involvement (Saks, 2006; Shuck et al., 2017; Cole et al., 2012).

Cooke, Cooper, Bartram, Wang & Mei (2016) appreciated the role of high-performance work-system while investigating resilience and employee engagement of the banking sector employees in China. They indicated that employee engagement had become a significant factor for organizational success during the last two decades (Cooke et al.,
Sattar, Ahmad & Hassan (2015) investigated contributory role of HR practices and engagement of banking sector employees of Pakistan and their ultimate impact on employee satisfaction and performance. It has been observed that the encouraging and positive role of HR practices develop higher level of engagement in banking employees, resultantly, they deliver higher level of performance. Ghosh, Rai, & Sinha (2014) while considering banking sector employees in India, explored the impact of organizational justice on employee engagement and found positive relationship between them. They stated that employee engagement was a topic investigated in most of the research studies involving various kinds of relationships in different industries (Ghosh et al., 2014). They declared Kahn as academic father and mentor of employee engagement. Wahyuningsih et al., (2018) states that employee engagement in the corporate world, as well as in the academia is an imperative area of inquiry for its optimum virtual importance.

1.4 Predictors and Outcomes of Employee Engagement

Since the introduction of engagement concept, a number of antecedents, with varying relationships, have been scrutinized in many research studies, meta-analyses and synthetic reviews (Baily et al., 2017). Employee engagement is a resultant outcome of various organizational and employee-related factors that increase or decrease it accordingly. Bailey et al., (2017) stated that one-hundred and fifty-five research studies examined various antecedents of employee engagement. It was also observed that, following different ideologies on engagement concept, (Kahn, 1990; Schaufeli et al., 2002; Maslach et al., 2001; Rich, et al. 2010) underlined the importance and significance of many antecedents in the framework of aforesaid ideologies.

While exploring personal engagement, Kahn (1990) presumed two important factors, i.e. employees’ perceptions about their work-settings and employees’ self-characteristics that affected psychological conditions, ultimately influencing their willingness to get them engaged and adjust themselves in particular job-roles. It is comparable to the Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) belief that role characteristics eventually make impacts on psychological states that inspire employee’s internal motivation for role performance. Kahn (1990) focused on three core psychological conditions, namely, “meaningfulness,
safety and availability” that directly affected engagement. He further theorized that organizations and employees’ characteristics were the key factors that stimulated the aforesaid conditions. Perceptions regarding organizational and work-associated factors with job-tasks and employees’ roles mainly influence meaningfulness. Safety is related to a social system that prevails in an organization, develops supporting environments and healthy relationship among employees. Role and organizational meaningfulness, with perceptions of safety leads to employee’s self-confidence and self-consciousness that make him capable of delivering high level performance at the workplace. Considering Kahn’s (1990) theory of employee engagement and three key psychological conditions, Rich et al., (2010) studied three predicting variables; titled “value congruence, perceived organizational support and employee’s core self-evaluation”, as antecedents of employee engagement, whereas, “citizenship behavior and task performance” were the outcome variables and were found to have positive correlation among all variables. Following Kahn’s (1990) theory of employee engagement, Saks (2006) scrutinized some antecedents and consequences in the context of job engagement and organizational parameters in a research study conducted on 102 employees performing different jobs. He found positive association among all six antecedents/predictors like: “reward and recognition, perceived organizational support, perceived supervisor’s support, distributive justice and procedural justice, Job characteristics” with job engagement and organizational engagement. Job characteristics and organizational support were the key predictors/antecedents of job engagement (R=0.37 & 0.36, p value =0 .001); whereas, procedural justice and organizational support were also significant predictors of organizational engagement.

As per aforesaid discussion, and the information given in table 1.1 and 1.2, it may be observed that a number of antecedents and consequences have been investigated by various researchers conducting research on different industries, like: banks, etc. adopting available framework of employee engagement and measuring scale. It is also pertinent to highlight that most of researchers adopted the domain of burnout following JD-R model and ignored the fundamental Kahn (1990) theory of employee engagement, reflected in table 1.1 & 1.2 having summary of studies conducted in the world and in Pakistan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Author/date/location</th>
<th>Measure of engagement used</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Antecedents</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Dominant theoretical framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adriaenssens et al (2011), Belgium</td>
<td>9-item UWES</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>Job Characteristics &amp; Organizational Characteristics</td>
<td>Patient Care Services</td>
<td>Job demand/Support control model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Albrecht and Andreetta (2011), Australia</td>
<td>9-item UWES</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Empowering leadership</td>
<td>affective commitment and turnover intentions</td>
<td>JD-R Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bakker and Bal (2010), Netherlands</td>
<td>9-item UWES</td>
<td>HLM</td>
<td>“Job Autonomy, social support by peers or group, management feedback, learning opportunities along with supervisory coaching”</td>
<td>weekly job performance</td>
<td>JD-R, broaden-and-build theory, COR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bakker and Xanthopoulou (2013), Netherlands</td>
<td>9-item UWES</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Job and personal resources</td>
<td>Employee Well-Being</td>
<td>JD-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bhatnagar (2012), India</td>
<td>17-item UWES</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Psychological empowerment</td>
<td>Innovation and Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>JD-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Unit of Analysis</td>
<td>Key Variables</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Theory Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hu et al (2011), China</td>
<td>9-item UWES</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>“Job demands selected like physical work, workload, emotional relational demands, peers conflict” whereas, “Job resources to be considered like job control, coaching by leaders, colleague support, learning opportunities, task clarity”</td>
<td>Organizational Outcomes</td>
<td>JD-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kahn (1990), USA</td>
<td>Personal engagement and self-expression</td>
<td>Qualitative study; participant observation, interviews, documentary analysis</td>
<td>Psychological conditions to be taken “meaningfulness, safety and availability”</td>
<td>In-role performance</td>
<td>Theory of attachment (Goffman, 1961); job design theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rich et al (2010), USA</td>
<td>18-item scale</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>“Value congruence, POS, core self-evaluation”</td>
<td>Task performance, OCB, both rated by supervisors</td>
<td>Kahn’s (1990) engagement theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Saks (2006), Canada</td>
<td>“5 Item for job engagement and 6 items for organisation”</td>
<td>Multiple regressions</td>
<td>“Job characteristics, Procedural and distributive justice, POS, PSS, Rewards and recognition,”</td>
<td>Job satisfaction, organisational commitment and turnover intentions</td>
<td>SET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tims et al (2013)</td>
<td>9-item UWES</td>
<td>Three wave self-reported survey, SEM</td>
<td>“Job crafting as structural &amp; social with job demands as challenging &amp; hindering”</td>
<td>Employee Well-Being, Self-Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Agarwal et al (2012), India</td>
<td>9 item UWES</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>Innovative Work Behaviour, Turnover intentions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chughtai and Buckley (2009), Pakisan</td>
<td>17-item UWES</td>
<td>Hierarchical multiple regression</td>
<td>Trust in supervisor and trust propensity</td>
<td>“Learning goal orientation, In-role job performance, OCB”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Shuck et al., (2001), USA</td>
<td>19 Item scale adopted by May et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Multi Regression</td>
<td>job fit, affective commitment, psychological climate</td>
<td>discretionary effort, and intention to turnover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sulea et al., 2015, Romania</td>
<td>9 item UWES</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Job Characteristics</td>
<td>Counterproductive work behavior and OCB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Andrew and Sofian(2012), Malaysia</td>
<td>Saks (2006) Scale</td>
<td>Multiple regressions analysis</td>
<td>Employee Communication, Employee Development, Co-employee Support</td>
<td>Job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions, OCB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Menguc et al. 2013, Canada</td>
<td>Salanova et al., 2005 scale</td>
<td>HLM</td>
<td>Perceived Autonomy, Supervisory support and Supervisory Feedback</td>
<td>Employee Service Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5 Studies Conducted in Pakistan

Employee Engagement has acknowledged being a leading factor for most of the research under umbrella of employee behaviors at different industries across the globe. Similarly, academic researchers and scholars at Pakistan have recently been investigating this burning phenomenon in association to many workplace influential factors that effects employees overall performance (Memon, Ghani & Kazi, 2019). Memon et al. (2019) developed a research model in which, they highlighted about key role of leadership in organizing and well-managed performance system that may be applied as practical framework to improve engagement level of Pakistani workforce at banks. Shah, Saeed, Yasir, Siddique and Umar (2018) conducted a research study focusing population of banking sector limited to only two cities of Pakistan and investigated talent engagement (job & organizational engagement) being mediator while evaluating impact of transformational leadership style on employees’ turnover intentions. They reported partial mediation for organizational component of talent engagement whereas; there was no mediation for job engagement in the relationship (Shah et al., 2018). Islam and Tariq (2018) conducted a research on 536 employees of different industries including banks and investigated mediation role of employee engagement. They found learning environment being an influential factor to get them more engage at workplace beyond their described job activities and they exhibited extra role behaviors in terms of more creativity, knowledge sharing with peers and clients along with ample proactive behavior. Sattar, Ahmad and Hassan (2015) studied mediating role of employee engagement while investigating influence of HR practices on employee performance and job satisfaction in banking sector of Pakistan. They found that empowerment was the factor, which was contributing more than other factors like training and development whereas; employee engagement partial mediated the relationship. They also suggested to bank management to put more focus on empowerment in order to increase engagement level of employees. Rasheed, Khan and Ramzan (2013) investigated influential antecedents and consequences of employee engagement while conducting a research on 303 employees working at 44 different branches of private and public limited banks in Lahore city of Pakistan. They found positive relationship among all antecedents (Perceived Supervisor Support, Perceived organizational support and organizational justice) and consequences (OCB – Individual and Organizational) with employee engagement. They suggested management at banks to have more focus on support for employees.
from supervisors and organization in terms of justice which would have better impact on OCB through improved level of employee engagement. In screening the research, related to employee engagement in Pakistan, several predictors and outcomes which researchers have investigated accordingly, are reported in Table 1.2.

Table 1-2: Studies on employee engagement in Pakistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Author/date /location</th>
<th>Measure of engagement used</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>antecedents</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Dominant theoretical framework</th>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Zameer et al. (2018)/Pakistan</td>
<td>Saks (2006) Scale</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Service quality, Corporate Image and Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>JD-R model</td>
<td>Banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Iqbal et al. (2017)/Multan, Pakistan</td>
<td>Saks (2006)</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Job characteristics, rewards and recognition, training</td>
<td>JD-R model</td>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Akhtar et al., (2016)/Pakistan</td>
<td>9 item UWES</td>
<td>Multi Regression</td>
<td>Training, Empowerment, Rewards</td>
<td>Extra-Role Customer services</td>
<td>JD-R model</td>
<td>Banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Sattar, Ahmad &amp; Hassan(2015)/Pakistan</td>
<td>9 item UWES and Karatepe (2013)</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>HR Practices</td>
<td>Employee satisfaction and employee performance</td>
<td>JD-R model</td>
<td>Banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Waqas &amp; Saleem (2014)/Faisalabad, Pakistan</td>
<td>17 items UWES</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>Monetary Rewards and non-monetary rewards</td>
<td>Perceived organizational support</td>
<td>JD-R model</td>
<td>banks, universities, textile industry, and private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Tufail et al., (2016)/Pakistan</td>
<td>9-items UWES</td>
<td>Partial Least Squares (PLS) approach</td>
<td>Islamic Work Ethics</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>JD-R model</td>
<td>private and public universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Nawaz et al., (2014)/Pakistan</td>
<td>9-items UWES</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>Employee Empowerment, Employee Training</td>
<td>Employee Creativity</td>
<td>SET</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6 Employee Engagement and Similar Constructs

A serious question, arising from various researchers regarding similarity problems pertinent to employee engagement construct with other relevant constructs like: “job satisfaction, job involvement and job commitment”, but it has been revealed by discriminant validity results that employee engagement is quite a different construct (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Harter & Schmidt, 2008). Many academic researchers criticized employee engagement and termed it as putting “old wine in a new barrel” meaning resurrection of an obsolete and outdated idea (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Therefore, next section will discuss some similar construct to delineate the difference among employee engagement and other constructs.

1.6.1 Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is described as a resultant employee’s attitude with respect to his positive or negative evaluation about job role (Brief and Weiss, 2002, p. 175). Job satisfaction, being an employee attitude, is associated with the evaluation of job characteristics and prevailing job conditions (Brief & Weiss, 2002; Eagly & Chaiken, 1993), like “I like my pay”, whereas, contrasting job satisfaction, employee engagement is the outcome attitude of employee’s experiences at workplace like “I feel vigorous while working”. Blizzard (2004) stated that job satisfaction is linked with the benefits that an employee receives in return for his services rendered to an organization, whereas, employee engagement is related to employees’ discretionary efforts reciprocated by them towards the organization as a whole. Muchinsky (2003) defined employee’s satisfaction towards job reflecting his degree of pleasure, which he experienced while performing a job role (p-307), whereas, on the other hand, employee engagement comprised all influencing factors, while an employee performed a job. Maslach et al., (2001) explained job satisfaction as need-fulfillment and contentment after performing a job role regardless of any connection of employee’s self with the job itself (Latham & Ernst, 2006). Yalabik et al., (2013) stated that job satisfaction might be the consequence of employee engagement, but could not be a similar construct like employee engagement.
1.6.2 Organizational commitment

Various researchers defined commitment differently based on their own viewpoints. Most of the researchers considered commitment as an attitude in terms of organizational commitment and defined it as having strong belief to be a loyal member of an organization on long-term basis. This definition is the representation of employee’s self-identification, sincere and effective attachment to a particular organization, termed as an “employee’s psychological bond” with the organization (Coopey & Hartley, 1991). Hall, Scheider, and Nygren (1970) defined commitment as: “when goals of the organization and employees become integrated and congruent”. However, majority of researchers referred to the definition of Porter et al., (1974) in literature to explain commitment, who initially improvised research questionnaire for measuring employee commitment. They explained three psychological factors, which employees applied to evaluate their own worth of self-identification and level of involvement towards an organization: (i) employee’s willingness to exert efforts to perform a job role, (ii) his confidence for his value recognition and valued input, and (iii) his aspiration to remain part of the organization for a long time.

Meyer and Allen (1991) conceptualized and referred to organizational commitment comprising three segments: “affective, continuance and normative” type behavior associated with commitment. Firstly, effective component reflects employee’s emotional connection along with full engrossment with the employer along with his personal identification as being a member that motivates him to remain attached with the organization on long-term basis. Secondly, continuance commitment is all about contemplation of loss and associated cost of his exit from an organization. Feelings of continuance commitment increase the level of adherence to the organization that motivate and console the employee to stay with the organization. Thirdly, normative commitment prescribes employee’s feelings of obligation and genuine expression of duty to remain attached with an organization and not to relinquish.

As Saks (2006) stated that organizational commitment was employee’s attitude, which spelled out his attachment with employers, whereas, employee engagement explained the level of employee attentiveness and absorption in a role-performance. Saks (2006)
submitted his viewpoint that employee engagement was a distinct construct and phenomenon from job related involvement and commitment and employee related OCB. Rich et al., (2010) observed that majority of academic researchers conducted cross-sectional research studies on engagement construct, whereas, Kahn (1990) explained engagement concept as “ebbs and flows and adjustments of employee’s self embeddedness in a job” (p-964). Kahn differentiated engagement from its similar constructs: involvement and commitment, referring to employee’s psychological presence while performing his job-role in any situation or particular moments. (Kahn, 1990: 717-718). Macey and Schneider (2008), while investigating engagement, argued that commitment, either termed as job or organizational, be taken as antecedent of employee engagement and not as a part of engagement concept or as an output. Yalabik et al., (2013) conducted a cross-sectional-design-type research study and proposed that employee satisfaction with current role and subsequent commitment with the employer, both, might act as predictors rather than an outcome variables, whereas, in a meta-analysis, conducted on more than 50 samples, designated job satisfaction and job commitment as consequences of employee engagement (Cole et al., (2012).

1.6.3 Job involvement

A “cognitive or belief state of psychological identification” being meaning or understanding of Job Involvement which was given by Kanungo (1982). Brown (1996) defined job involvement with respect to individual’s cognitive belief about a job focusing on satisfaction of his needs either at work or outside the work. Job performance is related to individual’s self-esteem, defining job involvement, based on employee performance (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). Being the only cognitive construct and related to job identity (Kanungo, 1982), job involvement is different from employee engagement. Saks and Gruman (2014) referred to the research findings of Kahn (1990) and Rich et al., (2010) who followed same approach and argued that employee engagement was a different construct from other so-called similar constructs like: job involvement and job satisfaction, as these constructs did not represent the true sense of employee’s self. As per viewpoint of researchers about employee engagement, that it is the accurate and true
representation and expression of employee’s self during task performance (Rich et al., 2010).

1.7 Research Variables for the current study

Table # 1.1 & 1.2, Page 13 to 17 and aforesaid discussion, there are many antecedents and consequences that researchers have been investigating with many mediators and moderators in order to contribute to employee engagement literature, measurement and theory-building, but still, there is no consensus on its single definition, reliable measuring scale and the valid relevant and applicable theory. It has been observed that there are three key factors from where employees receive motivation to get themselves engaged at workplace, namely: “role of the leadership, attributes of an employee and the job itself”. These three contributory factors function cohesively to develop sustainable feelings of engagement in employees to achieve optimum level of performance delivery along with extraordinary discretionary behaviors. Present research study has been raised and constructed on empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics as antecedents of employee engagement, whereas, service performance and OCB have been observed as consequences of employee engagement.

Bailey et al., (2017) quoted thirty-six research studies conducted to examine various aspects and styles of leadership and management behaviors that contributed towards increased employee engagement, and revealed positive relationship among the variables. They referred to the research study of Schalkwyk et al., (2010) conducted regarding connection between empowering leadership behavior and employee engagement, and noticed significant positive relationship. Park et al. (2017) reported positive correlation between both empowering leadership and employee engagement variables while conducting a research study on 400 employees in Korea. While, identifying empowering leadership style, as a distinct construct from other leadership styles, Kim, Beehr, and Prewett, (2018) opined that more emphasis on the aspect of psychological empowerment, as compared to other leadership styles, the empowering leadership would become more influential factor for enhancing employee engagement, and to exhibit positive job attitudes, whereas, limited research studies have examined this type of differential relationships with workplace attitudes.
Bailey et al., (2017) quoted the role of employee’s psychological states while examining employee engagement as fifty-two studies, referred and scrutinized this important aspect. They also pointed out that most of these studies considered factors relating to job demand factors centered on job demands-resources framework rooted in burnout philosophy to examine the employee engagement, which was not unexpected because of shifting trend from Kahn’s theory to burnout theory. Kahn (1990) desired to design such a practicable research framework, which could be helpful to understand the process of self-role-involvement. Kahn (1990) in his research study tried to give an understanding on influencing variables, employees’ perceptions about themselves, their assigned work and relationships among them. This comprehension comprised people’s experience within specific work situations and their strategy of countering that experience which came under the domain of psychological capital. The widely studied attributes of psychological states were self-efficacy, resilience and optimism (Libano et al., 2012; Ouweneel et al., 2012). It is conclusively believed that positive psychological states, available resources, perceived positive assumptions for leaders and employers were related to enhanced level of employee engagement as observed by Baily et al., (2017). Conversely, negative antecedents, like: hindrance job demands, abusive supervisory style and workplace bullying were associated with lower level of employee engagement. Referring to many cross-sectional and complex studies, Bailey, et al. (2017) labeled leadership, job resources and individual psychological states as mostly associated factors with employee engagement. They suggested to investigate these factors further at different workplace settings. Datu, King & Valdez, (2018) incorporated cross-sectional and longitudinal research studies related to 990 school students to probe the impact of psychological capital on students’ motivation, academic engagements and achievements. Results reported that those students who were observed with matured and higher side psychological capital were found highly engaged in their studies, academic related activities and tasks as compared to those students who had lower level of psychological capital. Alessandri, Consiglio, Luthans, and Borgogni, (2018) stated that developing sustainable psychological capital, within the organization, was beneficial for it so as to engage employees effectively. Alessandri et al., (2018) concluded that higher level of
employee engagement was the result of increased psychological capital that ultimately improved the employee performance.

Conceptually, research work and perceptions of Goffman (1961a) motivated Kahn (1990) to study variation of individual’s attachment to a specific role and then detachment. Thereafter, Kahn (1990) incorporated the role of task/job characteristics in job-design research (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). He further included other encouraging determinants and opportunities, like: interpersonal, group, intergroup and organizational that generally enhanced employees’ meaningful motivation and importance at workplace. The research was centered at, and relied on two counts: first was how individual’s attitudes and behaviors varied commensurate with psychological experience of work (Hackman & Oldman, 1980), the second was how individual, group, interpersonal, intergroup-related factors, simultaneously and collectively, influenced these individual’s experiences (Alderfer, 1985a). Resultantly, based on these premises, Kahn (1990) defined psychological conditions, wherein, employees showed their engagement or disengagement against their work psychological experience relevant to essentials of inter-related conditions.

Instead, many multidimensional models of employee engagement, after Kahn’s (1990) engagement theory, emerged in the literature causing confusion about this construct, but all claimed that leadership actions, personality traits and job characteristics were key antecedents and facets of engagement. Saks (2006) found positive relationship between both job characteristics and employee engagement. Social exchange theory puts forward that employees feel pleased to perform more than their duties by showing engaged behavior, when they feel that their organization takes care of them (Saks, 2006). Rai, Ghosh, Chauhan & Mehta (2017), while studying impact of job characteristics on employee engagement, found positive relationship between both variables. Bailey et al., (2017), in their consolidated research synthetic review deliberating employee engagement, referred to sixty-five research studies that were conducted on the job-design basis along with their relevant factors, especially under the umbrella of JD-R Model based on job demands and job resources. After extensive research under the JD-R model, recently, researchers have started criticism as how to differentiate between demands and
resources, whether, these are positive or negative in nature, it is not clear (Schaufeli & Taris, 2014 and Bakker & Demerouti, 2016). Many researchers in the area of job design and its related constructs deliberated on these constructs in details and have directed to concentrate on investigating employees related understanding and observation about job characteristics for developing enhanced and improved level of engagement among workers (Crawford et al., 2010). Albrecht (2010) suggested to investigate role characteristics in the context of engagement to understand how it influenced the work engagement.

Kahn (1990) denoted three factors: role characteristics, task characteristics and work-interaction among the individuals that influenced psychological meaningfulness. He explained that individuals were influenced by psychological meaningfulness more while encountering the challenging type of work which was clearly delineated, creative and varied in nature (Hackman & Oldman 1980). It has been observed that some features of work, like: autonomy, task significance, task variety and feedback, intrinsically motivate employees to bring and indulge their selves at work and invest their full energies willingly in their tasks (Kahn, 1990; Christian et al., 2011). In addition to this, it was argued by Bakker and Demerouti (2016) while explaining engagement that JD-R model did not explain explicit difference among “job demands and job resources” based on the nature of positivity or negativity in terms of demands and resources that pertain to job role. Researchers stress to consider and evaluate employees’ understanding that how they perceive job characteristics in order to improve their engagement at workplace with job roles as majority of research examined job characteristics to improve thoughtful of the engagement concept (Holman et al., 2010). Many research studies reported different outcomes of job characteristics in different occupations, while studying this phenomenon in relationship to employee engagement (Corin, Berntson, & Härenstam, 2016). Albrecht (2010) suggested to probe further about the role of job characteristics pertinent to influencing employee engagement.

Bailey et al., (2017) in their extensive narrative synthetic review specified two main outcomes of employee engagement related to employee performance and moral aptitude. They discussed about two domains of employee performance: one was organizational or
team performance and second was individual performance. They classified individual performance into three categories: (i) task performance and (ii) extra role performance and (ii) counterproductive performance. In the perspective of organizational and team performance, most of the research studies reported positive relationship of employee engagement among effects of performance-related variables, like: loyalty, customer satisfaction, quality services, team performance etc (Bailey et al., 2017). Emma, (2015) while arguing about the findings of business experts’ reviews and academic researchers’ publications, signified the strong link among employee engagement, employee performance and other business-oriented outcomes. Salanova et al., (2005) reported positive association of employee engagement to the service climate that, eventually, predicted improved customer-related employee performance at workplace. As Kahn (1990) termed personal engagement in terms of “exhibiting of employee self with presenting his physical, cognitive and emotional alertness” while performing a role to stimulate his potent energies for delivering high level performance. The driving force behind employees’ cognitive, physical and emotional presence integrated employees’ energies to perform positive role in the variant working environments. Therefore, in-line with Kahn’s (1990) approach, an engaged employee performs his job tasks using optimum level of his energy, passion and self-investment, that in the long run, is eventually converted into increased level of in-role and extra-role performance which was discussed and concluded by Christian in 2011. Therefore, on the basis of (i) job characteristics theory, advanced by Hackman & Oldham (1980), (ii) leadership theory proclaimed by Bass & Avolio, 1990, and (iii) personality-related factors, it was revealed by Macey and Schneider (2008) that direct positive relationship existed among job characteristics, leadership, personality traits and work engagement that determined the level of employee performance.

As per aforementioned discussion and deliberation on construct of engagement, it was believed by Kahn in 1990 about various aspects and factors that were indulged with this phenomena. He highlighted the contributory role of individual’ passion along with his volatility in order to put his full-self while performing his job related activities and responsibilities that was ultimately improved employee performance which was taken in term of in-role or extra-role. The present study is aimed at to consider employee
performance in the perspective of employee service performance and OCB. Baily et al., (2017) referred to twenty-four research studies revealing positive association between employee engagement and its outcomes like: job performance both in-role or extra-role. Elaborating employee related in-role performance, it is the delivery of an individual’s job specifications set by the management conforming to employee’s output behaviors in accordance with his job duties, which is termed as task performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Avey et al. (2008) studied the relation of employees’ positive attitudes and emotions with their work engagement, and confirmed that employees having positive emotions as well as psychological capital were likely to exhibit higher level of work engagement and subsequently demonstrated productive OCB. They indicated that psychological capital was the most influential factor for inciting positive emotions leading to requisite attitudes and behaviors to perform a task. In a review of previous research studies, covering engagement and performance, the researchers validated strong and positive connotation between engagement and task performance (Christian et al. (2011). They further elaborated while concluding the discussion; employees’ extra-role performance was associated with such behaviors, which enhanced task performance as result of improving & sustaining the shared and psychological environments. Extra-role performance was determined and evaluated by organizational citizenship behavior. Soane et al. (2012) in their research study pointed out significantly positive relationships among employee engagement and its outcomes variables of OCB, task performance, and committed to stay with the employer.

Ma, Qu & Wilson, (2016) in their recommendations for future research suggested to further explore the OCB-individual relationship after considering their antecedents and consequences in the empirical framework so as to strengthen the concept of OCB, particularly in services-business organizations. Inspite of extensive research conducted on OCB for more than 25 years about its antecedents and consequences, its effective link with the individuals has been mostly ignored (Ma, Qu, & Wilson 2016; Scott, 2007). Gupta and Sharma (2015) directed to investigate further connection between employee engagement and OCB based on social exchange theory under different situations. Work is not only related to physical activity, but also, it involves other various factors, like work itself, supervisory role and employee’s psychological traits which make a
significant impact in the execution of a work activity wherein employee engagement plays an important role to deliver optimum performance-based efforts made on some discretionary behaviors (Gupta & Sharma, 2015).

Baily et al (2017) referred to nineteen research studies, wherein, researchers identified the relationship between engagement and other facets of extra-role performance and reported positive link between employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior that how engaged employees exhibit such behaviors that support their discretionary efforts in order to illustrate employer’s corporate image positively. Furthermore, Rich et al. (2010) referred to Kahn’s (1990) viewpoint on engagement construct elaborating the employee’s personal self, which he endues to his role and delivers extraordinarily beyond the specified job requirements that, make impact on other employees, and mainly on the organization termed as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB).

1.8 Background of Current Research and Gap Identification

A number of gaps, in the form of theoretical and methodological shortcomings have been identified, while reviewing numerous research studied conducted by researchers concerning employee engagement.

Employee engagement is a workplace phenomenon (Saks and Gruman, 2014) which reveals that causes of declining employee performance at workplace emanates from the low level of employee engagement (Knight, Patterson, and Dawson, 2016). Researchers have proposed to further probe employee engagement due to many controversial reasons, misperceptions and non-consensus on its meaning, theory and its measurement (Bailey et al., 2017; Michael, Joseph, Ronald, 2016; Juan Liu, Seonghee & Eka, 2017; Knight et al., 2016). Saks & Gruman (2014) indicated toward findings of many academic researchers who were yet wavering about its meaning, antecedents, outcomes, measurement tools and theory-building process. They stated that even after many years of research, employee engagement was still an emerging concept, and was at its beginning phase. All available theories and models, so far discussed, are primarily entrenched in the burnout construct and have caused distraction from the core concept and idea of employee engagement introduced by Kahn (1990). It is true that early researchers and
scholars acknowledged the idea of employee engagement postulated by Kahn (1990), but a bulk of literature appears to lack adequate research studies rooted in Kahn’s (1990) original work on engagement. Saks & Gruman (2014) criticized the research studies, conducted during the last 24 years, while exploring employee engagement because of their link only with burnout concept as being opposite to employee engagement, and ignored Kahn’s (1990) concept on the actual subject. Saks and Gruman (2014) underlined that, ample, but scattered research had misjudged many important aspects and issues while considering one or two research streams that linked employee engagement with burnout concept, and evaded the philosophy of Kahn’s (1990) theory. However, Kahn (1990), and many other researchers believe that the antithesis of burnout feelings was not the employee engagement at work (Saks & Gruman, 2014, Anthony- McMann, et al., 2016). Presently, the concept of employee engagement is once again under explicative discussion of academic researchers to rethink it in the background of Kahn’s (1990) work and differentiate it distinctly from the burnout construct (Anthony- McMann et al., 2016; Baily et al., 2017). Anthony- McMann et al., (2016), while arguing about different operationalizations of employee engagement, criticized, that recent ample and distended research was on the basis of “burnout-antithesis–framed measures of engagement”, which labeled it as a “narrow lens” to evaluate engagement through it. Saks and Gruman (2014) suggested to explore it further by virtue of its meaning, measurement, key antecedents and consequences harmonious with Kahn’s (1990) philosophy.

Apparently, under the prospects of JD-R model, having many perceived benefits, the concept of engagement gained much popularity among the researchers, wherein, questions raised by them about employees’ identity, subjectivity and power on account of job characteristics in association with engagement were adequately answered. Nevertheless, a critical-theoretical prospect might emerge as a challenge for the all-available theoretical frameworks within the concept of engagement domain under the widely studied JD-R model. The critical concerns in this context would, however, be extended to highlight the power-dynamics, relating to employee engagement construct which attracted, comparatively, less attention of researchers (Baily et al., 2017). They referred to the recent observations about limitations of the well-established UWES measure for engagement suggesting researchers to probe this construct further so as to
validate its definition and measurement. Anthony- McMann et al., (2016) compared the two measuring scales, developed conforming to Khan’s (1990) philosophy of employee engagement, i.e. (i) Rich Scale by Rich et al., (2010) and (ii) ISA Scale by Soane et al., (2012). They suggested to adopt Rich Measuring Scale, developed by Rich et al., (2010) assumed to be most suitable to measure the employee engagement in accordance with the Kahn’s (1990) concept. Moreover, they pointed out that Rich Scale was rooted in need-based-satisfaction framework, with investment of employees’ energies along with individual’s self, but lacked suitable manipulation, while considering measuring scales formulated on burnout footings. Since the introduction of his concept in 1990, Khan (2010) revisited his philosophy and rejected all other prevailing engagement frameworks, positioned engagement under the aegis of burnout or job satisfaction, like UWES or Q12, thereby, most of the researchers agreed to Kahn’s philosophy on engagement (Fletcher & Robinson, 2013; Saks & Gruman, 2014).

It has been observed that employee engagement remained an influential variable in many empirical research studies, but, variations, regarding its nomenclature, research frameworks and measuring scales, were rooted in different research mechanisms. As a result, operationalization of such research frameworks about its definition and measurement commenced accordingly (Bailey et al., 2017; Shuck, et al. 2017; Saks & Gruman, 2014).

Many researchers reported that most of research studies, meta-analysis and narrative reviews conducted concerning employee engagement with its predictors and effects, had been dependent on the findings of those studies which were conducted on the basis of measuring instruments built on the burnout construct, whereas, engagement had been operationalized on diverse adopted measuring scales (Fletcher & Robinson, 2013; Shuck, 2011). Prominently, utilizing burnout being the core factor in examining engagement and frameworks centered in burnout antithesis, all investigator positioned engagement in connotation to burnout and considered employee engagement, an antipole or opposite to burnout, but within the same domain e.g. Bakker et al., (2008) and Shirom (2004). Similarly, researchers regarded employee engagement attuned to employee job satisfaction, on the basis of job satisfaction framework (Robinson et al., 2004). Similarly,
Saks (2006) represented job engagement and organizational engagement separately and measured them on-the-job and organizational basis. Presently, researchers have proposed to rethink employee engagement on the basis of Kahn’s (1990) own construct which is independent of both, job satisfaction and burnout (Bailey, et al. 2017; Saks & Gruman, 2014). While debating about future research directions, Gupta and Sharma (2015) suggested to investigate various relationships of employee engagement, in association with job characteristics, personality attributes and motivational factors, as being important predictors of engagement. This state of affairs persistently motivated academic researchers to work on its definite meaning, measurement, antecedents and outcomes owning to prevailing lack of researchers’ consensus on it.

It has been noticed that leaders and organizations debate and discuss about employee engagement as a productive entity, but hesitate to go ahead to explore relevant factors that actually affect employee engagement and its resultant outcomes. Only 13% engagement level, as reported by Gallup Survey 2015, indicated that leaders gave less practical importance or paid less attention to it. Therefore, the current business scenario has drastically changed the business environments and has compelled researchers to consider this phenomenon as most influential aspect for the organizations to create and develop such atmospheres at workplaces where employees might engage themselves to achieve higher level of performance, and exhibit positive attitudes like organizational citizenship behaviors.

It has been discerned that majority of the existing research studies, conducted with the aim to explore employee engagement, its antecedents and consequences along with validating instruments based on frameworks, have been conducted and validated in the developed countries other than Asian region. The present research study has been conducted in Pakistan, portraying a remarkable industrial development and significant economic growth, flourishing business development, socio-cultural evaluation and many other issues related to human resources, specifically, employee engagement.

It has observed that development in services industry across the globe become driving force for every developed or developing country having significant share of economy, which also has greater impact on employment. As per Pakistan Economic Survey (2018-
19), 4.71 percent growth rate has observed for services sector, which has crossed 55% of overall GDP that is leading sector in the economy of Pakistan. The financial sector in Pakistan is going through a major transition period. Financial sector is one of the key part of services industry, which consists of banking, insurance and investment management, whereas, banking sector accounts for around three-fourth of Pakistan's financial sector. Pakistan has a large and diverse banking system, which is contributing substantial share in services sector subsequently in overall economy of Pakistan. As per banking survey report of the year 2016 regarding commercial banks operating in Pakistan, published by KPMG Taseer Hadi & Co formally known as KPMG, reported that 182,866 staff were employed in commercial banks at the cost of Rs: 199,309 million per year. In view of above scenario, looking towards substantial importance of banks in financial section of Pakistan, the researcher selected the banking sector as a whole from all over Pakistan by selecting major cities of provinces as its very critical to investigate various factors that are related with engagement level of employees delivering their services at different banks of Pakistan. Therefore, expressly, designating the banking sector employees in Pakistan, as a part of service industry, the dominant area of the current research study was to explore many workplace factors, like: empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics that contributed to higher level of employee engagement. This ultimately influenced employee’s service performance and other comprehensive personal behaviors that employees exhibited additionally beyond their routine required job descriptions. This role performance was studied with respect to employees’ service performance and organizational citizenship behavior. Performance, whether, in-role or discretionary behavior, remained an important standpoint for dealing with expanding business challenges and workplace diversity (Liu and Cohen 2010).

On the other hand, Baily et al., (2017) provided a solid evidence that how researchers ignored the fundamental work of Kahn (1990) on employee engagement (Table 1.3). As per details referred by Baily et al., (2017), during last 27 years of research on the subject of employee engagement once Kahn (1990) introduced this buzzword, researchers in 65 research studies applied JD-R model under domain of burnout theory, which is opposite to engagement to investigate employee engagement. On the other hand, only 7 research studies conducted by different researchers to examine employee engagement under the
umbrella of Kahn (1990) theory of engagement. This is the significant reason to investigate key factors related to engagement level of Banks’ employees of Pakistan by following the Kahn (1990) theory of engagement. Hence, based on the aforesaid discussion, the shift of employee engagement research from Kahn (1990) theory of engagement to burnout theory under the shadow of JD-R model has been revealed as the main problem in literature and ignorance of fundamental philosophy to measure it accordingly. The purpose of the present research study is to scrutinize the contributory influence of key antecedents, like: empowering leadership, psychological capital, job characteristics and consequences, like: employees’ service performance and organizational citizenship behavior which are related to employee engagement in Pakistan focusing employees working in the banking sector.
### Table 1-3: Theoretical frameworks used for employee engagement research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopted Theoretical Framework</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>No of Research Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. JD-R Model</td>
<td>Schaufeli et al., (2002)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social exchange theory</td>
<td>Alferes et al., (2013)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Theory of Job design or characteristics</td>
<td>Homung et al., (2010)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Work engagement theory</td>
<td>Otken and Erben (2010)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Transformational leadership</td>
<td>Tims et al (2011)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Authentic leadership</td>
<td>Bamford et al (2013)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Attachment theory</td>
<td>Lin (2010)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Baily et al. 2017
1.9 Objectives of the Study

This research study titled “Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement” is an intensive and concerted effort that the researcher has done to connote and signify the importance of fulfilling ultimate demands of employee engagement focusing the employees working at banks operating in Pakistan. The main objective of the study is also to scrutinize and investigate the contributory part of empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics in fostering employee engagement as an antecedent and its effectual contribution towards subsequent consequences with regard to employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior.

In developing the proposed evidence model for this research study, its focus has been limited to key antecedents, like: empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics and resultant consequences, like: service performance and organizational citizenship behavior of employee engagement. All selected antecedents and consequences have been explained and justified accordingly. The overall model will be developed based on following aims:

1. To highlight the importance of employee engagement that has gained much popularity among academic researchers, writers and business gurus.
2. To probe the role of empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics as a significant antecedents in enhancing employee engagement in the banking sector of Pakistan.
3. To study the employee service performance and OCB as a consequence of employee engagement.
4. To scrutinize the relationship among empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics, employee service performance and OCB.
5. To examine the impact of antecedents (empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics) on consequences (employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior)
6. To find whether, employee engagement mediates the association between antecedents and consequences taken in this research study.
1.10 Research Questions

In pursuing the essential objectives of this research study titled “Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement” following research questions have been addressed:

i. What is the importance of employee engagement at workplace settings of the banking system?

ii. What type of relationship exist between empowering leadership, psychological capital, job characteristics and employee engagement as key antecedents of employee engagement in the context of banking sector of Pakistan?

iii. What is the nature of relationship between employee engagement and employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as an important consequence of employee engagement in the context of banking sector of Pakistan?

iv. To what degree, empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics predict employee engagement, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior?

v. Does employee engagement mediate between the relationship of antecedents and consequences?

1.11 Hypotheses of the Study

H1: “Empowering leadership and employee engagement are positively associated to each other”.

H2: “Empowering leadership and employee service performance are positively related to each other”.

H3: “Empowering leadership and organizational citizenship behavior are positively related to each other”.
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H4: “Psychological capital has positive relationship with employee engagement”.

H5: “Psychological capital and employee service performance are positively related to each other”.

H6: “Psychological capital and organizational citizenship behavior are positively related to each other”.

H7: “Job characteristics have positive relationship with employee engagement”.

H8: “Job characteristics and employee service performance are positively related to each other”.

H9: “Job characteristics and organizational citizenship behavior are positively related to each other”.

H10: “Employee engagement has positive relationship with employee service performance”.

H11: “Employee engagement has positive relationship with organizational citizenship behavior”.

H12: “Employee engagement mediates the relationship between antecedents and consequences”.

H12a: “Employee engagement mediates the relationship between empowering leadership and employee service performance”.

H12b: “Employee engagement mediates the relationship between empowering leadership and organizational citizenship behavior”.

H12c: “Employee engagement mediates the relationship between psychological capital and employee services performance”.
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H12d: “Employee engagement mediates the relationship between psychological capital and organizational citizenship behavior”.

H12e: “Employee engagement mediates the relationship between job characteristics and employee services performance”.

H12f: “Employee engagement mediates the relationship between job characteristics and organizational citizenship behavior”.
1.12 Significance of the Study

The current research study defends and divulges many important reasons, queries, and subsequent resolutions. First of all, this study provides an evidence and insights about the critical role and contributory part of employee engagement in the banking sector of Pakistan. Second, this study examines the employee related attitudes and behaviors at work with respect to employee engagement of banking sector employees that have been critically important for all types of organizations since long. Finally, this study reconnoiters the fundamental mechanism that links many aspects of attitudes (antecedents) with employee engagement and their behavioral output at individual level.

When this researcher explored “employee engagement” on “Google Search Engine”, results showed 716,000 links, which discussed this concept, and displayed 89,600 research articles for researchers associated with this field. As a result of substantial consideration, the concept of employee engagement has occupied the utmost attention of academic researchers and business gurus (Baily et al., 2017; Saks & Gruman, 2014; Shuck et al., 2017). The available research literature specifies that employee engagement construct is still vague due to disagreement about its definition, theory and measurement that needs to be further investigated on the proposition of Kahn’s (1990) theory (Bailey et al., 2017; Shuck et al., 2017; Saks & Gruman, 2014). There are a lot of queries that need to be investigated and answered. It is also imperative to examine employee engagement, its antecedents and consequences regarding their practical workability in the organizations, in general, and employees in particular. Therefore, the present study is intended and undertaken to facilitate researchers and business experts, specifically interested in Pakistan’s banking industry, to identify key contributory factors that enhance employee engagement level at workplace leading to their improved performance, and essential for sustainable progressive growth of business at national and international levels.
1.12.1 Theoretical Significance

Mostly, research on employee engagement revolves around the concept of burnout (Shuck et al. 2017; Saks & Gruman, 2014; Baily et al. 2017; Anthony-Mcmann et al. 2017). Cheng and Chang (2018) referred to the viewpoints of scholars and strategic leaders, stressing for a serious need to assess the significance of employee engagement in promoting the prosperous business. After contribution from Rich et al (2010) when, they criticized the irrational research on employee engagement, in-line with burnout philosophy using the JD-R model, many researchers suggested to re-think, and once again follow, investigate and operationalize it on the foothings of Kahn’s (1990) theory (Baily et al., 2017; Anthony- McMann et al., 2016; Rich et al., 2010; Saks & Gruman, 2014).

Adopting Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement, this research study is hopefully expected to fill the existing research gaps integrated with the investigation of employee engagement based on its fundamental concept. This study would evoke influence mainly for the following important reasons:

i. Supports comprehensive understanding of employee engagement adopting the core Kahn’s (1990) theory.

ii. Contributes to literature with research findings, adopting Kahn’s (1990) theory to investigate employee engagement by adding sufficient evidence to the existing relevant knowledge and literature about Pakistan banking sector.

iii. Considers antecedents: empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics that inspire employees to achieve requisite level of engagement at workplace.

iv. Objectifies consequences: employee service performance and organizational citizenship considered employees-related behaviors.

v. Adopted scale instrument for employee engagement on the basis of Kahn (1990) theory.

It has been observed while critically reviewing literature available on employee engagement that this area of research is mostly dominant in the research studies.
conducted in the Western context, whereas, limited research has been conceded out in the Asian context, especially, in Pakistan. It is also pertinent to highlight that mostly, research on employee engagement, conducted in Pakistan, is governed by the burnout theory rather based on Kahn’s theory of employee engagement. Variables studied on the engagement research, based on burnout construct conducted in Pakistan, are self-evaluation, fair treatment (Danish et al., 2014), organizational justice (Abbasi and Alvi, 2012), leadership style and organizational learning (Saleem et al., 2015), work over-load, job satisfaction, employee performance, distributive justice and organizational citizenship behavior (Ali & Farooqi, 2014; Hassan et al., 2014), hope, innovative behavior and knowledge-sharing behavior (Fatima, & Khan, 2017), employee training, empowerment and creativity (Nawaz et al., 2014), islamic work ethics and OCB (Tufail et al. 2017), work environment, training and development and organizational performance (Chaudhry et al. 2017), work-life-balance and employee cynicism (Iqbal et al., 2017), work discretion, job clarity and business performance (Ahmed et al. 2017), perceived organizational support (Alvi et al., 2014), HR practices, jobs satisfaction and employee performance (Sattar et al., 2015).

It would be imperative to mention here that many researchers investigated various variables and their influence on employee engagement, but none of the research studies broached empowering leadership (being organizational related factor), psychological capital (being employee related factor) and job characteristics (being job related factor) collectively, as antecedents to examine engagement, employee service performance and OCB as being behavioral effects of employee engagement in the context and socio-cultural background of Pakistan. The current research study represents different stances to test the theoretical assumptions following “Kahn’s (1990) theory of employee engagement”.

1.12.2 Practical Significance

A general perception prevails in Pakistan that people having links with the elite class are privileged to avail better opportunities, whereas, middle or lower class people remain deprived of better chances to exhibit their inherent talent which damages the working culture of any institution or organization.
The vital importance of banking sector of any country, including Pakistan, has been recognized globally for the speedy development of its national economy mobilized by requisite financial resources provided by the banks. The efficiency of banking industry depends upon functional and emotional factors of employee engagement proclaimed as “Fully Engaged”, “Disengaged” or “Partially Disengaged” having their proportion in the total strength of employees. It was revealed during the research that the employees placed in the officer grade position are fully engaged providing satisfactory results.

The contemporary business activities have been catalyzed with the advent of information technology, and every business enterprise, including Banking Sector, has been subjected to drastic competitive environment, putting their ultimate survival at stakes, especially, the banking sector which entirely exists and relies on the customer service performance and employee oriented courteous behavior and way of handling. It would not be out of place to mention about the influence of information technology on the previous conventional system in banks, which has brought about drastic changes, such as, business-oriented environments, transformation of “Paper-work” to “paperless” documentation, providing comfortable opportunities for bank employees, but also as a token of goodwill gesture to the customers, where were, subjected to undesired long waiting hours consumed in the completion of transactional formalities through paper files, ledgers, etc. About all this, the current situation has proved supportive in establishing a compatible and unified professional relationship among bank employees within the scope of their mental accountabilities. As a matter of fact, information technology has entirely changed the business markets and the banking sector, no exception which has also been compelled to realize its business strategies according to the complex environments. This is achievable only when banks induct competent, educated and highly motivated workforce who, with the passage of time, turnout to be “engaged employees” by virtue of their dedication to the assigned job roles. In the banking sector and similar financial development institutions, an engaged employee is an “asset” and a disengaged employee is a “liability”. The preserve of a disengaged employee in the banks is unimaginable who fails to provide his ascribed customer services during his duty hours. Nevertheless, the bank’s high authorities must realize and exploit potential of engaged employees for further promotion of business. Two foremost occasions make remarkable influence on
Pakistan’ Banking Sector; nationalization in 1974 and then their subsequent privatization in the year 1992, when many private banks were established which adversely affected the employees’ behavior, mental development, service quality, team work, workplace environment and culture. After privatization of banks, highly educated young persons irrespective of their gender are being recruited as management trainee officers, evolving a new pleasant workplace culture enabling banks, to progress at a rapid pace consonant with the national development. State Bank of Pakistan (SBP) is the regulatory body, which controls the banking industry in Pakistan comprising 45 banks including public, private, foreign banks as per information provided at its website. Overall, the banking sector of Pakistan has a lot of business potential due to rapid changes in technology after introduction of high-speed mobile internet, Islamic banking and increasing public awareness about diversified benefits of banking. It is hopefully envisaged that China Pakistan Economic Corridor (C-PEC) would be a game changer and backbone for Pakistan’s depreciating economy that would produce positive impact on the banking sector owning to its broadly planned infrastructure. The banking industry is undergoing radical changes by adopting the most modern operational systems like: digital banking, changing consumer behavior, uncertainty in regulations and compliance issues. It was mentioned in a report published by SBP in the year 2017 (Raja Kamran), that besides, financial and rapidly evolving changes and scenarios in banking sector of Pakistan, other challenges regarding employees related issues stemmed up for the management and leaders. These problems, like: high stress level, un-friendly environment, undue working pressures, extra working hours, injustice in terms of compensations among bankers and job insecurity because of not meeting targets, are the prominent reasons of increasing depression level in employees that adversely effected the employee engagement and overall bank performance. The present culture at banks is seriously negating rules and regulations framed by the SBP. This state of affairs requires thoughtful consideration of researchers to suggest remedial measures to resolve the matters by visualizing the uneasy state of conflicting interests, uncertainties and apprehensions with extensive argumentative views. Banks and all financial institutions have considered the key concerns that contribute to the rapid advancement and development for boosting up economy of any specific state weather developed or developing and globally in general.
As per figures and indicators published in 2017 under a factsheet title: “The World Fact Book Pakistan” available at CIA web site, revealed that the population of Pakistan has crossed 200 million showing with growth rate of 4.7% (2016) per annum. It is anticipated that during following years, radical development and economic growth in Pakistan will be observed resulting from the tangible impact of C-PEC, other foreign investment and local industrial development, especially in the banking sector as per CIA – 2017, recently, Banks showed 16.1% growth rate with 14% average profit (Haq, 2016). Hence, looking towards the expected growth and its sustainability in the financial sector like banks, it is critically important to maintain improved endurable employee performance, whereas, employee engagement is the key factor of employee performance that needs to be accorded appropriate importance. Davis (2017) states that employees act as decisive catalyst and make essential difference in competitive edge for the organization due to their engaged behavior and commitment, which eventually influence market share of companies. Ribeiro et al., (2018) recognized while examining performance of employees working at banks in their research study, concluded in their findings that employee’s commitments are influential factor in maintaining their performance for ultimate nourishment of banks’ growth and progressive advancement. Similarly, with explaining critical issues that intrude performance of the banking sector in Pakistan, Khan and Imtiaz (2015) recognized that unprofessional leadership styles, top to down authority distribution, higher level of job stress and long working hour were the key issues that badly affected the engagement level and subsequent employee performance. Therefore, leaders’ negligence to address these severe issues at any bank disturb its competitive capacity with other banks, lowering its profit margin compared with other business organization.

In a recent Pakistan National Human Development Report, 2016, published by UNDP highlighted the three key impulsive factors that could stimulate Pakistani youth in enhancing their proficiency in (i) Education, ii Employment and (iii) Employee Engagement. Engagement is the prime driving force for Pakistani youth to compete globally (Pakistan National Human Development Report, 2016, published by UNDP). Gallup Survey (2013) indicated that only 15% Pakistani employees were observed highly engaged at workplaces compelling management leaders to seriously consider
engagement-related employee’ issues. Foreseeing the impending developments after operationalization of C-PEC, the role of engaged workforce would certainly be multifarious and challenging. Josh Bersin, Principal and Founder, Deloitte Consulting LLP (2017) reported that employee engagement had become priority areas for leaders and HR Consultants to maintain streamlined processes for getting sustained productive performance from employees. Sean Graber (2015) in his article published in Harvard Business Review highlighted that business enterprises were spending billions of dollars every year to improve employee engagement without any palpable success because of persistent confusion in this prospect. Matthews (2018) criticized on the research and focus given by researchers and corporations on importance and fruitful outcomes of employee engagement, whereas, employers placed different written banners at their offices to highlight significance of this aspect for employee. However, after passing 28 years and drastic attention to discuss and cope with engagement related issues at workplace to achieve optimum employee performance for better position among companies in the industry, serious observation has raised by researches about some specific gap that still pertains between two poles; one, what we are talking about this phenomena and what actually, we are doing strategically at organizations. They suggested to align HR strategies with business Strategies with considering engagement as value-added aspect for overall employee and organizational performance by adopting proactive approach and provide clarity of the set goals related to employee engagement.

The perception of further exploring employee engagement assumed the priority area of this research after this researcher’s contribution and coordination as HR Manager with the yearly Gallup Surveys, conducted in the years 2007-2010, in Standard Chartered Bank, Pakistan. This study has been significantly assigned to the employee engagement with the expectations that it would guide and support Pakistani banking sector organizations in formulating their strategies and policies appropriately considering these aforesaid vital components. The framework of the present study would be most favorable for Pakistani managers and leaders to consider and understand the key elements while implementing their policies with reference to their organizational and business-oriented cultural setups, and would also help them out to identify various contributory aspects and factors for bringing out improvement in employee engagement practices.
## 1.13 Operational Definitions of Key Variables

*Table 1-4: Definitions of variables or key terms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Abbreviations</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Author/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>“a practice, or set of practices involving the delegation of responsibility down the hierarchy so as to give employees increased decision-making authority with respect to the execution of their primary work tasks”</td>
<td>Ahearne et al. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>“An individual’s positive psychological state of development that is characterized by: (1) having confidence (self-efficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging task; (2) showing a positive attribution (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future; (3) perseverance for achieving goals and, when necessary, redirecting avenues to reach goals (hope) in order to succeed; and (4) when beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond (resiliency) to attain success”</td>
<td>Luthans et al. 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Characteristics</td>
<td>JC</td>
<td>“A set of five core job characteristics (i.e. skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback) that affect five work-related outcomes”</td>
<td>Morgeson &amp; Humphrey (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>“The harnessing of organization members' selves to their work-roles in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances”</td>
<td>Kahn (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Service Performance (ESP)</td>
<td>“In-role performance is related to behaviors that are generally specified by the job description and contribute to the organizational success”</td>
<td>Borucki and Burke (1999)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)</td>
<td>“Individual behavior that is discretionary, is not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization”</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.14 Organization of the Study

The current study has been distributed into five main parts, represented in the Thesis Layout in Figure No 1.5 having chapter-wise details of contents, as depicted below:

Chapter 1: First chapter of this research study provides detailed information on the Employee Engagement and refers to the prevalent research gaps and shortcomings in the available literature on the subject along with suitable guidelines and suggestions for future researchers to achieve perfection in this domain.

Chapter 2: In this chapter, the mainstay of employee engagement has been explained. Primarily, discussion relating to employee engagement construct, theories falling under this domain and requisite measuring scales based on different engagement theories and models, have been argued, therein. Moreover, in addition to this, according to the analysis, most of the research in this regard has been conducted in the Euro-American background, which may not be suitably applicable to the Pakistani business culture. It may be pointed out that employee engagement research is required to be specific considering the actual context of workplace settings in the perspectives of Kahn (1990) philosophy on engagement versus Job Demands and Resource Model based on burnout construct. Keeping in view the gap identified in the available literature, it is deemed necessary to testify employee engagement as concordant with Kahn (1990) theory which explains this aspect very appropriately integrating the discussed and debated/argumentative guidelines, the proposed research theory may be tested for corporations using data analysis techniques for model testing, and confirmation of suggested variables applying confirmatory factor analysis, correlation and regression analysis. The proposed relationships referred to in this chapter have been established on Kahn (1990) theory; resultantly, a viable framework for this study has been developed and the key variables, namely, Empowering Leadership, Psychological Capital, Job Characteristics, Employee Service Performance and Organizational
Citizenship Behavior have been diagnosed for further investigation juxtaposed with proposed hypotheses utilizing the collected data relevant to the said identified variables.

Chapter 3: This chapter is about the methodology, which the researcher has adopted to measure the employee engagement starting with research paradigm, (i) research design, (ii) research type, (iii) sampling, (iv) data collection & instrumentations and data analysis techniques used therein.

Chapter 4: This chapter has been allocated to examine the relationships and influence of antecedents on employee engagement, that is, empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics and also about the impact of engagement on consequences, that is, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior. In this chapter, characteristics of the banking sector employees in Pakistan, who voluntarily participated in the survey, prior to compilation of this study, have been portrayed. The item-wise descriptive statistics of all concerned variables, normality of all variables on account of Skewness and Kurtosis Values, subsequently confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) utilized to ascertain and determine the validity of instruments used to examine the constructs of this study, Convergent Validity, Discriminant Validity, reliability analysis, correlation and PROCESS macro have been discussed in this chapter.

Chapter 5: This chapter is about the discussion and findings of results presented in chapter 4, highlighting research contributions, research limitations, directions for future researchers and the conclusion.

This thesis, comprising relevant references, appendixes, tables and questionnaire, has been summed up with the belief that it would be a useful addition to the literature on the relevant domain of research.
Figure 1-4: Thesis structure
Chapter No 2

Review of Available Literature
2 Review of Available Literature

This chapter provides review and deliberates critically of available literature on the beginning and further development of employee engagement concept, its relevant and highly conferred engagement theories, its antecedents, consequences, deliberations on its measurement along with its perceived relationships with other constructs.

2.1 Theoretical Foundation

The prospectively proposed hypotheses that the researcher has presented in this research study are centered on social exchange theory (SET) rooted in positive psychology (Homans & George, 1961). While scrutinizing the origin and basis of “Positive Psychology” when a renowned researcher Maslow (1954) referred to a chapter in his book (Motivation and Personality) on the psychology, which later on, he did not include it in its next edition of 1970, because of his understanding about its roots in the treatment of mental health for maintenance of good life style for individuals. It has been observed that from the start, human experience has remained of the primary aspect to investigate positive psychology related constructs for individuals or employees at workplaces. It was Seligman (1998, 2002), who interpreted this area of investigation differently way and explained positive psychology, at workplaces, as the phenomenon of joyful happy for life in terms of “positive emotions, engagement and meanings”. Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) elaborated positive psychology as quoted “the scientific study of positive human functioning and flourishing on multiple levels that include the biological, personal, relational, institutional, cultural, and global dimensions of life”. In accordance with positive psychology, the aforesaid behavior motivates employees to work for the employers beyond their normal capacities to achieve set goals, and unveil such behaviors that are reckoned as OCB (Spreitzer and Sonenshein, 2004).

SET has become basic theory to recognize the intensity of workplace behaviors of employees once this theory emerged in the literature relevant to organizational behavior. Beside, researchers also recognized several viewpoints on social exchange and its related debates, and firmly accepted by experts that interactions among individuals transform their behavior into feelings of responsibility and become consciously responsive to adopt
positive attitude, whereas, these interactions among individuals remain a conditional bond on the reciprocal reply of other individuals (Blau, 1964, Lawler & Thye, 1999). SET is grounded in exchange method of behaviors. Researchers have been investigating leadership style, peer relationship and psychological construct on the basis of SET (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005) for many years. By focusing on workplace settings so as to explain SET in the perspective of employees’ behaviors, Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) explained that exchange of inter-relations and available resources are the core aspects of SET, which are invariably based on mutual exchange process. This mutual exchange process influence the behavior and attitude of employees, eventually influencing the employee engagement. While explaining SET, researchers argue about the interests of individuals and their inter-dependence on each other which are the main and essential factors on which, SET depends, while explaining the exchange of behaviors as these two factors play the decisive role that motivate individuals whether to perform or not (Rubel, 1997). Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) highlighted the worth of obligations that individuals felt when they interacted with each other having mutual independence while interacting for process or at workplace. They centered on three scenarios, wherein, an individual possessed some kind of exchange in order to interact with others, therefore, first is “dependent”, second is “independent” and third is “inter-dependent”. They argued that in the case of “dependence and independence” there would be no possibility of any exchange among individuals, whereas, exchange was based on the dictum of “give and take” while interacting. In view of the aforementioned discussion, employee engagement is an example of exchange process, in which, employee and his/her proprietor interact with each other to arrive to reasonable decision (Robinson et al., 2004).

Similarly, in 2006, it was Alan Saks, who connected individuals to their employers while investigating employee engagement under umbrella of SET and Kahn (1990) theory of engagement. He highlighted the fluctuating nature of engagement that individuals demonstrated for their employers subject to facilities and resources which the employer provided them for execution of job responsibilities and in response, the employer expected from employees to deliver their required job performance. Accordingly, the employees scrutinized those resources for exchange utilizing their knowledge and experience and ultimately reflected their engagement level. Saks (2006) indicated in his
research study that employee would reflect improved level of engagement with encouraging resources like empowerment at workplace, supervisor’s recognition and learning opportunities for growth of their career. He further explained how employees responded to the antecedents of engagement if the nature of available resources changed. Furthermore, Saks (2006) utilized and suggested to adopt SET for explaining the engagement construct while examining its relationships with other constructs. Margolis (2017) stated that most of the researcher referred SET while investigating employee engagement with respect to employee and employer related behavioral variables as employees performed at their workplace by considering two things: financial benefit that they received from the employer and their efforts that they rendered for the organization against reward. Uddin et al., (2019) concludes, while referring to the research work of Kahn, Macey and Schaufeli on employee engagement based on SET that engagement is a psychological state, wherein, employees disseminate such behaviors like: first is “Say”, meaning express good words for peers, teams, employers and company’s merchandises, second is “Stay”, meaning express no turnover intentions to leave employer and finally, third is “Strive”, meaning work for long hours with full vitality and personal self-efficacy, so as, to accomplish jobs targets and employer’s goals.

2.2 Employee Engagement

The contemporary researchers have shifted their research focus from criticism to positive approach for inferring organizational concepts and employee-related outcomes, emanating from employee engagement, rather than studying and discussing employees’ weaknesses and their subsequent malfunctions, which was the result transformed mental approach of psychologists (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). The academic researchers have started to explore human strengths with optimal outcomes, and have deduced many workplace variables and employee-related productive working attitudes that catalyze the healthy working environment, and restrict the employees from resorting to negative attitudes causing adverse outcomes.

Richman, A. (2006), Senior Consultant, WFD Consulting Incorporation argued about engagement, that appeared in the academic research and corporate world, as a buzzword and gained much popularity because of its encouraging and productive results for
employees, as well for the organizations. Despite its desired effects, Gallup Survey (2014-15) reported that only 13% of the employed workforce was actually engaged at workplaces, consequently, the employers’ focus had been shifted from organizations to the employees so as to sustain their profitable business productivity, utilizing maximum engaged workforce.

It has been observed that many prolonged misperceptions and disagreements persisted among researchers and business experts (Saks & Gruman 2014; Shuck et al., 2014; Alagaraja & Shuck 2015; Cole et al., 2012) because of its conceptual similarity with other established concepts, like, Job Commitment, Job Involvement and employee Job Satisfaction. Various research studies on engagement has been conducted concerning its linkage with burnout grounded on research effort done by Maslach et al., (2001) which is now questioned and criticized by many researchers especially by Saks & Gruman (2014) and Anthony- McMann et al., (2016). Saks and Gruman (2014) argued that, once, Kahn introduced buzzword and narrative of employee engagement in 1990, extensive research work has been done to investigate this phenomenon. They stated that employee engagement was one of those constructs that gained much popularity in a very short time period among the business researchers and practitioners. This popularity of employee engagement construct was not surprising as many researchers empirically revealed its positive organizational outcomes (Rich et al., 2010; Macey et al., 2009). Since beginning, when Kahn (1990) talked about engagement, lots of research articles have been written, many case studies have been done and number of meta-analyses have been shared based on qualitative and quantitative research on this subject. Similarly, the corporate world is considering employee engagement as a highly influential factor, not only considering the employees’ perspective, but also for organizational sustainability. Saks and Gruman, (2014) opined that notion of engagement, whatever it was called, like: employee, individual, job, work, personal, leader, supervisor, team etc. became deriving theme in management-related research studies.

As revealed by Google search, Kahn’s (1990) research article has been cited more than 3900 times during last two decades, that indicates how much attention, this concept has attracted to this emerging concept. The business research gurus are still trying to explore
its relationship with other HR management constructs in multidimensional ways. Saks and Gruman, (2014) asserted that after passing 26 years, the available literature on employee engagement was very much up-to-date. Interestingly, during the last 5 years, employee engagement drew much attention of consulting firms owning to its positive outcomes. Besides adopting burnout stream, Schaufeli and Salanova (2007), while elaborating work engagement in their research study, also indicated that work engagement was an important element for contemporary modern organizations for their nourishment. Saks and Gruman (2014) talked about the available research work and knowledge in the literature about employee engagement and analyzed that employee engagement was adversely affected by two critical problems, namely; various divergent definitions of employee engagement based on different terminologies, and absence of an appropriate measuring instrument; besides, no consensus was generally accepted by the researchers on the engagement theory.

Saks and Gruman, (2014) deliberated on engagement and argued that employee engagement was productive for organizations, in the form of many returns, like: improved profit shares, better productivity, satisfied customers, higher returns on shares, decreased turnover intention and better employee’s wellbeing. Researchers also criticized employee engagement by revealing that half of the US workforce was disengaged and firms spent billions of dollars unnecessarily as production cost (Crawford et al., 2010; Richman, 2006; Johnson, 2004; Harter et al., 2002; Kowalski, 2003). They also criticized that engagement carried several definitions having no consensus of researchers and practitioners on its single nomenclature as Kahn (1990) termed it as “personal engagement”, Schaufeli & Salanova, (2011) as “work engagement” and Rich et al., (2010) as “job engagement”. They further questioned about its various measurement scales for employee engagement and their validity in the absence of generally accepted theory. Bakkar and Albrecht (2018) deliberated on research investigations and findings, recently shared by many research scholars in the literature, who examined engagement in context to many employee, job and organizational related variables (Saks and Gruman, 2017; Gawke et al., 2017; Van Mierlo and Bakker, 2018). They reckoned about viewpoints of experts who used to have key eye on affairs of organizational performance in terms of employees’ related concerns. They observed that engagement either examined
at any level like, “individual, group, specific team and management” had become a catchword for all small and larger enterprises. Similarly, they stated that engaged workforce has become a necessity of every organization to compete with their contenders in the concerned industry and to succeed accordingly. In their analysis, they figured out different research studies conducted to reveal various workplace aspects during employees’ experience while performing their roles, that had leading impact on their engagement level e.g. regulate such HR strategies that would have greater impact on engagement level of workforce through managing applicable job demands along with required resources to complete the set targets as various research studies (Albrecht et al., 2015; Rich, et al., 2010, Baily et al., 2017) indicated about substantial worth of employees’ personal elements either psychological or motivational that are directly or indirectly related with engagement. Besides, while critically reviewing engagement, they underlined the second main aspect, which is management style that any leader or manager adopted during his administration in order to achieve company targets and goals (Denning, 2013). Furthermore, they discussed about nature of job and workplace conditions that differs jobwise, while performing at diverse nature of business (Services Sectors) and production units that subsequently influences employee engagement accordingly.

2.3 Employee Engagement and its Related Theories

It has observed that available literature on the emerging employee engagement construct is composed of three central approaches described as under:

i. Kahn (1990) Theory of Engagement


As stated by Saks and Gruman (2014) that engagement construed many definitions based on its allied constructs, and similarly, many theories and research models were presented to highlight the conceptual importance of engagement. Saks and Gruman (2014) stated
that roots of all engagement theories and presented models emanated from two primary research areas;

i. Personal engagement and personal disengagement, primarily introduced by Kahn in 1990


2.3.1 Engagement Concept by William A. Kahn (1990)

While studying employee role performance, researchers (Katz & Kahn, (1978), Van Maanen, (1976), Graen, (1976)) paid less attention to the psychological presence of employee’s self during his/her role performance. This aspect motivated Kahn (1990) to explore employee’s self in detail and introduced three self-conditions of the employee, that is physical presence at work, cognitive role presence and emotional presence at work. Kahn ‘s fundamental focus was to develop theoretical framework to reveal employee’s self in order to investigate how employees indulged their selves in performing role tasks and also isolated their selves in performing role tasks. Kahn (1990) presumed that employees respond differently in varying situations of assignments, and he tried to explore the variables that described this self–role adjustment according to the role response in a specific task performance.

Kahn (1990) referred to the research work of Goffman (1961a) regarding individual’s attachment and detachment that varied in role performance depending on the situation, and there was a need to augment this concept by linking it with organizational factor. Finally, Kahn termed these self-role adjustments in task performance in terms of two terminologies like; “Personal Engagement” and “Personal Disengagement”. Kahn (1990) determined the term personal engagement like, “the harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances”. Both self and the role have strong relationship, because an individual exhibits his personal energies in job-role behaviors expressing his presence within role, which, ultimately, reflects individual’s high level of spirit or engagement at work (p-700). In his definition, Kahn (1990)
highlighted the coupling mechanism of employees’ self with their existing roles to engage them at workplace, which subsequently exhibited their “physical, cognitive and emotional” presence and involvement in task performance. Likewise, Kahn (1990) particularized personal disengagement as “the uncoupling of selves from work roles; wherein, people withdraw and try to escape themselves physically, cognitively, or emotionally during role performances”. He further highlighted the role of employee’s removal behavior and self-protection when he/she was not “physically, cognitively and emotionally” present while performing a job role at workplace.

Consequently, Kahn (1990) based on these definitions of engagement joined the employees’ relations among them along with their tasks/job characteristics as discussed by Hackman & Oldham, (1980). Kahn (1990) in his research study combined various viewpoints of researchers who worked on “interpersonal settings like: Bennis et al., (1964) & Rogers (1958), group settings like: Smith & Berg (1987) and Bion (1961), intergroup settings by Alderfer (1985a), and organizational settings by Hochschild (1983)” that improved or demotivated people and inculcated a sense of meaning in them at work. The research premise of Kahn (1990) was established on two elements: one was employees’ attitude and behavior resulting from psychological experience of job/task (Hackman & Oldham, 1980), and, second, several factors of work settings like (i) individual, (ii) interpersonal, (iii) group, (iv) intergroup, and (v) organizational, affected these psychological experiences. He argued that the psychological experience of employee’s self while performing a role was the core contributor towards expressing employee’s motivational behavior which expressed him/herself.

Kahn (1990) extended the idea of Oldham (1980), wherein, he highlighted the psychological conditions that influenced individual’s internal motivational state. On the basis of Oldham’s idea, Kahn explained three prominent psychological conditions: “meaningfulness, safety and availability” that influenced employee’ level of engagement at workplace, whereas, in the absence of aforesaid conditions, individuals resorted to disengagement behavior. The cumulative impact of these three psychological conditions, defined the role of an employee at job, whether engaged or disengaged. The
assessment of job meaningfulness, with maintaining requisite safety level and available resources motivated an individual to perform a job role accordingly.

Harter et al., (2002) stated that Kahn’s psychological conditions developed a sense of self identification or recognitions in individual’s work-role which he maintained by engaging himself in his work. He further pointed out that individual’s agreement on expected benefits and necessary protective guarantees, along with essential resources, to fulfill the job demands inspired the personal engagement. Resultantly, the personal engagement fluctuates in accordance with benefits, work meaningfulness and safety in varying situations. Kahn (1990) corroborated that availability of job resources also caused constructive effect on employees in order to encourage them for increased level of engagement.

Kahn (1990) described psychological meaningfulness as perceived feelings of an individual on his self-contribution that could be physical, cognitive or emotional for his role performance. The feelings of job role recognition, like: worthwhile, advantageousness and evaluability, based on individual’s remarkable contribution, developed the psychological meaningfulness of a job. He statistically confirmed that a high-level connection existed between personal engagement and psychological meaningfulness, having components of task characteristics, role characteristics and work interaction (r=0.89). Kahn (1990) explained psychological safety, which was employees’ perceived feeling or experience while they expressed themselves and utilized their inner-selves without thinking of any negative outcomes to their self-image, self-prestige and job career developing a safe and trusted working conditions that led them to high level of personal engagement. This was tested statistically and found the high level of association existed between personal engagement and psychological safety (r=0.83). He highlighted four influential factors of psychological safety, like; “interpersonal relations of employees, group and intergroup dynamics, organizational management style and its process, and organizational culture”. In connection to aforementioned debate, Kahn (1990) highlighted the role of management style necessary for enhancing employee’s psychological safety through supportive and resilient management style along with some control/autonomy on work that provided them safer environment. Furthermore, Kahn
(1990) defined psychological availability as perception of having required physical and cognitive or emotional related resources that were essential requirement to engage individual’s self at work or in a particular situation. He noticed varying employee’s self-availability in their role performance depending upon requisite and coping techniques of job demands at work how to deal with and attempt to overcome problems, and social lives which were also tested empirically, illustrating positive connection between personal engagement and psychological availability ($r=0.81$).

May et al., (2004) in their research study conducting on employees of an insurance company, extended Kahn (1990 -1992) work on employee engagement. They empirically validated the Kahn (1990) engagement framework and found positive and significant correlation among employee engagement and three psychological conditions. They recommended that employee engagement should be investigated in relation to other dimensions of trust-related behaviors particularly “sharing of control from management”. Considering research work by Kahn (1990) on engagement concept, Rich et al. (2010) concluded that engaged employees render their physical efforts with hands, cognitive from their heads and emotional from their hearts, and argued that engagement expressed a comprehensive picture of employee’s self as compared to other similar constructs, like: satisfaction and involvement which defined limited aspects of employee self. In the same way describing engagement concept, Christian et al., (2011) characterized it being a widespread paradigm in which employees absorbed their entire self in their work using all energies like; “physically, cognitively and emotionally”. In explaining research work of Kahn (1990) work on engagement, Rich et al. (2010) commented that it was a “motivational and multidimensional” construct that encouraged individuals to involve their full selves to perform a specific or general task, therefore, it might be presupposed that since 1990, when Kahn introduced the term “engagement”, a few researchers adopted his philosophy in its real sense.

2.3.2 Maslach Theory of Engagement

After seven years, when Kahn (1990-1992) introduced the buzzword “engagement” in literature, researchers working on burnout domain integrated burnout factor with job engagement (Maslach and leiter, 1997). Subsequently other researchers bracketed

Maslach et al. (2001) stated that many opinions prevailed about the concept of burnout, and its basis, but all researchers and phycologists agreed to three fundamental dimensions i.e exhaustion, cynicism and inefficacy leading to the emerging concept of a predominant theory in the field of burnout. Exhaustion, being the first dimension of burnout is directly related to stress, wherein, the individual experiences feelings of emotional fatigue, resulting in cynicism, and feelings of detachment. The exhaustion factor of an individual exemplifies the basic stress aspect of burnout. It denotes to “feelings of being over loaded with work and depletion of one’s emotional and physical resources”. Cynicism being the second factor demonstrates the interpersonal aspect of burnout, which bring up the extremely detached destructive reaction to different working conditions and aspects during job role. The reduced efficacy being the third component of burnout is about the self-evaluation aspect of an employee. Feelings of self – ineffectiveness or unproductive and fear for not achieving targets at work are result of inefficacy.

Maslach and Leiter (1997) extended their primary concept about burnout adding job engagement as its positive aspect and defined it as “an energetic state of involvement with personally fulfilling activities that enhance one’s sense of professional efficacy”. It has observed that Maslach and his colleagues enunciated second viewpoint on engagement on the basis of burnout construct, wherein, employee engagement was considered as antipole of job-burnout. This theory was developed on the construct of employee job burnout and its elaboration. Maslach et al. (2001) while discussing the history of their theory, highlighted the earlier research work on burnout when researchers appraised the exhaustion behavior. They further highlighted the linkage between engagement and burnout and discussed six critical dimensions of organizational working culture, considered as antecedents of burnout, like: (i) employee work-load elaborated as extra work load that led to exhaustion, (ii) employee’s less control over job resources and authority to perform or accomplish the task that led to inefficacy, (iii) inadequate
financial rewards and intrinsic acknowledgement as social reward in recognition of employees’ productive engagement caused feelings of inefficacy, (iv) less community or social interaction at workplace and allied social support from peers at workplace, (v) employee perceived fairness in terms of workload, rewards, evaluations, appraisal, promotions and obstruction of employee’s voices on conflicts, led to feelings of **cynicism**, (vi) mismatched values and norms between employees and the organization led to undesired conflicts. Maslach et al. (2001) indicated that controversy arising from above mentioned six dimensions at workplace and employees was the main reason of burnout intention. Burnout could be directly proportional to the employee’s mismatch with the aforesaid six dimensions at the workplace. Besides this, greater would be employee engagement in presence of greater harmony among employees with respect to six dimensions at workplace. Similarly, employee engagement at workplace is linked with appropriate workload, liberty of choice and job autonomy/control, encouraging appreciation in terms of rewards and proper recognition of employee’s achievements, healthy cordial environments and helping community, workplace justified fairness in processes and procedures and best-fit between employees and organizational values without implicating conflicts.

Maslach and Leiter (2008), in their research study got some support in favor of their previous burnout notion (1997) that workplace fairness issues, like: inequity, favoritism, prejudice etc. that employees experienced, might lead to job burnout with the passage of time, nevertheless, employees who did not experience fairness issues would assent and prefer to stay with that organization on long-term basis. It was also revealed that engagement also mediated among the six antecedents of burnout and work attitudes. Divergence of mindset might lead to burnout and harmony at workplace might lead to engagement. They studied various determinants of burnout in a longitudinal study design and its antipole engagement, taking a sample comprising administrative staff from a university and observed changes in staffs’ burnout over time. Research findings revealed that staff with burnout intention could be identified earlier on the basis of mismatch between the employee and the concerned performing role at workplace. According to the research framework and findings, proposed that employee or job-related constructs, like engagement, commitment, involvement and satisfaction were not identical and were quite
different in nature from each other (Maslach et al., 2001). They stated that ample research under umbrella of burnout, a representation of negative psychological state, was exercised on the basis of employee engagement which was positive aspect of the burnout condition. They further elaborated that engagement was dissimilar to other psychological constructs, like: satisfaction, commitment, involvement, but it expressed individual’s comprehensive relationship with work as compared to other constructs. Rich et al., (2010) questioned and showed concerns about the productive link between burnout and employee engagement constructs and stated that both were not similar to each other and could not be gauged collectively.

2.3.3 Schaufeli and Engagement

Schaufeli et al. (2002) built their framework based on Maslach theory of engagement in their research study while validating Maslach’ work in order to develop a model for engagement concept, and highlighted that both engagement and burnout concepts were not similar to each other and had independent grounds that led to accept engagement as a distinct construct. They found strong negative and weak correlation between two dimensions; vigor and emotional exhaustion which were pointed out by Maslach and Leiter (1997) in their model. They concluded that it would be more appropriate to consider both constructs as indirectly related rather than opposite to each other. Based on their research findings, they termed engagement as work engagement instead of personal engagement as denoted by Kahn (1990). They operationalized and categorized work engagement on the basis of work that an individual performed and connected it with different three individual mind’s conditions’ like, “vigor, dedication and absorption”, that would be positive and fulfilling. Moreover, they elaborated work engagement and differentiated work related states of mind, which was more constant, continuous, more pervasive, effective and cognitive in nature in lieu of considering it as specific and momentary.

Schaufeli et al. (2002) described vigor in terms of two fundamental, but core individual’s abilities, one: employee’s energy that he/she exerted in work with full willingness, two: mental resilience that an individual would require to face various difficulties at work with determination. Schaufeli et al. (2002) described dedication in such a way that the
employee would show high level of involvement in assigned work and display feelings of significance for work, motivation to perform work, pride in doing work, enthusiasm, interest and, above all, also accept work as a challenge. Schaufeli et al. (2002) argued that during absorption, the individual would concentrate in his work, deeply engrossed, without realizing the fleeting time and detachment from his work. Schaufeli & Bakker (2001) highlighted the precincts of burnout construct, which primarily comprised two main dimensions, “vigor and dedication”, opposed to “exhaustion and cynicism”. Schaufeli et al., (2002), while deliberating their viewpoint on the third dimension, absorption, was included in the concept of work engagement after further clarification through in-depth interviews centered on initial outcomes of the study; whereas, vigor & exhaustion were thought to be as “energy” and cynicism and dedication as “identification”.

2.3.4 Job Demand and Resource Model and Theory

Bakar and Demerouti (2007), while encompassing engagement construct presented a well-known model titled, Job Demand Resource Model (JD-R), which traces its background to burnout literature. Originally, JD-R Model, being the model of burnout, was introduced in the year 2001(Demerouti et al., 2001). The concept behind its introduction was based on two broad workplace dimensions: “employees’ job demands and available job resources”. Demerouti et al., (2001) in this model explained that burnout was main cause of dominant high job demands that developed tiredness or exhaustion in employees and shortage of job resources that led to increase of withdrawal behavior in employees, called as dis-engagement. While integrating the influence of both job demands and available resources, researchers argued that inflating employee burnout conditions and ultimate dis-engagement were directly linked with intensity of job demands and available resources to fulfill that demands with entire objective of management. It was argued by researchers (Demerouti et al., 2001) that JD-R model was presented being a substitute for other prominent models of well-being like “demand – control model and effort – reward imbalance model”. The reason for introducing JD-R model was that all other models were limited to some specific independent variables which did not cover and relate to all kinds of job positions.
Demerouti et al., (2001) argued that Job Demand and Resource model integrated an extensive range of workplace conditions relevant to employees and organizations for different relationships among the variables. Besides, focusing only on negative outcome variables, Job Demand - Resource model encompassed both positive and negative signs and consequences of employee well-being as showed in below mentioned model.

![Diagram of JD-R model of burnout](image)

Source: “Demerouti et al. (2001)”

**Figure 2-1: The JD-R model of burnout**

Demerouti et al., (2001) specified various job demands in their research article denoting psychological, physical, organizational and social features while performing a job, which required persistent mental, psychological and physical efforts and energy of an employee that may ultimately effect psychological and physiological costs. Furthermore, they
categorized some job demands, like “physical work overload, job role ambiguity, role-conflict, working hour’s pressures and job insecurity”. Similarly, job resources were psychological, physical, organizational and social features of a job while performing a job task that supported employees to pursue their job goals, manage influence of job demands and more emphasis on their personal growth, subsequent learning and skill improvement.

While deliberating JD-R model, researchers categorically highlighted many job resources that originated from different aspects such as “(1) organization, like: reward, pay, job security, career growth, (2) social and interpersonal relations like: coworker’s and supervisor’s support, workplace environments and teamwork climate, (3) job organization, like: role clarity and participation and autonomy in decision-making, and finally (4) job/task itself, like: task identity, task significance, skill variety, autonomy and job performance feedback” (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). The central principle of the JD-R model is that both work demands and available proceed in an integrated way affecting job burnout and employee engagement.

It has observed that available job resources to perform a job-role, play motivational role to stimulate and encourage for positive attitudes, higher levels of employee engagement, employee well-being and decreasing burnout level (Rich et al., 2010). This motivation, developed from job resources, is perceived to be intrinsic and extrinsic in nature. Intrinsic motivational factor of Job resources may be perceived/believed when job resources facilitate basic psychological employee needs, such as, “job growth, employees learning, and development”, whereas, extrinsic motivational factors are core contributory factors for “accomplishing work-related objectives and goals” (Bakker et al., 2011). Furthermore, Bakker and Demerouti (2007) elaborated about available job resources that enabled employees to manage various challenges due to job demands in order to reduce/handle the effects of these demands on employee related - burnout and resultant job strain or stress. On the other hand, Bakker and Demerouti (2007, 2008) explained, how extraordinary job demands made impact on worker’s mental and physical resources just like exhaustion resulting from over-work that ultimately caused adverse effects on employee’s energy and subsequent internal stress creating reasons for employee dis-
engagement at workplace, increased burnout and other health related problems. Xanthopoulou et al., (2007) while further elaborating the JD-R model, included another factor relevant to personal resources. Personal resources comprised characteristics of employee’s self, connected to employee’s resilience, and sufficient autonomy that employees could exercise to control their workplace environments at their own successfully (p-124). Furthermore, these personal resources also consisted of workers dissimilarities in terms of their level of “self-efficacy, organizational based self-esteem and optimism”, which were effected or stimulated by available resources to perform job and these resources were also related to employee engagement at work (Xanthopoulou, et al., 2009a; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Similarly, researchers reported positive relationship between available job resource and work engagement, whereas, job resources and burnout are negatively related.

Job demands are related to employee’s health related issues and burnout (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2008). Specifically, while extending research work of Kahn (1990) on engagement and further misperceptions on engagement concept, Rich et al., (2010) studied burnout and engagement differently and compared them in line with burnout and engagement theories to investigate which approach was better and aligned with Kahn’s original engagement concept. Rich et al. (2010) elaborated job demands by dividing them into stressful or challenging. They found that stressful demands and engagement were negatively related as this kind of demands produced negative impact on employee’s personal growth, learning and development, role overload, role conflict and role ambiguity. Whenever, job demands were treated as challenges, these would be positively related to engagement. Examining relationship of personal resources with work engagement, wherein, personal resources mediated different relationships between job resources like “social support, autonomy, development opportunities and supervisory mentoring” and “work engagement and exhaustion”.

2.4 Limitation to JD-R Model to study engagement

Challenging job demands and available resources to perform a job role are imperative for workers to get them engage at workplace. Nevertheless, many researchers have criticized
it because of its comparatively limited approach to investigate and explore employee engagement.

Bakker and Schaufeli (2008) highlighted the importance of engaged employees across the world. There is another interesting point that academicians and corporate world, both, are taking EE differently.

1. Discussed engagement in terms of motivating resources materialized through peer support, recognition by managers, employee performance feedback, provisioning of development and working opportunities to display employees’ skills effectively by consulting Gallup Surveys.

2. Discussed employee engagement encompassing employee’s commitment and his subsequent extra-role behavior, such as, employee’s psychological condition when he feels high level of interest for firm’s success and delivers high standard output beyond the written job specifications, whereas, some researchers discarded it for being as an attempt to revive an obsolete concept.

3. Referred to engagement, resulting from job resources, and encouraging organizational consequences, namely: employee commitment derived from positive mental approach opposite to job burnout as also vetted by Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter (2001) in their JDR Model. The researchers also emphasized to investigate employee engagement with respect to job-related variables, like job demands and available resources to deliver for exploring other antecedents of engagement. Researchers also referred to the findings of others researchers (Demerouti et al., 2001) about facets of emotion, tiredness/exhaustion, unjustified job enlargement, mental pressure of extended working hours related to job demands. Furthermore, employees were found to be highly disengaged due to non-availability of adequate job resources, particularly feedback, control, socially supportive related snags, and certainly the least contribution from the company’s decision-making process (Demerouti et al., 2001)

While deliberating in a critical way to explain about JD-R model in detail, Bakker & Demerouti (2007) claimed that working conditions at a workplace could be categorized covering two aspects, i.e. “job demands and job resources” unspecified to a particular
occupation, but, however, applicable to all workplace settings in general. Bakker, Demerouti, and Euwema (2005), studied job demands and burnout using population of almost 1000 Dutch teachers working at different colleges and established that job demands did not cause burnout subject to availability of available resources to fulfill those demands like: feedback on delivered performance, autonomy, group support and administrative support. Bakker et al., (2005) discussed that autonomy was the helping factor to counter job demands as workers had the autonomy to respond to job demands accordingly to nullify the influence of job demands on burnout level. Moreover, the role of social support, feedback and supervisor’s interaction might reduce the burnout arising from job demands. Hakanen, Bakker, and Demerouti (2005) studied work engagement of 1919 public sector Finnish dentists using JD-R Model to examine how they dealt with high job demands. They found that under high job demands at workplace, good job resources, like: skill variety and peer contacts were the most constructive and supporting factors to keep dentists engaged with their job. Shuck et al., (2011) examined the employee engagement and its antecedents and outcomes, exposed through empirical findings, that job resources motivated employees to get them engaged at job, as well to restrict their turnover intention to quit the job. Findings of their research study also revealed that employees would be more engaged, showing less turnover intention, if he/she foresaw availability of physical, emotional and psychological job resources. Britt, Castro, and Alder (2005), in their research study, explained the same finding as pointed out by Shuck, Reio & Rocco (2011) and verified that these three job resources were predictors of employee’s motivation to complete the given task.

2.5 Why Kahn’s Theory of Employee Engagement?

Crawford et al., (2010) observed that JD-R model experienced limitations regarding elimination of various employee engagement predictors, and division of working conditions in job demands and resources in predicting engagement level of workers (p. 844). Following philosophy of Kahn’s (1990) work, Fredrickson (1998) linked the employee engagement with employees’ perceptions about meaningfulness of work for them. He stated that if employees perceived their work or job as meaningful for them then they would be more engaged at work. Similarly, in the same context, Harter et al.,
(2002) argued and observed same findings in results of their study. Fredrickson (1998) opined that work meaningfulness was a working framework for employees that provided a better insight and understanding of value addition and significance for a company. Shuck et al., (2011) established that employees’ job-fit was another influential factor for practitioners to enhance employees’ engagement at work along with two other important components of psychological climate and affective commitment. Schaufeli et al., (2001a) examined employee engagement and burnout, using confirmatory factor analysis approach involving population of a university employees and students. They confirmed that both constructs were opposite to each other. It was found significantly that measuring scales used for engagement and burnout were negatively related using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis. The study revealed that three factors “vigor, dedication and absorption” were established and acceptable for analysis.

Rich et al., (2010) extended Kahn’ work and his theory on employee engagement, and studied the extent to which employee engagement acted as an important tool by which many of its predictors affected the employee’s job performance. They explained that Kahn’s (1990) theory completely encompassed and elaborated employee’s self as a driving force which every employee invested in his/her job roles to materialize outcomes. Rich et al., (2010) argued that their results statistically confirmed indirect relationship between antecedents and outcome variables through employee engagement, which acted as a mediating mechanism among the variables. It was also pointed out that employee engagement was the only mediator included in the relationship while examining engagement in context to JD-R model. Whereas, Rich et al., (2010) argued that scant empirical findings or theories claimed employee engagement to be productive, and generated competitive advantages, but their research studies proved that individuals fostering with higher-level job engagement contributed to their enterprises by demonstrating high level of individual performance along with positive extra role performance like “organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)”. They further concluded that employee engagement was a motivational aspect and associated to behavioral outcomes, which required further research to investigate interconnectivity of job attitude, employee engagement and subsequent role performance. Rich et al., (2010) established significant and positive association among job engagement and its outcome variables of
employee task performance and extra role behavior like OCB (Beta – 0.25 and 0.27) which concurred findings of Hoffman et al., (2007) proving that both aspects like performance and OCB concepts, were parts of a broader construct of employee’s overall job performance.

Cole et al., (2012) pointed out that JD-R model, was referred to by several researchers in their research studies to explore the engagement and burnout antecedents, which compelled them to keep their focus only on job demands and job resources, and ignore other essential aspects of job, like: physical, organizational and social entities. It would be important to comment that a few researchers differentiated between demands and resources. Cole et al., (2012) referred to research work done by Crawford et al., 2010, wherein, he explained some job demands perceived as challenging factors, were found to resist engagement rather than support it. Cole et al., (2012) concluded that more focus on job demands and job resources in examining employee engagement raised serious concerns in neglecting the relevant antecedents. He also proposed to study and investigate employee’s personality traits that might predict engagement differently. Cole et al., (2012) explained that popularity of engagement notion and the continuous interest of researchers in investigating it was owing to its positive and affirmative influence on employees’ and organizational behaviors because it encouraged to develop positive optimistic psychological states of mind rather than negative ones (Avey et al., 2010; Luthans & Avolio, 2009). Extending the debate on understanding employee engagement, in the same era, much confusion persisted while conceptualizing and interpreting employee engagement (Cole et al., 2012) which was not only confined and limited to the meaning of engagement and its similarity with other constructs i.e. job involvement, job satisfaction, job commitment, organizational commitment (Macey & Schneider, 2008), but also extended to ascertain status of burnout and engagement as two different concepts placed at opposite poles of same continuum (Bakker & Leiter, 2010; Maslach & Leiter, 2008, Cole et al., 2012). It would also be pertinent to clarify that burnout and work engagement were mostly operationalized as being opposite to each other on the basis of Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Schaufeli & Bakker (2010) argued that regardless of their adverse nature, engagement and burnout both could be assessed through different measuring scales, because of their distinct psychological states.
Cole et al., (2012) concluded that there was still an essential requirement to further investigate engagement to counter serious criticism like “A new blend of old wine” and must be extended and integrated with recent work of Rich et al., 2010 together with other engagement-related research which would facilitate researchers to understand its conceptual philosophy. They also elucidated that both engagement and burnout overlapped when gauged by UWES and MBI. It did not confirm alignment between theory and measurement, which resulted in confusion and impeded consensus on the theory regarding development of engagement concept. Cole et al., (2012) referred to the prior work and experience that criticism would persist about employee engagement construct until researchers reached the consensus on its definition and its measurement methodology that would help to differentiate engagement from other similar constructs, not only conceptually, but would also provide its empirical justification leading to transfer of resultant cumulative knowledge. It would be important to mention the conclusion of Suddaby’s research that growth and development about knowledge of a construct could not be visualized until researchers reached on a consensus or discussed and integrated the basic elements of the phenomenon that would lead to fragmented organizational knowledge (Suddaby, 2010). Cole et al., (2012) also recommended to avoid UWES measuring scale by the researchers who considered employee engagement as a distinct phenomenon which was suitable only to measure burnout construct. Cole et al., (2012) argued that it was now appropriate time to rethink and reformulate Schaufeli’s and colleagues’ independent perspective on Kahn’s (1990) theory who was the first researcher, which integrated “employee’s full self in terms of physical, cognitive and emotional energies” with task performance in describing engagement. This narrative of engagement by Kahn (1990) not only highlighted link between employee engagement, and subsequent job performance, nevertheless, it incorporated the idea of the employee’s self too. Finally, understanding employee engagement, Kahn’s narrative of engagement might provide theoretical foundation, required at the moment to re-conceptualize employee engagement as a concept without overlapping with burnout construct.

Saks and Gruman (2014) in their article critically studied the concept of employee engagement based on its definition, theory and measurement and discussed various research studies and meta-analysis expanding the literature on the concept, but
researchers’ concerns still continued on its unanimous definition, theory and accurate measurement mechanisms. Saks and Gruman (2014) presented another theory for integrating Kahn theory and JD-R model, both, in order to investigate employee engagement. As a result of their theory, they inferred that confrontational nature of research on employee engagement aspect remained under continuous criticism due to two concerns: first various definitions described by different researchers and second multiple measuring instruments available as per different approaches about engagement. Moreover, researchers expressed many reservations on the theory of engagement. It has claimed that the problem regarding understanding of employee engagement definition and its measurement emerged because of its roots in the burnout concept (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001) which questioned its distinctiveness while measuring engagement in the context of job burnout (Saks & Gruman, 2014).

Besides, various similarities and mismatches, Saks and Gruman (2014) validated that literature on engagement manipulated two prominent definitions, one given by Kahn (1990) plus second given by Schaufeli et al., (2002). They stated that Kahn’s (1990) definition was more comprehensive than that of Schaufeli et al., (2002) because it incorporated factors of personal agency and employee’s agentic self, as also validated by Cole et al., (2012) and other researchers. Kahn (1990) explained the definition of employee engagement distinctively and indicated the role of employee’s complete self in a particular job (Saks and Gruman 2014). They further augmented Kahn’s (1990) effort wherein, employees could avail themselves of rational choices to take decisions relevant to contribute their actual selves while performing a specified role. Saks and Gruman (2014) finally conceded that Kahn’s description was much better, significant, and appropriately conceptualized the engagement concept than that of Schaufeli et al. (2002).

Gupta and Shukla (2018) stated that researchers had been appraising employee engagement while evaluating and concerning employee’ “self” with subject to “role” once Kahn introduced this word of engagement in the literature of business management in 1990, wherein, still research gurus are interpreting employee engagement in terms of “personal, job, work and organizational” perspectives by different operationalization. By following theories encompassing self and role, Gupta and Shukla (2018) tried to validate different operationalization of this phenomena in order to check its validity and impact of
engagement of task performance by conducting research on 317 employees of several enterprises located at India. They observed while examining results by applying AMOS that all engagements like Job, work, organizational and personal indicated positive relation but personal engagement were the most strongest aspect to determine the task performance. Hence, they concluded that personal engagement were remained the most suitable operationalization to explain the engagement concept.

2.6 Measurement of Engagement

Besides disagreement on defining employee engagement, amazingly, many measuring scales about gauging this aspect were improvised, some of which, as discussed by Saks and Gruman (2014) are tabulated as:

Table 2-1: Measuring Scales of Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1      | Rothbard (2001) | 9-item scale | • 4 items for measuring attention  
• 5 items for measuring absorption |
| 2      | May et al. (2004) | 13-item scale | • 4 items for cognitive engagement  
• 4 items for emotional engagement  
• 5 items for physical engagement |
| 3      | Saks (2006) | 12-item scale | • 6 item for measuring job engagement  
• 6 item for measuring organization engagement |
| 4      | Rich et al., (2010) | 18-item scale | • 6 items for Kahn’s factors of engagement “physical, emotional, cognitive” |
| 5      | Soane et al., (2012) | 9-item scale | • 3 items for each dimension of ”Intellectual engagement, Affective engagement, social...” |
It may be observed that almost, majority of measuring scales having links with burnout construct developed on the basis of most common scale i.e. UWES, whereas, almost all measuring scales have their roots in Kahn’s (1990) work. It is also pertinent to highlight that most of the research on engagement, and its related construct, has been conducted in connection with burnout. Most of the researchers utilized UWES or other measuring scales, having background basis in UWES, or JD-R model. Bailey et al., (2017) in a detailed narrative synthesis, while encompassing various viewpoints on definition of engagement, contradictory meanings, predictors and outcomes, conclusively screened various definitions and their measuring scales. Bailey et al., (2017) discussed six main domains, described below, about which researchers studied engagement in different perspectives using different measurement scales:

2.6.1 Measurement Based on Personal Role Engagement

This domain was based on Kahn’s (1990) research work who introduced the word “engagement” in literature and described it in terms of “personal role engagement” incorporating employees’ appearance in the shape of their cognitive, emotional and physical nature with genuine selves at job/work. Several research studies operationalized employee engagement centered in Kahn’s (1990) theory. Anthony- McMann et al., (2016) termed all measuring scales as “needs-satisfaction-based frameworks” which were mainly entrenched in Kahn’s engagement theory, that highlighted three main psychological conditions leading to employee engagement. After a considerable time span, when Kahn introduced the engagement theory in the year 1990, May et al. (2004) validated all psychological conditions of Kahn’s theory, but researchers noticed some
reliability challenges in their measuring scales while adopting them in their research studies. Rich et al., (2010) investigated engagement grounded on Kahn’s theory, and explained how engaged employees expose their cognitive, effective, and physical energies in their role performance. Soane et al. (2012) extended the operationalization of professed “needs-satisfaction-based Kahn’s framework” and expressed their views that Kahn conceptualized engagement on the basis of employees’ positive bond at workplace. Bailey et al., (2017) described that only four quantitative research studies developed the measuring scales based on Kahn’s (1990) theory on engagement with subsequent operationalization and they further stated that four studies adopted the scale established by May et al., (2004), three studies adopted scale developed by Rich et al., (2010), one study adopted the scale developed by Reio and Sanders (2011) and three studies adopted the scale developed by Soane et al., (2012).

2.6.2 Measurement based on job engagement

The second prevailing and leading domain, in the engagement literature, encompassing the positive state of employee’s concentration on work tasks, is well-known burnout-antithesis of the framework. This domain was initiated and raised on the burnout literature, because, researchers exploring the area of burnout have adjudged engagement as antipole of burnout (Shuck 2011). Depending on the burnout literature, Schaufeli et.al, (2002) treated and operationalized engagement as “work-associated state of individual’s positive and fulfilling mind” side by side with presence of “vigor, dedication and absorption” towards job defined or undefined accordingly (Schaufeli et al., 2006). This burnout-antithesis framework proposes that burnout and disengagement are somewhat similar to each other resultantly, an engaged employee does not experience burnout feelings (Maslach et al., 2001; Shirom, 2005; Demerouti & Bakker, 2008). Schaufeli et al., (2002) established Utrecht Work Engagement Scale which is well-known as UWES. Based on their defined stream, UWES was further consulted and adopted in 148 studies, validated and translated into many languages, 42 research studies adopted full version of UWES 17-item scale, 90 research studies adopted shorter version of 9-item scale and some studies adopted 5 –item version (Bakibinga et al., 2012 and Bailey et al., 2017).
Interestingly, the researchers who revealed engagement, being a distinct construct in comparison to burnout, are still measuring engagement with the same scales that measure burnout like: Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, which includes several items exactly opposite to the items in burnout measuring scale developed in Maslach Burnout Inventory. In a meta-analysis, empirical findings revealed that MBI and UWES measured burnout and antipole of burnout, but did not measure the engagement (Cole, et. al, 2012). Anthony- McMann et al., (2016) while exploring different operationalizations of engagement concept, criticized and questioned the researchers about authenticity of their research who were measuring burnout and engagement on the basis of identical concepts, whereas, Kahn (2010) rejected the proposition that burnout and engagement, both, were antipole or opposite to each other. Nevertheless, he did not agree to accept arguments of the researchers who were favorably supporting to measure burnout and engagement simultaneously with the same scale.

2.6.3 Measurement based on Multidimensional domain of engagement

Saks (2006) while differentiating engagement, for job and organization, pointed out three important aspects of engagement, like: “cognitive, emotional and behavioral”, that were related with employee job performance (p-602). Bailey et al., (2017) referred to research studies, conducted by only three researchers who adopted Saks’s (2006) idea for gauging job and organizational engagement, whereas, two researchers adopted his scale to gauge job engagement and one researcher adopted one part of his scale to gauge organizational engagement. Bailey et al., (2017) also discussed about the work of Selmer et al., (2013) in this domain who studied engagement in the perspective of work-group level and proposed another measurement scale, which was further adopted only for one study.

2.6.4 Measurement based on Composite attitudinal and behavioral construct of Engagement

This domain is the combination of attitudinal and behavioral dimensions, individual work-related states of mind. In this domain, Bailey et al. (2017) referred only to the work of Swanberg et al., (2011) owning to the lack of validity of others measuring scales who
also developed their own measurement scales based on Schaufeli et al., (2002) definition of engagement.

2.6.5 Measurement Scale based on Engagement as a management practice

As a result of positive employee and organization-related outcomes, Bailey et al., (2017) stated that researchers, working in human resource management stream, considered engagement as a dynamic tool to engage employees at workplace while studying best management practices (Truss et al., 2014). Researchers focusing on HRM practices contributed with quantitative nature of case studies. Bailey et al. (2017) referred to the work of Jenkins and Delbridge (2013) and Arrowsmith and Parker (2013) who argued that engagement could be promoted in HRM practices through soft approach adopting developmental techniques and hard approach adopting performance-focused techniques, which remained under long debate between unitarist and pluralists in the perspective of employees’ relationship and organizational communication. Only in three research studies, conducted uptill now, researchers have opted this approach to gauge engagement.

2.6.6 Measurement Scale Based On Self-Engagement With Performance

Britt et al. (2005) explained engagement concept by giving it nomenclature of “Self-engagement” based on Triangle Model of Responsibility. They linked employee’s sense of responsibility and his commitment to employee performance and developed 4-item measurement scale to gauge feelings of responsibility and commitment during his role performance. This scale was adopted only for a single research study.

2.6.7 Measuring Employee Engagement with Gallup 12 Questionnaire

Gallup, Inc. is an American-based consultancy and research-oriented global organization established by Dr. Gallup in 1935. Gallup, having almost 80 years of consultancy experience in the field of management practices, provides logical conclusions, based on analysis and subsequent advice to support corporate leaders and their managers to resolve their workplace problems. Gallup works on individuals’ attitudes and their behaviors for the stakeholders functioning across the globe. A well-known microeconomic framework
developed by Gallup by which corporate leaders and their managers can better utilize their employees’ skills for maximized as well as accelerated organizational performance.
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**Figure 2-2: A Behavioral Economic-Based Model for Organic Sales Growth**

Source: Gallup Inc.

This above-said framework has been utilized by many business experts to create exceptional techniques and tools for attaining visualized organizational performance and subsequent growth in the industry. Once, Kahn (1990) introduced engagement in the business literature, Gallup Consultant was the pioneer to examine engagement as a **buzzword** for high-level performance, and introduced **modus operandi**, for evaluation of employee engagement by devising 12 – item questionnaire well-known as Gallup Q12. This 12-item questionnaire has a proven link with performance-related organizational and employee-related outcomes. Gallup is providing guidance and support to thousands of companies all around the world to develop and foster better employee engagement culture. Gallup Q12 tool is designated to gauge employee engagement in terms of employee’s work productivity, loyalty for customers and company sales’ growth rate that clearly reflect the philosophy behind development of Gallup Q12 for improving the organizational productivity by effectively utilizing employees’ potential capacities. Gallup’s experts scrutinized this 12-item questionnaire, after conducting hundreds of surveys in different countries, and confirmed a definite correlation with positive outcomes. Gallup Q12 survey is applied to a five-point scale which comprises four categories: first two questions collect responses on employees’ basic needs, succeeding
four questions cover responses on management support, next four questions are related to team work, and the last two questions are concerned about sale’s growth. Gallup survey divided employees into three categories as per details:

i. Engaged employees: Show high passion while performing duties along with firm association with the employer as an innovator and creator.
ii. Disengaged employees: Try to perform as per employer’s demands, but do not exert extra-role effort and show minimum exuberance to perform as expected.
iii. Actively and almost completely disengaged employees: Unhappy, dissatisfied employees, expressing, and propagating their discontentment feelings to other colleagues cynically.

2.7 Antecedents of Employee Engagement

This section comprises of antecedents of employee engagement like empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics and its relationship with outcome variables in terms of previous researcher studies.

2.7.1 Empowering Leadership and its relationship with outcome variables

The highly conducive competitive business demands for prominent performance have obliged the workforce and leaders to formulate and regulate their work attitudes and policies commensurate with the globally changing geo-political scenario which have, eventually, influenced the international economic conditions (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Takeuchi, Tesluk, Yun, & Lepak, 2005).

All research studies investigating leadership were patented at to 1930s era (Hunt, 1996). Earlier, all researchers remained focused on exploring and identifying traits of successful leaders. Extensive criticism on trait-related studies compelled researchers to shift their focus from trait to behavioral approaches for leadership style investigation (Stodgill, 1948, Hemphill and Coons, 1957). Ultimately, trait and behavioral approaches have been probing the one best possible way of leading employees rather considering important role of situational factors, which play important role in defining effectiveness of a leadership
(Mullins, 1999). This was the key limitation that led to study sensitive leadership styles through “situational” and “contingency” theories of leadership (House, 1971).

Recently, the idea of empowerment entrusted, either to employee or leadership, has gained a popular consideration of researchers and practitioners since its inception in the literature (Spreitzer, 1995; Srivastava et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2011; Lorinkova et al., 2013). The notion of empowering leadership has been recognized, and has emerged side by side with research investigations on “supportive leadership” introduced by Bowers & Seashore (1966), authority delegating behaviors, employee involvement and coaching highlighted in “situational leadership theory” introduced by Hersey & Blanchard (1969), and lastly “participative leadership” presented by Locke & Schweiger (1979). Later on, researchers (Wallace et al., 2011 & Maynard et al., 2012), having interest in empowering leadership, applied two different theoretical viewpoints, structural empowerment perspective and motivational perspective to study its effectiveness and usefulness. The first approach regarding “structural empowerment perspective” emphasizes on involvement of employees in allocation authorities, distribution of work and responsibilities among workers and subordinates which was deliberated in detail by Conger & Kanungo (1988) and Leach et al., (2003). They further explained the second approach, the motivational perspective focuses on “individual perceived empowerment, self-efficacy and self-determination”. Incorporating aforesaid two different theoretical viewpoints, Zhang and Bartol (2010) theorized leaders’ empowerment very differently and purified it in term of a practice rater a structural phenomenon, wherein, organizational leaders or managers assign and transfer their partial powers to subordinates as an effort to enrich their motivation to perform their job more effectively while performing their job activities. It may be presumed that the outcome of behaviors, regarding empowering leadership, comprises developing work meaningfulness in employees, promoting employee involvement in decision-making, giving them autonomy as compared to bureaucratic leadership style and expressing high level confidence in their optimal performance.

Empowering leadership is all about leader’s empowering behavior directed towards employees, in terms of delegating his/her authority to take self-directed decisions
independently, based on shared information, asking for their valued inputs and coaching them for required productive outcomes (Chen et al., 2007). The two modes of explaining empowering leadership, some authors explain their point of view slightly different. According to their point of view, there are two streams while defining empowering leadership; one is behavioral and other one is conceptualization. Behavior-oriented empowering leadership comprises leaders having senior positions, status and subsequent authority in their companies who motivate their staff members to share their views, creative thinking, disseminate relevant information, shared decision making along with encouraging teamwork at workplace (Arnold et al., 2000; Chen et al., 2011). Conceptualization-oriented empowering leadership includes motivational-related effects through power sharing and autonomy. There is a mutual consensus of researchers to measure empowering leadership on the basis of leader’s behavior (Srivastava et al., 2006). It has been reported in the prior research studies that effects of empowering leadership are mostly influential, beneficial and produce desirable outcomes (Zhang & Bartol, 2010; Chen et al., 2007, Yun et al., 2006) Cheong, Spain, Yammarino, & Yun, (2016) while explaining two facets of empowering leadership, pointed out that leaders with empowering approach, facilitate employees to come out of their indolent attitudes, enhance and realize their self-responsibilities, take high risks and render themselves answerable for their performances (Yun, Cox, & Sims, 2006).

Managing the contemporary and demanding organizational context, workforce and leaders are hopefully required to engage themselves in such behaviors that should be adoptive as well as proactive beyond ongoing and formal working roles and behaviors (Martin et al., 2013). Empowerment culture has made employees more self-responsible and more empowered to take their job-related decisions, which has increased their work roles effectiveness and encouraged them for proactive behaviors (Martin et al., 2013; Cheong, Spain, Yammarino and Yun, 2016).

It is imperative to focus on role’s consensus, along with expected discrepancies that may affect employee engagement at work, as a role, being an essential element of Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement. Kahn (1990), based on the role theory, elaborated the contribution of employee’s self for a specific job role to achieve high level of employee
work engagement. Precisely, as Kahn (1990) described that an employee could be completely engaged when he feels fully attentive, focused, absorbed in his job role performance conforming to three conditions of physical, cognitive, and emotional involvement, and when he harnessed his self in the particular work role (Kahn, 1992: 322). The role theory also explains workplace attitudes and suggests that mental tension is the primary cause of uncertainties relevant to job expectations affecting the employee’s competence and resultant job effectiveness (Kahn et al., 1964). Based on these arguments, it may be presumed that employee engagement at workplace increases with high level of LMX agreement between the manager and the worker that could facilitate workers to be more attentive, energetic, integrated, connected and focused on their job roles. Spreitzer (1995) explained psychological empowerment in a different way, and studied employee/human’s cognitive assessment about their selves in the context of job role that might develop intrinsic motivation among them. He specified four core components of empowerment comprising the following:

(i) Meanings that support the understanding of purpose regarding employee’s job,
(ii) Competence that characterizes the employee’s self-capacity to deliver or self-efficacy,
(iii) Self-determination characterized by employee’s perception of autonomy or power to perform job activities without getting influenced by the system norms
(iv) Impact that an employee can produce, influence and affect a large working environments or system.

Using this four-factor composition of empowerment, Stander and Rothmann (2010), in their empirical study, validated the Spreitzer (1995) work of empowerment, in association with employee engagement. They argued that “meaning” acted as one of the core and actual stimulus for employee engagement as termed in Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement, whereas, “meaning” was referred to items of UWES engagement measurement scale in terms of dedication construct, which was another facet/aspect of employee engagement. Similarly, availability component of Kahn’s (1990) engagement
work was mainly related to competence. On the other hand, Macey and Schneider (2008) studied empowerment and investigated it, in connection with employee engagement by considering empowerment being the key factor to influence employee engagement. Stander and Rothmann (2010) empirically established positive connotation between “empowerment and employee work engagement”. In the perspective of research of Kahn (1990 & 1992) on employee engagement, it is revealed by May et al. (2004) that perceived supportive manager relations at workplace were positively linked and correlated with employee engagement which was mediated by one of Kahn’s psychological condition i.e. safety. Accordingly, “supportive supervisor relationships”, as well as “coworker relations and coworker norms”, attributed to the environment, wherein, employees could feel secure and free to engage completely in their work. On the other hand, Saks (2006) in his research study also observed a positive association of “supervisor support and engagement”.

Additionally, Ahearne et al. (2005) investigated empowering leadership behavior with respect to 231 female salesforce of a pharmaceutical company, side by side, its relationship with sales performance. They revealed that employees having less job knowledge got much better benefits from the empowering leader’s behavior than employees having high job knowledge and experience. Ahearne et al. (2005) argued that sales-persons having superior job knowledge and substantial length of service adopted routine manners to perform their jobs, resultantly, they were less affected by job empowerment with only meager managerial benefits. On the other hand, employees possessing comparatively less job knowledge were highly inspired by their leaders’ empowering behavior and showing trust in their talent to perform jobs at their own. In formulating the concept of leadership empowering behavior, they explained four fundamental points of the concept, one ; emphasis on worth of work/job, two; employee involvement in day-to-day decision making, three; encouraging employees for high output and finally removing workplace constraints that might emanate from the bureaucracy. Atwater & Brett (2006) discussed in their research study regarding leaders’ behaviors and its influence on subordinates’ attitude followed by 360-feedback technique. They stated that there were many work-related factors, which affected employees’ behaviors, like: satisfaction, engagement and turnover intentions. Their
results showed that employee engagement was a phenomenon that contained items in its measuring scale that were directly affected by changes in leaders’ behavior. They further suggested to explore the different relationships in terms of leaders’ behavior, approach and consequent changes in employees’ attitude and performance.

Zhang and Bartol (2010), while referring to the work on empowerment defined the empowering leadership “practice of maintaining such flexible working conditions, without limitations or constraints, that promoted power sharing and highlighted the importance of job to employees along with job autonomy, specifically, for making decisions and complete reliance on employees’ skills”. Shuck et al., (2011) also confirmed the critical role and requisite training of leaders, managers and supervisors in developing better congenial working conditions, directly linked with employee engagement, whereas, Harter et al., (2002) and Lloyd (2008) noticed distinct and substantial influence of employees’ supervisors and their discretionary efforts on employee engagement in their research findings. Xu and Thomas, (2011) studied the link and accompaniment between leadership behaviors and employee engagement and verified that leadership behavior and engagement were related to each other. They scrutinized the direct link of leadership behaviors and followers’ engagement and confirmed the positive relationship in the correlation analysis with R-value of 0.35. Matta et al., (2015) studied the influential role of leaders in relevance to their subordinates’ perceptions regarding employees’ behavior and their subsequent motivation using Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) and Role Theory when both leaders and subordinates asserted on quality of LMX. Analyzing dyad relationship of 280 leaders and subordinates, when leaders and subordinates, both, displayed substantial LMX agreement at every level of their relationship, results of regression analysis, confirmed maximum employee engagement and OCB in the above-mentioned dyads.

Previous literature on management and leadership concept, the key role of leaders and managers in prompting employee’s empowerment has been persistently acknowledged by researchers (Martin et al., 2013). Empowering leaders encourage their employees to change their sluggish working mindsets, initiate risks, develop in their behavior of self-responsibilities and make them answerable and accept liabilities of subsequent outcomes
(Yun, Cox, & Sims, 2006). Precisely, it should be admitted that empowering leadership is all about a set of leader’s behaviors in terms of power-sharing, allocation of job responsibilities, shifting power and autonomy to employees through work meaningfulness, showing confidence in their improved performance and promoting employees’ own decisive competence (Ahearne et al., 2005; Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014). Moreover, the role theory (Kahn et al. 1964) describes that additional work assignments and enlarged job responsibilities, ascribed by the higher management/leaders, adversely affect the employee’s role perceptions, eventually, develop role stress, which compel employees for extra role performance (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970).

Erkutlu & Chafra (2013) conducted a research study on employees of 600 banking sector in Turkey and investigated role of empowering leadership in improving and maximizing employee engagement level. Their results reported positive relationship between empowering leadership and engagement. Amundsen and Martinsen (2014) defined leadership empowerment as intrinsic motivation for employees through power sharing and developmental support. Influencing followers, through transferring power downward for decision-making, is the core and unique aspect of empowering leadership (Amundsen and Martinsen, 2014). Kim M. and Beehr T (2018) stated that numerous research studies have explored leadership with in-depth and critical reviews and contributed literature of leadership with many well-established styles to deal with subordinates. They argued that when empowering leadership style was introduced, developed and measured then it was essential to examine and compare its various relationship and differences with other leadership styles as it was found to have positive relationship with transformational leadership style and Leader-Member-Exchange theory as noticed by Amundsen and Martinsen (2014). As far as its discriminant validity is concerned, it has been revealed in the factor analysis that empowering leadership has similar relationship with other leadership styles just like other styles have among them that highlights, how it is empirically distinguishable from other styles (Arnold et al., 2000, Tekleab et al., 2008; Amundsen and Martinsen, 2014).
Cheong et al., (2016) in their research article referred to many research studies, wherein, researchers argued about the empowering leadership construct inline with other leadership constructs, like supportive leadership given by Bowers & Seashore (1966), situational leadership theory given by Hersey & Blanchard (1969) covering “employee’s coaching, involvement, power delegating behaviors, participative leadership (Locke & Schweiger, 1979), super leadership (Manz & Sims, 1989), and then individualized leadership having the support of self-worth of followers (Dansereau et al., 1995”).

Research on empowering leadership concludes with the belief that it is very beneficial and result-oriented for desirable positive outcomes (Yun et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2007; Vecchio et al., 2010; Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Vecchio et al. (2010) explained, how empowering leadership produced positive effects on followers’ performance showing signs of reduced followers’ resistance. Empowering leadership reflects such behaviors and attitudes, which endow employees to feel free to implement self-directed and autonomous decisions at workplace by means of shared information from leaders and mentors (Chen et al., 2007). In the rapidly changing business practices and expanding complex nature of work due to growth of flattening organizations worldwide, leaders have been constrained to depend on employees and teamwork, thereby, increasing the interest of business researchers and practitioners to explore and implant the empowering leadership (Arnold et al., 2000; Seibert et al., 2004). Business revolution through globalization adopting the modern technologies, increased costs to avail better resources, have vitalized the role of leadership more challenging and critical (Murphy, 2002). Moreover, scholarly evidence and practical indications validate that business enterprises and groups; pursuing the empowerment approach, perform better than their competitors which still rely on traditional practices (Wirthman, 2014). Therefore, the contemporary workplace settings have been necessitated to implement and adhere to empowering leadership practices so as to engage and adjust employees suitably well in their job roles for achieving maximum performance. Saks and Gruman (2014) while exploring the concept of employee engagement acknowledged empowering leadership being an significant antecedent of employee engagement.
Wu & Chen (2015) found positive association between empowering leadership and service performance. Sharma & Kirkman (2015) investigated empowering leadership differently and deliberated about the construct of empowering leadership in terms of its antecedents and emerging consequences, whether positive or negative. While discussing the individual level positive outcomes of the empowering leadership, Sharma & Kirkman (2015) argued that empowering leadership was positively associated to employee’s commitment, job satisfaction, effective job commitment, organizational commitment and employee engagement. They further discussed that empowering leadership was positively linked with employee’s in-role and extra-role behaviors. Erkutlu & Chafra (2015) studied the impact of empowering leadership on followers’ work engagement through mediation effect of self-efficacy and followers’ identification with the leader, and observed that both variables were positive and significantly related to each other. Stander (2016) while investigating the role of leader’s empowering behavior, employee’s psychological empowerment and work engagement in predicting the turnover intension of school teachers employed in 147 schools of South Africa, found positive relationship among the variables. Employees having psychological empowerment with leaders’ empowering behavior were found more engaged at job (Nel, Stander & Latif, 2015; Klerk & Stander, 2014). Sapna and Rizvi (2016), in their research study tried to explore the employee engagement predictors and their relationship with leadership style through 340 workers of a services sector. The results thus ascertained a significant relation and influence of age and education as moderators on the relationship of employee engagement and the leading style. They deduced positive relationship between employee engagement and transformational leadership style highlighted the perceptive importance of employee engagement, not only in academic research, but also, improved supportive HRM practices at workplace in order to attain employee’s productivity. Park et al., (2017) investigated the role of empowering leadership in fostering the employee job engagement and well-being after conducting a survey study of 400 employees selected randomly from 8 big firms of South Korea by using structural equation modeling. Results of correlation analysis reported that empowering leadership, psychological capital and the employee job engagement were related to each other. Results of SEM analysis showing beta value of 0.23, p< 0.01 demonstrated positive relationship between empowering leadership and job
engagement. Park et al., (2017) while discussing findings of results, highlighted the direct relationship of leaders’ empowering behavior with their followers’ job engagement. They stressed the importance of fostering empowerment factor in the employee job engagement as a positive psychological driving force.

While examining empowering leadership and its impact on employee performance, Hao, He, and Long, (2017) recommended to investigate other effective mechanisms, like: relationship between empowering leadership and subsequent positive effects; like engagement. Behrendt, Matz, and Göritz, (2017) presented an integrated model of leadership behavior while discussing task-oriented behaviors and relation-oriented behaviors. They labeled empowering leadership as being an interaction style known as relation-oriented leadership style. They argued that leaders having relation-oriented style foster and develop the individual engagement at workplace. Li, Chiaburu, and Kirkman, (2017) stated that empowering leadership is the key that unlocks employees’ citizenship behaviors. Seibert, Wang, and Courtright (2011) in their meta-analysis observed positive and significant effect of empowering leadership on individual performance and OCB, which demonstrated as how empowering behavior of leader elicited OCB in employees.

Bailey et al., (2017) believed that research studies, on engagement, reported positive relationship among various leadership styles, like: charismatic, transformational, ethical, authentic, and empowering leadership and employee engagement. Kim et al., (2018), in a meta-analysis discussed that empowering leadership was not similar to other leadership styles like transactional, transformational and directive leadership as factor analyses had revealed their dissimilarity (Pearce et al., 2003). They divulged that empowering leadership was a distinct leadership style not only conceptually but also empirically, as reported by many other researchers (Kim et al. 2018; Arnold et al., 2000; Ahearne et al., 2005; Zhang & Bartol, 2010; Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014a). Therefore, many researchers claimed that empowering leadership was a highly effective leadership style for organizations and employees, both, because of its favorable effects as it developed intrinsic motivation for job satisfaction, creativity, employee engagement and ultimately required employee performance (Amundsen & Martinson, 2015; Zhang & Zhou, 2014). Ali, Lei, Jie & Rahman (2018) while investigating empowering leadership behavior in
context of employee performance speculated that this type of managing style acted as a catalyst for prosperity of banking employees to yield better performance-related outcomes. Lee, willis and Tian (2018) in meta-analysis focusing on mediation and moderation models, observed positive and significant influence of empowering leadership on both individual and team level performance and organizational citizenship behavior. Cheong, Yammarino, Dionne, Spain and Tsai, (2018) determined positive relationship between empowering leadership and individual performance and OCB.

Based on the aforesaid discussion and following of SET, regarding relationship between “empowering leadership, employee engagement, service performance and OCB”, it is expected that empowering leadership would be a key aspect in order to explain employee engagement, service performance and OCB, so as, appended below hypotheses are proposed:

H1: “Empowering leadership is positively related to employee engagement”.

H2: “Empowering leadership is positively related to employee service performance”.

H3: “Empowering leadership is positively related to organizational citizenship behavior”.

2.7.2 Psychological Capital & and its relationship with outcome variables

With the emergence and necessitation of contemporary developing economic demands, considerable research on psychological capital has recognized this personality feature as a multifarious construct, which generates significant impact on other related constructs in relation to positive psychology, suchlike: employees job satisfaction, employee wellbeing, employee commitment, employee engagement and employee performance (Lorenz, Beer, Pütz, Heinitz, 2016). Employee recruitment and development practices have undergone radical changes in the prevalent highly competitive and dynamic business environments stressing organizations to focus on employees’ possessing positive psychological capital (Luthans, Luthans, & Luthans, 2004).
The emerging contributory notion of psychological capital, in the contemporary business research, is fundamentally inter-linked, which stems up from the theories of positive psychology and its relevant research on the subject (Peterson & Seligman, 2004; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Luthans and Youssef (2007) studied the psychological capital and asserted that it comprised workers’ psychological resources and their capacities that were mostly positive of enduring nature. In a research study, Luthans, Norman, Avolio, & Avey (2008) expressed their views on psychological capital, as a phenomenon, that encouraged employees to put their self-directed inspirations to focus on set organizational goals which ultimately affected their performance and positive work behaviors along with attitudes like highly engaged extra roles behaviors. On the other hand, Avey, Luthans, & Youssef, (2010) in an extended research article on the psychological capital, noticed decreasing trends in organizational cynicism, turnover intention and employees’ adverse workplace behaviors. Karatepe & Talebzadeh, (2016) in their investigation labeled psychological capital as personality variable or personal resource among flight attendants employed in an airline which grasped empirical attention of service-related job nature (Jung and Yoon, 2015). Mills et al. (2013) submitted arguments about various research studies, which revealed and confirmed positive relationship of psychological capital with employee-related outcomes, but having a little practical and significant utilization (p-160). Sweetman et al. (2011) criticized that previous researchers analyzed five components of psychological capital independently in terms of their relationships or impact, but now, researchers emphasize to investigate further and focus their attention on their collective effects (Chen and Lim, 2012; Karatepe and Karadas, 2014). Psychological capital comprises four core dimensions of employee’s capacity depending on their psychological resources described as under:

(i) Efficacy
(ii) Optimism
(iii) Hope
(iv) Resilience.
Efficacy may be defined as “employee’s personal confidence or belief in his/her self-abilities and competence to execute the given task/job successfully through mobilization of his/her level of personal work motivation and employee cognitive resources” characterized in the perspective of Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1997; Stajkovich & Luthans, 1998). Employees perceive and encounter a number of hurdles and problems in pursuing their assigned tasks, but the high level of motivation encourages them to accept the challenges confronting their capabilities to accomplish the task successfully (Bandura, 1997; Stajkovich & Luthans, 1998). The belief in self-efficacy develops such abilities in individuals to organize their-selves in a rational way to deliver, and ultimately acquire anticipated results. (Consiglio et al., 2016). Subsequently, self-efficacious people show confidence and rely on self-capabilities to attain and yield perceived outputs by utilizing their energies persistently to complete their set goals, irrespective of facing a lot of troubles, to achieve and satisfy their objectives under stressful situations (Consiglio et al., 2016; Stajkovich and Luthans, 1998).

It has been observed that most academic researchers scrutinize self-efficacy as a moderating variable in relationship to stressors and strain (Salanova et al., 2010), whereas, some researchers have focused on its direct impact as a predictor, and also as a mediating role in studying employee work engagement. Xanthopoulou et al., (2007) observed that “self-efficacy and optimism” predominantly, proceeded to enhance employees work engagement. Pati and Kumar (2010) studied the role of self-efficacy, related to enhancing subsequent employee engagement by applying it to a sample of 200 Indian software programmers, and found significant correlation among the variables, whereas, results ($r^2=0.229$, $p < 0.05$) established that self-efficacy was the predictor of employee engagement.

Chen & Shou (2016) perused self-efficacy and work engagement differently, and considered “self-efficacy as a personal resource in the context of creativity” which established supportive results regarding influence of inventive self-efficacy on engagement. Chen & Shou (2016) included the personal resource in the JD-R model and found that self-efficacy could be a core aspect of individual work engagement.
validating the opinion of various researchers for covering personal resources in the model of JD-R framework. Joo et al., (2016) studied psychological capital and its components in association with employee engagement, and identified that self-efficacy was a noticeable influencing factor in relationship to enhance engagement.

With respect to the above discussion, Consiglio et al., (2016) stated that self-efficacy was a motivational construct involving a number of motivational qualities that stimulate energy for taking steps to accomplish a job, guide and direct individuals’ efforts, appreciate and encourage them to remain persistent. Van et al., (2011) in their research study argued that there was a significant affects of employee self-efficacy regarding work engagement with moderation effect of intrinsic motivation. Liu, Cho and Putra (2017) in their research study, conducted on USA based restaurants, relevant to moderating effect of self-efficacy on employee work engagement, and recommended to regulate extensive exploration of employee engagement with respect to individual psychological differences, and empirical verification of direct influence of employee self-efficacy on engagement in various industrial/business settings. Carter, Nesbit, Badham, Parker and Sung (2018) connected aspect of self-efficacy with employee engagement and scrutinized their influence on job performance by applying appropriate HR practices and collected data from service sector workforce. They reported 12% improvement in performance of employees in terms of their target that they achieved when they were found highly engaged.

Karatepe, Ozturk and Kim (2019) conducted a research on the front-line employee working at banks of Russia in order to investigate employee engagement, and other outcomes, for example: in-role and extra-role performance, by evaluating the role of self-efficacy as personal resource and family support. They collected the data applying follow-through techniques of “time-lagged”, by which, data was collected at different time-intervals. They tested direct and indirect relationships to determine the authenticity of the proposed hypotheses and resultantly concluded that self-efficacy of front-line employees was the pivotal core factor as a positive resource, which motivated them to stimulate their positive emotions and utilize expertise for acquisition of the assigned object-oriented tasks. Front-line employees, having advance level of self-efficacy were
observed to be more engaged as compare to others who were identified to process lower level of self-efficacy. Besides, researchers observed that engagement acted as a strong mediator in the relationship while examining impact of self-efficacy on in-role and extra-role performance of front-line employees.

Based on research studies, discussed regarding self-efficacy, it might be perceived that individuals exhibiting self-efficacy behavior would be more energetic, self-directed, self-motivated, possessed high level of enthusiasm and more focused towards their responsibilities with preservative determined approach.

2.7.2.2 Optimism

Optimism, derived from the Latin word *optimum*, is the second dimension of psychological capital, conceded as the mental attitude of an employee based on his positive thinking. It is the perception or expectation of the best possible output by a person in any prevalent situation on the basis of personal belief of human beings that future occurrences would favorably happen on the positive side (Seligman, 1998). Scheirer and Carver (1985) stated that optimism is a source of energy that develops motivation to the expect best possible future outcomes from the existing situation. Optimistic employees anticipate best possible positive results in any situation, irrespective of their ability and capacity to achieve them, whereas, employees in case of self-efficacy, expect the best possible results having confidence on their own skills and abilities. They further elaborate that when something adverse happens unexpectedly to the optimistic people at any stage, it is the innate quality and mental approach of the optimists which always stimulates and encourages them to persevere and accept new challenges. Luthans et al., (2006) explained optimism as employees’ psychological attitude that empowers them to take the past situation as easy-going, the present situation as challenging and appreciable, and hopefully, foresee encouraging future opportunities. For that reason, people endowed with optimistic attributes, anticipate positive results and move ahead with expectations of the best possible results. Joo et al., (2016) studied psychological capital and its components, in association with employee engagement, and concluded that optimism was definitely one of the main influencing factors in enhancing engagement.
2.7.2.3 **Hope**

Hope is the third dimension of psychological capital of employees, which may be defined by Snyder et al., (2002) as “a person’s optimistic mental approach or attitude motivated to pursue and focus on job goals displaying firm belief and dependence on his own capabilities to acquire the desired job objectives”. They further stated that hope develops a sense of agency/compulsion in the human mind as motivational reinforcement to develop and adopt active pursuit of required pathways towards goal accomplishment. Snyder et al., (2002) further argued about the construct of hope and stated that the component of individual’s willpower and agency feelings provide motivational encouragement to achieve desired goals, whereas, other pathway components stimulate the individual to move ahead and explore new avenues and alternative solutions to actualize ambitions while facing many hindrances. Finally, agency thinking is a sort of motivation to achieve goals, whereas, pathway thinking is based on the planning to achieve set objectives for developing a positive spirit necessary to augment individual’s willpower and determination to deal with obstacles and take up alternative suitable methodology, accordingly, for accomplishment of desired goals (Snyder et al., 2002). Peterson and Luthan (2003) observed that hope was a significant predictor of organizational performance. Joo et al., (2016) studied psychological capital and its facets with reference to employee engagement, and concluded that hope was a significant contributory component for enhanced engagement.

2.7.2.4 **Resilience**

Luthans (2002) speculated resilience as the fourth important dimension of psychological capital and described it as employees’ mental attitude/reaction in the form of exuberant adaptation or recovery in case of failure or when, facing adverse situation. Failure means trauma, threats, tragedy, overstress linked with workplace or family affairs, health-related issues, and financial problems. It is the individual’s capacity to confront courageously with any mishap technically, and face the grave failure situation utilizing the positive mental approach, ultimately developing persistence to counter failure or bad experience, that in return, provides him learning opportunities and appropriate feedback for future progressive growth (Luthan, 2002). Resilience is the combination of reactive and
proactive approach. In case of reactive situation, the individual acknowledges failures, setbacks, difficult experiences, and eventually enables him/herself to invest maximum time and energy along with other available resources to deal with the setbacks. On the other hand, in case of proactive approach, the individual considers the setbacks as learning opportunities to develop and groom him/herself in a challenging way to become proactive (Sutcliffe & Vogus, 2003; Youssef & Luthans, 2005). In a research study, regarding banking employees in the service industry, psychological capital is considered to be a central contributory factor in their job role. Wrzesniewski & Dutton (2001) highlighted that the bank employees who engage themselves in various repetitive tasks or low-skilled jobs also understand the definite meaning of their job roles. It may be pertinent to mention that service employees having high level of psychological capital possess self-directed inspiration regardless of any intrinsic or extrinsic rewards plus without anticipation of any appreciation.

Conclusively, in the service industry, working environments, like banks, a close viable interaction between customers and employees exists for providing routine banking services exposing the employees to a critical situation to manage and carefully express their emotions to customers while delivering services by obeying prescribed rules (Grandey et al., 2005). Sihag & Sarikwal (2014) studied the connection between psychological capital and employee engagement, conducting a survey on 420 employees of IT companies based in India, using factor analysis, regression analysis and structural equation model. Results of regression analysis showed positive and significant relationship between psychological capital and employee engagement, eventually, revealing that employees having high level of psychological capital in terms of resilience, confidence, rebound capability and hope were regarded to be highly engaged at work.

Avey et al., (2011) in a meta-analysis differentiated psychological capital, vis - a - vis, its relation to employee’s attitudes, work behaviors and performance, whether desirable or otherwise, to materialize demanding objectives of an organization. They stated that earlier research studies coincided with positive relationship of psychological capital favorably with desired employees work attitudes. Employees having greater psychological capital optimistically aspire for positive aspects at the workplace.
(Optimism), belief of desired accomplishment (Self-efficacy and hope), and accordingly, encouraging attitude of seniors or leaders when they suffer from any setback (resilience) comparatively to those employees who possess lower level of psychological capital. Definitely, employees having high psychological capital are expected to be enthusiastically energetic about their engagement at job.

Nandan and Azim (2015) in a research study examined the Psychological capital as a mediator between justice (“distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice”) and organizational citizenship behavior and observed it positive and significant mediator which indicated that psychological capital was an important factor that transformed justice factor in to enhanced organizational citizenship behavior of employees. Joo et al., (2016) studied the contributory role of psychological capital in improving employee work engagement in the Korean perspective based on a research study conducted on 750 employees of a large corporation having multi-dimensional businesses. Joo et al., (2016) found positive relationship (r=0.76) between psychological capital and engagement, whereas, it was noticed that psychological capital was the predominant influencing factor to increase employees’ engagement at job ($\Delta R^2 = 0.46$). You (2016) in his research study, relating to 490 students of a Korean College, using SEM analysis on research instrument of Yoo (2004), deliberated psychological capital, combined with learning empowerment, and students’ engagement in the perspective of their involvement in learning process so as to assess their cognitive efforts and behavioral participation along with emotional contribution aimed at their assigned occupation. Results of the correlation analysis confirmed that all the above-mentioned variables were positively related and the level of students’ psychological capital enhanced their engagement through learning empowerment. You (2016) studied and revealed psychological capital as a significant antecedent of engagement which needed important consideration in the future research work. Based on “JD-R model and COR theory”, Karatepe & Talebzadeh (2016) investigated the psychological capital among 200 flight attendants of a private airline delivering services in Iran versus its relationship with employees work engagement. Eventually, they found a positive and significant relationship between the variables.
Amish and Singh (2017), while investigating the role of psychological capital in predicting employee engagement in a research study, conducted in private sector organization on sample size of 215 workers highlighted the contributory role of psychological resources in managing them attracted much recognition in the academic research. They indicated that employee engagement had become the focal point for the organizations and psychological capital could be beneficial to enhance it. Results of their research studies found a significant positive correlation among all dimensions of psychological capital, like: “hope, optimism, resilience and self-efficacy” significantly positively correlated to “physical engagement, emotional engagement, cognitive engagement” and, eventually, overall employees engagement that led to improved performance.

Gupta & Shaheen (2017) investigated moderation impact of psychological capital on the relationship of work engagement and turnover intension, and reported that employees with high level of psychological capital would be more engaged at workplace without any turnover intensions.

While arguing about positive effects of psychological capital on employees’ related outcomes, Kim et al., (2017) supported the opinions of researchers that psychological capital increased employees engagement (Park et al., 2015 and Min et al., 2015). Adopting JD- R model, Wang et al., (2017) studied the relationship between psychological capital and work engagement ascribed to 1330 Chinese female nurses. They maintained psychological capital as personal resource and found positive correlation between nurses’ psychological capital and work engagement. Similarly, according to Luthans and Youssef-Morgan (2017), Psychological Capital Intervention (PCI) model speculated employee engagement as high-level performance outcome of psychological capital. Luthans and Youssef-Morgan (2017) discussed about the overall positivity at workplace and role of leaders in facilitating and developing positive culture (Youssef-Morgan & Stratman 2016). They pointed out many dominant obstacles and hindrances in the promotion and maintenance of positivity at workplace, such as, abusive leadership, organizational politics and rampant negative organizational culture. They emphasized to recognize, consider and evaluate people as one of the furthermost essential
assets of an organization. Belief in employees’ worth, desire to exploit and develop employees’ potential skills, core strengths and requisite psychological resources were the main constituent factors in the development of psychological capital. Luthans and Youssef-Morgan (2017) argued that psychological capital was an evidence-based approach for those leaders who believed about importance of human capital and stressed to support and educate employees and themselves for the sake of maintaining positivity at workplace to get maximum productivity as a result of employee engagement, not in terms of organizational outcomes, but also as individual effects (P-359). Luthans and Youssef-Morgan (2017) while writing novel applications, future recommendations and summing up the article, suggested to explore it further with respect to its measurement, antecedents, outcomes and cross-cultural studies. Bailey et al. (2017), in a narrative review of employee engagement pointed out that 52 research studies explored the psychological state of employees involving its consequences, while studying engagement. Psychological states, like self-efficacy, resilience, employee’s personal resources attracted notable attention of researchers because of their positivity related to employee engagement, whereas 6 out of 52 studies established positive relationship between optimism and engagement. Young, Glerum, Wang, and Joseph (2018) scrutinized research studies conducted during last 20 years and specified that all factors related to employees, management, workplace or job-itself studied in association of employee engagement were important to examined but employees personality traits remained the utmost elements that directed employee to get them engaged or not, in which, positive affectivity was considered the highly influential aspect to develop emotions of engagement. In extension to research of Paek et al., (2015) on psychological capital, Kang and Busser (2018) while considering employees of hotel industry conducted research to inspect that critical role of psychological capital along with office-climate in forecasting employee engagement, wherein, they designed to evaluated moderating effect of firm hierarchy on the relationship by following SET. They reported that both office-climate and psychological capital were found to be highly influential and contributory factor to boost the employee engagement.

Kang & Busser (2018), while examining impact of psychological capital on employee engagement found that both variables were positively related to each other. Plessis &
Boshoff (2018) explored psychological capital as an antecedent to work engagement and found positive relation among the variables. They suggested that improving psychological capital of employees would be a potential element to enhance their levels of work engagement. Alessandri et al. (2018) while studying the influence of “psychological capital on work engagement and job performance”, affirmed that increase in psychological capital (“self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience”) ultimately improved the level of work engagement that in turn motivated higher performance level. McDowell, Huang & Caza (2018), while following the measuring scale adopted by Rich et al., (2010) for examining employee engagement, investigated the influential role of authentic leadership on psychological capital and engagement. They reported positive association between psychological capital and employee engagement (r=0.74). Luthans and Youssef-Morgan (2017), reported high-level individual performance as an outcome of positive psychological capital. Bakker et al., (2012) observed work engagement as predictor of task performance and OCB, both. Ugur and Esen (2018) stated that employees’ behaviors and attitudes had been under great debate for their positive or negative impact on performance either in-role or extra role. In their research study, they investigated job performance by examining role of psychological capital and organizational justice in enhancing performance. Their results indicated that psychological capital was the most influential factor for employee performance.

On the basis of aforesaid thorough discussion about psychological capital, it can be hopefully expected that psychological capital (“Self-efficacy, Hope, Resilience and Optimism”) would be related to employee engagement, services performance of the employees and their outcome extra-role behaviors like OCB (Bailey et al., 2017, Luthans and Youssef-Morgan 2017, Wang et al., 2017, Joo et al., 2016). Conclusively, this research study by following SET, suggests that psychological capital would be the key factor in order to explain employee related outcome behaviors like engagement, service performance and OCB along be appended proposed hypotheses:

H4: “Psychological capital is positively related to employee engagement”.

H5: “Psychological capital is positively related to employee service performance”.
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H6: “Psychological capital is positively related to organizational citizenship behavior”.

2.7.3 Job Characteristics and its relationship with outcome variables

The professional job-oriented activities of bank employees are multi-dimensional, challenging, multi-tasking, complex and customers-based delimiting a number of unpredictable internal and external factors, like: acquisitions, mergers, rightsizing, downsizing, changing latest modern technology, State Bank’s policies, financial crises, etc. Extensive focus on globalization, economic developments, tough market competitions, emerging technologies and workplace diversities have intensively increased responsibilities of bank employees manifold (Green, 2008), and to this effect, the banking sector has been playing its pertinent substantial role in the economic growth of the country besides various other major changes.

Researchers have been advocating the importance of work-design related issues since the time of Taylor (1911) to Hackman and Oldham (1975) who studied the work-design in terms of motivational aspects and introduced job characteristics theory in the literature. In the theoretical framework, used by Hackman and Oldham, in association with motivational aspects, at that time, it was anticipated that employee’s job-design and its allied characteristics were supposed to be the prime contributors to motivate individuals for achieving high level of their performance at workplace along with their own job satisfaction. Hackman and Oldham (1975) theorized job characteristics indicating two primary objectives:

(i) To study framework of job design keeping in view better job prospects,
(ii) To monitor/observe any changes or improvements effectuated by the aforesaid job redesign.

Oldham and Hackman (2010), while giving their opinion on the future of job redesign research, explained their earlier work on job-design in 1975 and dilated on the importance of expectancy theory of motivation (“Edward Lawler, Lyman Porter, and Victor Vroom (Porter & Lawler, 1968; Vroom, 1964”) which encouraged them to explore the essential characteristics of the specific job that enhanced employee’s internal job
motivation. Hackman and Oldham (1975) in their job characteristics theory, categorized “five core characteristics of any job” as under:

(i) Skill variety  
(ii) Task identity  
(iii) Task significance  
(iv) Autonomy  
(v) Feedback

2.7.3.1 Skill Variety

Skill variety is the first dimension of job characteristics theory, which encompasses utilization of employees’ diverse skills and potential talents needed at workplace to perform assorted activities ascribed to a specific assigned job.

2.7.3.2 Task Identity

Task identity is the second dimension of job characteristics theory, which comprises the amount of work required to be completed, as a whole or partially, having some identifiable quantity/piece of work commencing from beginning to end showing eventual visible positive results.

2.7.3.3 Task Significance

Task significance is the third dimension of job characteristics theory which describes significant and remarkable impact of employee’s job on lives of other people and stakeholders, whether internal or external.

2.7.3.4 Autonomy

Autonomy is the fourth dimension of job characteristics theory, which delimits the extent of ample job freedom, provided to employees with respect to their job activities independently along with substantial discretion to schedule their work procedures accordingly.
2.7.3.5 Feedback

Job-based feedback is the fifth and last dimension of job characteristics theory which divulges clear and direct information regarding work activities performed by workers relatively proportionate to the job, that is, how the job itself offers clear information about the effectiveness of workplace operations and activities pertinent to supervisors and co-workers, who could provide useful feedback on the performance of employees versus job requirements comparable with the people employed in other similar organizations to deduce and reckon conformity.

While discussing Job characteristics, Hackman & Oldham (1975), argued that the first three dimensions belonged to the critical psychological state i.e. “skill variety, task identity and task significance” of the Job characteristics theory, developed meaningfulness of the assigned work/tasks that, ultimately boosted up high internal work/task motivation. Further, they reasoned that the fourth dimension autonomy, developed a sense of responsibility in individuals towards their assigned tasks, which eventually, proved to be a significant contributory factor for raising the level of work performance. Nevertheless, they claimed that the last dimension i.e. feedback was mainly concerned with collecting information regarding employees’ output with respect to their assigned tasks, side by side, subsequent impact on desired organizational outcomes which, consequently, built up the level of employee satisfaction.
After Hackman & Oldham work (1976), researchers are continuously investigating work design and its allied constructs to establish its relationship with work attitudes, like: job satisfaction, job involvement, job commitment, employee engagement, stress, job insecurity, turnover intention, employee performance, OCB, etc. The incessant interest of researchers on work design and job characteristics has established a remarkable link, not only affiliated with individual effects, but, also has assigned to group, team and organizational outcomes. (Wall & Martin, 1987; Parker & Wall, 1998; Morgeson & Campion, 2003).

Over the years, it has been the matter of concern for behavioral scientists and scholars to investigate and explain why and how employees perform their requisite tasks at the workplaces. Introducing a new theory “The Theory of Purposeful Work Behavior”, Barrick et al., (2013) argued that there were various means to discuss and answer this

**Figure 2-3: Job Characteristics Model**

Source: Hackman-Oldham job characteristics model
question raised by the researchers, but all the answers could be identified and covered by their individual characteristics, side-by-side, considering the prevailing situational factors. Individual characteristics consist of individual’s personality features and his/her capacities, whereas, situational factors comprise individual’s job characteristics merged with social context. Barrick et al., (2013) also referred to the concern of behavioral science academic researchers who studied employees’ motivation and resultant work attitudes by examining two distinct determinants; role of individual’s personality and workplace circumstances. Substantial research studies have empirically taken cognizance of the significant role of employees’ dissimilarities bracketed with personality traits, while predicting and exploring employees’ motivation at work and succeeding behavior.

Likewise, ample research studies have empirically confirmed differences at workplace characteristics emanating from Job Re-design, whether enlargement or enrichment. The research work carried out by researchers (Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Humphrey et al., 2007; Turner & Lawrence, 1965) proved a meaningful factor in effectuating and improving the workplace employee motivation and positive behavior. Barrick et al., (2013) assumed that there was no other alternative to study employee behavior other than to envisage the joint impact of aforesaid two elements. Considering the high work pressure of quality and quantity, juxtaposed with job complexity, it may be identified that job burnout and employee disengagement are the fundamental causes of work intensification ( Lewis et al., 2009). On the other hand, as reported, encouraging working conditions, peer and the social support stimulate to balance the work complexity combined with high work pressure resulting in high workplace engagement (Taipale et al., 2011).

Several researchers have stressed in their research studies that Kahn’s (1990) quantitative research findings on employee engagement is widely cited in research articles while studying job design and its virtual characteristics (Rana, Ardichvili & Tkachenko, 2014). As opined by Hackman & Oldham (1980), Kahn (1990) implicated and interpreted the engagement theme, coupled with workers’ relationship among themselves relevant to their tasks/job characteristics. Kahn (1990) in his research study, placed views of other researchers, side by side, who worked on “interpersonal settings
(Bennis, Schein, Berlew, & Steele, 1964; Rogers, 1958), group settings (Bion, 1961; Smith & Berg, 1987), intergroup settings (Alderfer, 1985a), and organizational settings (Hochschild, 1983) which eventually motivated workers and stimulated their sense of meaning at work. The research premise of Kahn (1990) was predicated on two elements; first, employees’ attitude and behavior, which were related to psychological experience of job/task (Hackman & Oldham, 1980), second, some other factors within the work-settings like; “individual, interpersonal, group, intergroup, and organizational” etc. eventually affected these psychological experiences. He affirmed that the psychological experience of employee’s self while performing a specific role, was the actual contributor relating to employee’s motivational behavior to express him/herself.

Parker, Morgeson, & Johns, (2017), while reviewing the research on work design conducted during the last 100 years, asserted that regardless of criticism on job characteristics model (Hackman and Oldham; 1975), JCM has remained a leading and guiding reference for researchers to identify job characteristics and their outcome variables, and has been a predominant model depicting five core job characteristics, concomitant with various behavioral and effective personal and work outcomes.

According to the discussion on the relevant topic, regarding employee engagement, Kahn’s (1990) work on employee engagement is linked with three main psychological conditions denoted as “meaningfulness, safety, and availability” which directly influence the individual’s engagement or disengagement at work. Meaningfulness is related to employee’s personal assessment and evaluation of his worth and usefulness in terms of his/her performance at work which may not be taken for granted (p. 704). Kahn (1990) discussed the influential link of meaningfulness with many job-related factors of an individual, like: task/job characteristics, challenging work along with clearly identified and autonomous role. On the guidelines of Kahn’s (1990) theory, May et al. (2004) recommended in their research findings that meaningfulness, predominantly, plays an effective part in engaging employees at work, and leaders must consider this productive aspect of meaningfulness while devising job roles. Fairlie (2011) studied employee engagement and compared various job characteristics in the context of meaningfulness as how these characteristics affected employee engagement and other business-related
outcomes. Results confirmed the positive correlation between engagement and several other employees-related outcomes; whereas, fluctuation in the job characteristics affected employee engagement accordingly. In an empirical examination of engagement model, based on the study of 102 workers employed on different jobs in many business enterprises, Saks (2006) reported that job characteristics were strong predictors of employee engagement. In another model of employee engagement, speculating the job fitness in the context of individual-job and Individual—organization, Fleck and Inceoglu (2010) suggested that these two factors influenced the individual’s job characteristics. Results of research study carried out by Albrecht (2010) and Gagne and Bhave (2011), demonstrated that employee’s Job autonomy (dimension of job characteristics) was also a significant and weighty determinant in enhancing employee engagement. Crawford et al. (2014) revealed that challenging job, task variety, available job autonomy, substantial rewards and recognition, development opportunities and proper feedback on job outcomes were the remarkable antecedents of enhanced employee engagement. Some research studies empirically confirmed the positive correlation of job feedback and job control/autonomy with engagement (Llorens et al., 2006; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

Job autonomy inculcates and develops a sense of importance of work in the employees who accept ownership of their work activities and ultimate consequences along with control on outcomes (Kahn 1990). Researchers discerned positive relationship among job control/autonomy, job feedback and employee engagement (Xanthopoulou et al., 2009a, Bakker et al., 2011). Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2014) studied the impact of teachers’ self-efficacy combined with their perceived autonomy on their engagement in a survey conducted about 2569 teachers selected from 127 Norwegian elementary and middle level schools. Results shown a positive and strong relationship between autonomy and engagement. Regression analysis showed that teachers’ autonomy was strong predictor of teachers’ engagement. Crawford et al., (2010), in their meta-analysis obtained from a sample of 18000 workers, found positive relationship between autonomy and employee engagement having R-value of 0.37.

Mushtaq (2013) examined job characteristics and its effect on OCB on the sample of telecommunication employees in Pakistan and reported positive and significant
relationship between both variables. Shantz et al., (2013) investigated employee engagement in relationship to “job characteristics as a predictor, and task performance as outcome variable”, in a survey of 671 employees working with a construction firm using an online questionnaire. The correlation analysis confirmed positive linkage of all dimensions relating to job characteristics with employee engagement and same with task performance. Shantz et al., (2013) concluded that high level of employee engagement improved employee performance when business corporations facilitated employees with job characteristics bearing variety, significance, autonomy and feedback. Crawford et al., (2014) discussed in their book about employee engagement and elucidated many significant antecedents including job characteristics. Saks and Gruman (2014) in their research article shared views with other various research studies and many meta-analyses on employee engagement, and interpreted job characteristics as playing an significant role in increasing employee engagement and employee performance (Christian et al., 2011, Crawford et al., 2010, Macey & Schneider, 2008; Saks, 2006). Rana et al., (2014) while working on theoretical model of employee engagement, by focusing on its antecedents, moderators and outcomes and found positive relationship among job characteristics, employee engagement, job performance, turnover intension and OCB. They found that job characteristics was the major and core antecedent of employee engagement.

Alagaraja & Shuck (2015) focused on the productive role of human resource development (HRD) and organizational learning development programs which consolidated employees’ skills and acknowledged those consonant with their job characteristics, concurrent with the existing organizational system to facilitate employee engagement resulting in improved employee performance. They stated that three fundamental elements i.e prevailing organizational systems, individual’s personal attributes and assigned job characteristics represented indicators of the organization – engagement alignment at work. While sharing viewpoint and illustrating the significance of organizational-engagement alignment, Alagaraja & Shuck (2015) suggested to plan and invoke practically possible enablers and eliminate anticipated obstacles confronting performance which employees might face at workplace in aligning and adjusting their skills, knowledge, attributes and characteristics commensurate with their assigned jobs,
requisite criteria, job responsibilities in accordance with laid down organizational procedures, work routines and system. Rai, Ghosh, Chauhan, Mehta, 2017 conducted a research study on 214 employees of the Indian Public Sector banks to observe the relationship between job characteristics and employee engagement with moderation effect of perceived organizational and supervisory support. Results showed positive and significant correlation between job characteristics and engagement having R-value of 0.27. Bailey et al., 2017 in their narrative review of employee engagement referred to the work of Kahn (1990) and Hackman and Oldham (1976) on three psychological conditions and highlighted that task significance, job autonomy and job feedback affected the employee’s psychological conditions, which eventually contributed to employee engagement. Miracle, Ellinger and Franke (2018) examined the engagement level of frontline employees by apply a very novel approach to identify the key influencing factors by collection data from several service sector organizations, like; universities, banks, heath organizations and food Outlets and followed the Kahn framework by applying SET. Secondly, they examined studied variables by exchanging them at different level like, independent, mediators and moderator except dependents variables (“Job and Organizational Engagement”) in order to check their effect on the relationships. They examined employer’s support and client focus once as independent variable and second time as mediating variables to investigate the impact of these variables on the job and organizational relationship, whereas, job design aspects also considered once independent and mediating variables. Their findings concluded that both employer’s support and client focus were the key elements to determine the impact of job design factors on engagement either job or organizational level. Huang, Ma and Meng (2018) investigated High performance work systems (HPWS) and examined its connotation on employees’ response in terms of their mode, satisfaction and engagement level. The concluded that with shifting of timeworn management practices to upgraded management techniques has stressed leaders to consider and implement HPWS. They reported positive impact of HPWS on workers’ mode, which ultimately developed job satisfaction leading to high engagement level at workplace.

Bakker and Albrecht (2018) suggested to resolve this complex situation by scrutinizing the previous research studies on the role of job characteristics combined with employee
engagement, keeping in view, fluctuating job characteristics as independent variable and work engagement as dependent variable. Agarwal and Gupta (2018) examined relationship of job characteristics and work engagement and found positive relationship between them (r = 0.51). Lemmon, Jensen, Wilson, Posig & Thompson (2018), while deliberating engagement and disengagement argued that job characteristics, by virtue of its independent nature is the central component of employee engagement concept. Akingbola and van den Berg (2019) built their research on premise of two well-known researcher in the domain of employee engagement i.e. Kahn and Saks following SET. They investigated antecedents influencing engagement in NPOs organizations and their findings indicated that all consequences were related to behavior of employees like satisfaction, commitment and OCB. They key antecedents of their research study were job characteristics and value concurrence that influenced on consequences through job as well as organizational engagement. They highlighted about the worth of employees’ engagement for employees themselves as well for their employers that how this factor contributed towards the quality of workplace environment and resultant positive, encouraging and attractive job experience to work with peers and perform as per organizational demands, which ultimately reduced their cynicism that led to job burnout. Akingbola and van den Berg (2019) while examining engagement, reckoned the importance and critical role of “employee’s Self” while performing their job roles that adjusted them to disseminate their behavioral output as per available resources.

On the basis of above described discussion, it is determined that job characteristics: “Skill variety, Task Identity, Task significance, Autonomy and Feedback” are related to employee engagement and employee performance and OCB. Conclusively, this research study by following SET, anticipates that aspect of job characteristics would be the key factor in order to explain employee related outcome behaviors like engagement, service performance and OCB and suggests appended proposed hypotheses:

H7: “Job characteristics is positively related to employee engagement”.

H8: “Job characteristics is positively related to employee service performance”.

H9: “Job characteristics is positively related to organizational citizenship behavior”.
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2.8 Consequences of Employee Engagement

2.8.1 Employee Engagement and Employee Service Performance

This part of research thesis encompasses the relevant literature about employee service performance founded on the employee in-role performance, employee job performance and task performance, and its rationale in association with employee engagement as being the essential variable of the research study.

It has been revealed in various empirical research studies that employee engagement and employee task performance, both, at workplace express positive relationship (Alfes et al., 2013; Rich et al., 2010; Christian et al., 2011).

Kahn (1990) observed that academic researchers paid less attention to the presence of employee’s self while performing job roles (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Maanen, 1976; Graen, 1976). Kahn (1990) while elaborating the concept of employee engagement highlighted three primal psychological conditions: physical, cognitive and emotional in nature, and further investigated employee’s self and presupposed how employees exert their self-energy while accomplishing a task and isolate their selves accordingly. Moreover, he acknowledged that employees behave differently in varying situations, adjust themselves and compromise with the situations to respond to assigned tasks, which ultimately affect their job performance. He speculated that employees adhere to their own selves in comparison to their assigned/ascribed roles, in such a way, that incites them to engage themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally for optimum performance.

While studying engagement on the basis of Kahn (1990) theory, Harter et al., (2002) assessed that the presence of psychological conditions discussed in Kahn Engagement theory, help to develop employees’ self-identification for acquisition of their assigned roles. Based on the prospective cost and benefit analysis, employee perception influences employee engagement that varies according to prevalence of benefits, resource availability, recognition and safety. Social Exchange Theory supports the argument in favor of the contributory role of employee engagement in improving employee job
performance as elucidated by Saks (2006) who explained one of the beliefs of Social Exchange theory, described as “obligations are generated through a series of interactions between parties who are in a state of reciprocal interdependence.” His research findings revealed that employees possessing economic organizational resources, along with social attachment, are likely to be emotionally more obliged to pay back the organization manipulating available facilities. This truly represents the two-way model of employee-cum-employer engagement relationship, and the positive responsive attitude of employees towards their employer, which depicts their high level of engagement. Therefore, more the employees are engaged with their job roles, the greater will be their optimal contribution towards performance of their duties utilizing cognitive, emotional and physical resources. On the other hand, in case of non-provisioning of economic and emotional resources, employees’ withdrawal and disengaged behavior would probably expose adverse job roles. The aforesaid propositions, based on social exchange theory, also articulate the general actuality that when employees are furnished with “learning opportunities, social support and proper job feedback”, then in return, they try to exchange these invigorating and encouraging resources with their best efforts by focusing more on their performance.

As long as, Kahn (1990) viewpoint on engagement is concerned, Rich et al., (2010) particularly stated that engaged employees put forth their efforts for performance vis a vis required targets manipulating their pragmatic contribution by applying hands as physical, head as cognitive and heart as emotional. He further argued that engagement manifests a comprehensive picture of employee’s self as compared to other similar constructs, like” satisfaction and involvement, which define and expose limited aspects of employee’s self. Likewise, Christian et al., (2011) characterized employee engagement conceded as a widespread construct wherein employees involve their entire self in the work, consuming all their energies physically, cognitively and emotionally (p.97). Thus, Rich et al., (2010) suggested that Kahn’s (1990) research work on engagement might be viewed as motivational and multidimensional construct that encourages individuals to bring their full self to perform a specific or any general allocated task. In the context of employee services performance, Kahn (1990) discussed the individual’s self in detail considering the scope of employee attachment as well as detachment from a particular job role. He
also made it clear how these feelings of attachment and detachment were regulated with the changing job conditions and entrusted job responsibilities. Carter, Nesbit, Badham, Parker & Sung (2016) interpreted Kahn’s definition of employee engagement, wherein, Kahn (1990) developed a link between employee’s preferred self and employee’s active presence in terms of physical, cognitive and emotional availability having direct connection with employee role and task performance (Sonnentag, Dormann, & Demerouti (2010).

Many research studies have concluded employee engagement as an instrumental element of individual or organizational performance based outcomes (Saks, 2006; Christian et al., 2011; Rich et al., 2010). Alfes et al., (2010) theorized about employee performance, employee innovative behavior and turnover intention as three important outcomes of engagement. Many researchers conjecture about the built-in link between employee job engagement and employee job performance by suggesting that engaged employees are likely to be more productive by virtue of their better performance as compared to employees exhibiting disengagement behavior. Macey and Schneider, (2008) revealed many aspects of positive behaviors regarding employee engagement, suchlike, improved job/role performance, personal on-the-job initiatives while performing the job, organizational citizenship behavior, less absenteeism, decreased turnover or turnover intensions and further promotion opportunities.

It has been observed that allocation of job resources, like job assignments, learning opportunities, advancement opportunities among employees at workplace, necessitate the key role of managers, whereas, generally, the management (leader) restricts this role to himself (Shweta & Srirang, 2013). Various academic scholars have discussed LMX relationships among employees at workplace, and have found that high-grade LMX relationships develop a strong coherence between leader and member which directly influences employee job engagement and job autonomy, eventually, boosting up their task performance (Loi et al., 2011; Shweta & Srirang, 2013). Chaurasia & Shukla (2013) reported that employees’ enhanced performance at work was attainable owing to the exalted level of mutual relationships between managers and subordinates culminating in high level of engagement.
While deliberating and developing a measurement scale for gauging employee engagement based on Kahn’s (1990) main theory of employee engagement, Soane et al., (2012) indicated positive significant correlation with R-value of 0.38 between engagement and performance. Anitha (2014) in her research study, pertinent to middle and lower managerial level employees of small scale companies, ascertained the employee performance through employee engagement and established significant relationship among all variables, specifically leadership, working environment, co-worker relationship and employee wellbeing as predictors of employee engagement. She concluded that employee engagement was the key contributor to employee performance and emphasized on the role of healthy and congenial working environments in developing good working relationships among the employees, in the long run, getting them productively engaged at the workplace. Breevaart et al. (2014b) asserted, in their research study, that engaged employee possess high level of self-energy to concentrate, deliver and cope with adverse situations leading to improved task performance at workplace, whereas, May et al. 2004 expressed that positive self-emotions were another attribute of engaged individuals while performing their job activities, enhancing their focused dedication towards work in completing the assigned tasks (Christian et al., 2011). Rana et al., (2014) studied antecedents of employee engagement and its conclusive effects and found relationship between employee engagement and employee performance.

Bailey et al., (2017) pointed out and verified that high level of job performance was associated with employees showing high level of engagement and organizational-level performance with employee engagement (Barrick et al., 2015). Gupta and Sharma (2015) opined that popularity of employee engagement concept was because of its strong link either with the employee role performance or with the overall organizational performance. They pointed out the influential role of organizational resources and employee engagement on employee service delivery that directly improved the employee service performance as valued by customers.

Alagaraja & Shuck (2015) analyzed employee engagement and individual performance quite differently and investigated how organization – engagement alignment could affect
individual performance. They highlighted the productive role of HRD and organizational learning development programs that aligned employees’ skills and their knowledge with employees’ job characteristics, and the prevailing company system that facilitated employee engagement and effectuated the improved employee performance. They stated that three fundamental elements i.e prevailing organizational system, individual’s personal attributes and assigned job characteristics were the indicators of organization – engagement alignment at work. Alagaraja & Shuck (2015) believed that the second element, employee attributes (Individual skills and knowledge) were closely related to employee engagement, and were obviously important for individual’s performance.

Karatepe and Aga (2016) studied the importance of organizational mission along with perceived organizational support and examined their mutual relationship together with influence on employees job performance among frontline banking sector employees of 22 banks in Cyprus functioning as a service industry. They also admitted and incorporated the influential role of employee work engagement as mediator between the studied variables. Results of their SEM analysis indicated positive effect of employee engagement on job performance ($\beta_{21}=0.69, t=8.29$). They argued that positive engagement motivates employees to deliver better than expected performance. Carteret et al., (2016) investigated the role of self-efficacy and employee engagement on job performance in a longitudinal filed based research setting, and found substantial significant positive relationship among the variables. They confirmed the impact of employee engagement on employee job performance as R-value of correlation analysis was 0.48, which was also similar and close to R-value: 0.47 of self-efficacy for causing influence on job performance. They also observed that employee engagement was stronger predictor of individual job performance ($R^2 =0.43$) than self-efficacy ($R^2=0.405$). While investigating workplace family resources and their relationship with employee service performance and employee work engagement as mediator, Aryee, Walumbwa, Gachunga and Hartnell (2016) conducted a research study on 177 frontline employees of six large banks in Kenya. They reported a significantly positive relationship between “employee engagement and employee service performance” along with significant “moderating effect of employee expertise on the relationship”. Gupta & Sharma (2016) discussed employee engagement specifically and its business outcomes in
detail and highlighted three main outcomes of employee engagement, namely: employee performance, employee innovative behavior at workplace and turnover intention were the classified important employee engagement outcomes. Anthony- McMann et al., (2016) while deliberating on the operationalization of employee engagement, referred to many research studies, and reported positive relationship/impact both on employee engagement and employee performance. Yang et al., (2016) while arguing about the task performance and organizational citizenship behavior, indicated in their article that an effective shift was observed after detailed examination on the construct of performance-related to employee behaviors, suchlike: organizational citizenship behavior and employee performance, which eventually, improved the organizational behavior.

Shuck et al., (2013) examined employee engagement in the context of human resource development and studied its implications to workplace performance and organizational learning. While deliberating employee engagement, they used an interesting terminology “jingle jangle of employee engagement”. They stated that, instinctively, it was an understandable phenomenon that satisfied and engaged employees would perform better as compared to dis-satisfied and dis-engaged employees and preferred to stay with the organization on long term basis as also affirmed by Judge, Thoresen, Bono and Patton (2001) and Wollard & Shuck, 2011. Shuck et al., (2013) quoted the findings of Christian et al., (2011) concerning psychological connection of engagement with performance of assigned job tasks rather than being an attitudinal connection. They stated that organizational citizenship behavior and performance were common consequences of employee engagement. Gutermann, Lehmann-Willenbrock, Boer, Born and Voelpel (2017) investigated the role of leaders in enhancing followers’ engagement and employee service performance while conducting research on 511 employees and supervisors of a big service organization. Their results confirmed positive and significant relationship between followers’ engagement and employees’ service performance. Nazir and Islam (2017) evaluated performance of employees working at higher education institutes in India, in connotation to arrive at a correct conclusion about the support that they expected and actually received from their institutes with mediation role of employee engagement and observed positive and significant result with partial mediation in the relationship. They suggested to exert more focus on employee engagement so as to consider this
cogent factor while developing relevant strategies at higher level. Bailey et al. (2017) in their study, based on narrative synthesis, referred to a number of research studies, wherein, researchers revealed positive relationship between engagement and performance, whether pertinent to employee or organizational. Chen and Peng (2018) evaluated the service performance of employees working at 89 food outlets in Taiwan and examined role of leadership and psychological capital on subsequent engagement and performance of workers. They observed that there was direct and indirect impact of psychological capital and employee engagement on service performance, whereas engagement partially mediated the relationship of psychological capital and service performance.

Saleem, Bhutta, Nauman and Zahra (2019), in their research study, highlighted the significant role of behavioral integrity that acted as catalyst to improve employee performance when they were linking transformational leadership and employee empowerment with performance, through behavioral integrity. They specifically deliberated and highlighted the importance of employee empowerment, in predicting employee performance. Atatsi, Stoffers and Kil (2019) deliberated employee performance in a systematic analysis with detailed discussion on its definition given by many researchers along with key factors that affected performance in different financial enterprises. They pondered predictors and consequences of performance, explained measurement scales that researchers had utilized in their studies along with adopted theories in explaining the proposed relationships of selected variables for their research. They further argued about the mediator and moderation models in which, researchers investigated employee performance in different workplace settings and corporations and quoted their outcomes. They suggested to carry out further investigating and probe performance in the service sector and considering small business enterprises by utilizing different measurement scales in order to have single consensus on a measuring instrument. Arsalan and Roudaki (2019) investigated employee engagement and examined it as moderation with reference to connotation between cynicism and employee performance by conducting a research on health sector employees in the context of Pakistan. They reported that employee engagement was the key moderator that influence on the relations and also revealed that employee engagement decreased the cynicism
Atatsi, Stoffers and Kil (2019) deliberated on employee performance to ascertain its predictors, mediator and moderators along with measuring scales that various researchers introduced in the literature to gauge this construct while conducting research at different workplace settings for evaluating employees’ behaviors and other relevant phenomena. They presented different viewpoints of researchers on employee performance and consequently revealed its linkage with positive psychology in association with LMX and OCB under the aegis umbrella of given organizational behavioral theories in vogue. They highlighted many research variables at different workplace settings related to leaderships, employee, working conditions & environment, job itself, different job demands and available resources, which attracted a remarkable attention of the academics as well as business experts, causing substantial impact on employee and organization overall performance, whereas, employee engagement remained as independent, dependent or a mediator variable. They observed in their systematic review of the available literature on performance that majority of researchers followed SET in defining, gauging, evaluating and explaining results of their research studies. While deliberating about techniques of research design and data analysis, they observed that majority of researchers conducted quantitative research, whereas, most of them used regression analysis for reporting results along with some percentage of SEM technique.

Based on the central theme of above discussed research studies and their subsequent findings, it is established that employee engagement maintains a close relationship with performance in the context of service and non-service related outcomes (Menguc et al., 2013, Barrick et al., 2015; Christian et al., 2010; Rich et al., 2010). Consequently, this research study proposes the following hypothesis:

H10: Employee Engagement is positively related to employee service performance.
2.8.2 Employee Engagement & Organizational Citizenship Behavior

This section covers the concept of “Organizational Citizenship Behavior” which includes basic theories, various research studies on antecedents and fundamental relationship among the current study variables and employee engagement.

Service-oriented business organizations, like banks, mostly rely on their workforce to maintain streamlined effective operations and service experience along with high demands for extra-role performance beyond their normal role requirements. This term, extra-role requirements for effective performance was coined by Organ (1988) as “Organizational Citizenship Behavior” hereinafter called OCB.

OCB has been a matter of interest for academic researchers since 1964 owing to its close link with employee’s behavior which has ever grown consistently for the last two decades because of its effective association with progressive individual and organizational outcomes in terms of employee/organizational behavior (Podsakoff et al., 1993; Chen, Hui, & Sego, 1998; 2001; Hannam and Jimmieson, 2002; Marockzy & Xin 2004 Khalid and Ali, 2005; Podsakoff et al., 2009; Chahal & Mehta, 2010). First time, the term “Organizational Citizenship behavior” was introduced and familiarized in literature by Bateman and Organ (1980s) which was further elaborated and fortified by other researchers and strengthened accordingly (Williams and Anderson, 1991; Podsakoff and Mackenzie, 1993).

Academic researchers delving on individual/organizational behaviors extended their focus of attention to Chester Barnard Management theory (1938) and re-conceptualized it in terms of OCB (Katz & Kahn, 1966; Smith, Organ, and Near, 1983). The concept of OCB was deeply rooted in the ideas of Chester Barnard who, for the first time, discussed the importance of individual behaviors termed as “Cooperate” which meant individual’s willingness while working with others for mutual benefits and interests at a workplace enthusiastically in an organization (Barnard, 1938). Moreover, he determined cooperation as an essential element for betterment and progress of corporations even in the absence of any expected reward or personal incentive. He further interpreted it as an individual’s voluntary service and unconscious support scarifying his own interests even under
genuine restraints and compulsions. In conclusion, considering Barnard’s viewpoint, cooperation is the belief of the individual who performs his job/obligations with freewill in a prescribed structure of cooperation.

Katz (1964) focused on three core behaviors highly important for successful operations of an organization.

I. First, behavior is related to requisite optimum strength of employees for managing the essential job functions side by side their job retention for a maximum time-period to get benefit from their acquired expertise, nevertheless, their physical presence at job as turnover would be a financially cumbersome liability for organizations (p-132).

II. Second, behavior is related to employees’ dependable role performance at job directing them to accomplish assigned tasks paying more attention to quality rather than towards quantity. In general, as per organizational protocol/practice, leadership normally frames the job roles of employees (p-132).

III. Third, behavior is related to employees’ actions that must be innovative, spontaneous and capable of dealing with any emergent situations. This type of creative, innovative and supportive behavior, on part of the employees is very important for organizational effectiveness, functioning and its ultimate survival (p-132). According to Katz (1964), the nature and disposition of such innovative employees is above the prescribed role specifications, and in accordance with organizational set procedures.

Based on Katz (1964) work, this type of individual’s discretionary behavior, compelling them to deliver over and above their required job responsibilities, was further extended by Organ (1988) who termed it as “Organizational Citizenship Behavior” without any incentive of financial rewards for these discretionary behaviors. It was argued that aforesaid behaviors promote effectiveness of a company in general (Organ 1988) and Organ (1988a) further recognized the role of five core behaviors in exhibiting the OCB by actions of the employees. Hence, organizational citizenship behavior emerges as the result of employee’s extra role behavior while performing duties at workplace. Organ (1988) highlighted five core behavioral aspects of OCB which is given below:-
(i) Altruism,
(ii) Conscientiousness,
(iii) Sportsmanship,
(iv) Courtesy,
(v) Civic virtue.

(i) Altruism, the individual’s first discretionary behavior embodies interpersonal nature by which an individual demonstrates readily so as to extend cooperation to his/her coworkers, supervisors and customers and other matters pertinent to organization related assignments and problems.

(ii) Conscientiousness is the second discretionary behavior on part of the person comprising various extra role behaviors displaying faithful adherence to the commitments demanding minimum job role requirements such as “attendance, punctuality, adherence to company rules and regulations, controlled refreshments breaks, earlier leaving the office before the stipulated time” etc.

(iii) Sportsmanship is the individual’s third discretionary behavior that comprises willingness to tolerate and accept inconveniences or frustration without any appeal, protest and complaint (Organ, 1988, p. 11).

(iv) Courtesy is the individual’s fourth discretionary behavior, which educates and guides employees to follow good manners and avoid creating problems among colleagues, avoid immoral attitude, refrain from abusing rights of companions and divulge information regarding organizational changes and policies to unconcerned persons.

(v) Civic Virtue is the individual’s fifth discretionary behavior, which prescribes the workplace participation customs as how an individual responsibly shares, involves and is concerned about company events and meetings along with his fruitful points of view on different important issues.

Humphrey (2012) stated that the notion of organizational citizenship behavior once gained popularity, when Organ (1983) introduced the Katz’s (1974) behavioral activities “Innovativeness and Spontaneous” as OCB in the literature. Katz (1964) highlighted the role of leaders and managers within organizational structure in assigning required tasks for various roles at workplace; however, it became difficult to assess an individual
exercising OCB, but the successful accomplishment/execution of set goals exhibited notable practice and adoption of OCB by employees (p-132). Lee and Allen (2002) in their research asserted that behavior of organizational citizenship was productive and effective from organizational point of view because it could be helpful in enhancing the overall effectiveness without causing any risk or misapprehension of job insecurity for employees at the workplace.

Humphrey (2012) corroborated the viewpoint of Lee and Allen (2002) regarding organizational citizenship behavior that it involved no specific requirement of organizational citizenship, but employees engaged themselves opting their own freewill to practice OCB in the interest of the organization. Lee and Allen (2002) contended that employees’ participation in social functions organized by employers and the mutual cooperation with colleagues, were the prominent examples of exercising OCB. Williams and Anderson (1991) identified the benefits of organizational citizenship behavior for an organization, and differentiated between behaviors, directed toward individuals and organizations respectively. They were of the view that “Altruism and Courtesy” were employees’ behaviors related and directed to individuals, whereas, behaviors like “conscientiousness, civic virtue and sportsmanship” were directed and related to the organization.

Newman and Harrison (2008) described that concomitant presence of three behavior like (i) Job involvement, (ii) citizenship behavior and (iii) employee job performance were true representation of employee engagement. Rich et al., (2010) argued that some empirical findings or theories validated that employee engagement was productive and facilitated competitive advantages, but their research studies concluded that employees displaying high level of job engagement contributed to their employers by delivering much higher individual performance and OCB. Rich et al., (2010) established positive statistical significant relationship among all variables implicating employee job engagement and its resultant variables of employee task performance and OCB (Beta – 0.25 and 0.27 respectively) which confirmed the findings of Hoffman, Blair, Meriac and Woehr (2007) illustrating that both concepts “employee task performance and OCB” were virtual parts of a broader construct of employees’ overall job performance.
Rurkkhum and Bartlett (2012) ascertained the relationship between employee engagement and OCB as an extra role performance of 522 respondents employed on non-managerial jobs in four big industrial units in Thailand. They proved an explicit evidence of positive correlation between the variables: employee engagement and OCB with R value of 0.12 to 0.48 for all components of OCB, that is, “altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue”, whereas, employee engagement showed 23% variation in the regression analysis for OCB. It would be appropriate to mention here that Rurkkhum and Bartlett (2012) investigated relation of employee engagement to each component of OCB and revealed a strong, positive and significant relationship among all the variables. Soane, et al., (2012) labelled OCB and employee task performance as potentially influential outcomes of employee engagement (p. 536). Andrew and Sofian (2012) studied employee engagement, based on findings probed by Sak (2006), basically derived from Kahn (1990) focal work on engagement using the social exchange theory. Results of the research study conducted by Andrew and Sofian (2012) showed positive and significant relationship between employee engagement and OCB. Rana, Ardichvili and Tkachenko (2014) studied antecedents of employee engagement and their consequences, using Robert Dubin’s (1978) method, and found positive association between employee engagement and OCB.

In a research study, Gupta and Sharma (2015) expressed their standpoint relevant to employee engagement, OCB and organizational performance based on review investigation, side by side, considering the available literature on the constructs using contents and relational analysis for devising conceptual model to establish the causal relationship among the above-cited variables. Research findings revealed that occurrences of behaviors, exhibiting discretionary efforts, were the result of high-level employee engagement, which ultimately enhanced the organizational effectiveness exerting efficient operational activities, denoted as OCB. Gupta and Sharma (2015) further elaborated that current competitive and dynamic business environments have constrained organizations to hire and retain their talent, not only in the form of engaged employees, but should also render their own extra efforts in performing tasks to maintain long-term sustainable organizational performance. Gupta and Sharma (2015) argued that OCB attracted substantial attention of business gurus that, subsequently, forced them to
ameliorate employment culture environments and organizational choices to hire extraordinary talent capable of exhibiting extra role behavior. Employees possessing OCB were acknowledged to be more productive, bearing adequate knowledge about improved organizational functionality, improved coworkers relationship, better resource utilization, time management and expressed nominal feelings of discontentment. Gupta and Sharma (2015) tendered their viewpoint on relationship concerning employee engagement and OCB in detail utilizing relational analysis and related aspects of employee engagement with each components of OCB. Gupta and Sharma (2015) affirmed first three components of OCB that were the behavioral outcome of engaged employees, namely: (i) altruism, (ii) conscientiousness and (iii) sportsmanship. They discussed the high level of employee’s robust behavior at workplace as a positive effect in terms of a physical component of employee engagement, treating it as spontaneous attitude of highly engaged employees to assigned tasks.

Christian et al., (2011) highlighted many behaviors ascribed to engaged employees, suchlike: self-energy, enthusiasm, involvement and dedication exhibited by them during their high level of in-role/extra-role performance. Different research studies accounted organizational citizenship behavior, as similar to performance-based outcome of employee engagement. Shuck et al., 2011 reasoned that researchers and business experts studied employee engagement and its outcomes, like OCB with regard to individual performance and its consequent impact on operational and financial performance.

Matta et al., (2015) studied work engagement and OCB and their results of regression analysis reported that engagement was positively associated with behavioral outcome variables of OCB, both in perspective of individual and organization, with direct effect of LMX perspective. Byaruhanga, & Othuma (2016) using the social exchange theory, perused the organizational citizenship behavior, employee engagement, employee’s trust and employee empowerment regarding 376 employees of two Sub-Saharan African countries, Rwanda and Uganda. They found significant and positive relationship among the variables, especially between employee engagement and OCB. Anthony- McMann et al (2016) while deliberating on many operationalization of engagement concept, its
measurement, relationship with predictors and outcomes, discussed about positive relationship between employee engagement and OCB.

Ma, Qu, and Wilson (2016) while commenting on OCB in their research studies, emphasized upon the vital importance of OCBs for customer’s satisfaction and promoting organizational effectiveness. They implied that OCBs were not only essential to promote organizational effectiveness and customer satisfaction, but also they performed a definite role in fostering positive emotions along with a sense of social attachment with their colleagues. They further explained that, besides many other positive employee or organizational related consequences, assuring OCB could create and promote win-win situation for both the companies and workers.

Ko, Lee and Koh (2017) studied job performance of 250 nurses employed in three main hospitals in Korea, in connection with their contributory role of employee job engagement and social capital with the mediating variable of OCB, using SPSS 21 and AMOS 21. Researchers deduced indirect relationship, along with impact of predicting variables, on nurses’ performance through OCB, whereas, correlation analysis confirmed positive correlation between employee job engagement and OCB having R-value of 0.64. Eldor and Vigoda-Gadot (2017) studied employee engagement quite differently in a framework/setting considering relationship between employee and organization. They admired employee engagement as the best utilization of employees’ personal strengths while they were performing their role related tasks at the workplace (Kahn, 1990; Schaufeli et al., 2002). They appreciated the ever-growing interest of academic researchers and corporate sector relevant to worker’s extra-role behaviors, and recommended to further probe the relationship existing between OCB and employee engagement (p-545-546). Bailey et al., (2017) speculated that extra-role behaviors were connected with extra-role performance and facilitate employee task performance. They indicated that about 19 research studies investigated the employee engagement and multifarious aspects of employee’s extra-role performance, whereas, nine research studies found corresponding association between both engagement and OCB (Rich et al., 2010), validating the findings of Christian et al., (2011) meta-analysis. Finally, Bailey et al., (2017) concluded their argumentative discussion that all studies, focusing on
relationship of employee’s behaviors with construct of extra-role performance, researchers considered and accepted organizational citizenship behavior as an output variable.

Based on the above deliberations, in the context of OCB versus its relationship with employee’s engagement, this research study proposes the following hypothesis:

H11: “Employee Engagement is positively related to OCB”.

2.9 The Mediating Role of Employee Engagement

2.9.1 Empowering Leadership, Employee Engagement and Employee Behaviors

Conger (1989) while dilating on leaderships, specifically highlighted the practical importance of empowering behavior of managers as how this trait fortified the employee’s self-belief for effective performance, which invariably not only encompassed the positive extrinsic actions of leaders, but also it changed the intrinsic motivational attributes and belief to perform accurately and accomplish the tasks. Kahn (1990) discussed management style, while explaining safety in the context of employee engagement and argued about the leader’s behavior, as how it developed supporting relationships among employees, and trusted on their competence to perform without apprehending fear of failure. Explaining personal engagement and dis-engagement, Kahn (1990) associated individual’s self to role’s performance through employee’s presence (physical, cognitive and emotional) at work place with full energy, which highlighted the role of employee engagement in fostering performance related outcomes. Wildermuth and Pauken (2008), in their article, analyzed employee engagement in context of organizational culture and leadership as how these factors influenced employees to get them engaged or disengaged at workplace. They concluded the subject by highlighting the significant role of job characteristics and employees’ personality traits for employee engagement along with influence of organizational culture and leadership style.

Erkutlu and Chafra (2013) scrutinized empowering leadership as a source for elevating employee engagement level. Their results reported positive relationship between empowering leadership and engagement. Vecchio et al., (2010) explained as how
empowering leadership produced positive effects on followers’ performance showing signs of followers’ reduced resistance. Sharma and Kirkman (2015) studied outcomes of the empowering leadership and reported positive correlation between empowering leadership and employee’s commitment, job satisfaction, effective job commitment, organizational commitment, employee engagement, employee’s in-role and extra-role behaviors. Erkutlu and Chafra (2015) reported positive and significant relationship of empowering leadership with followers’ work engagement, whereas, Stander (2016) also reported positive relationship among leader’s empowering behavior, employee’s psychological empowerment and work engagement. Employees were found to be highly engaged having job empowerment at workplaces (Nel, Stander & Latif, 2015, Klerk & Stander, 2014). Park et al., (2017) reported that empowering leadership, psychological capital and the employee job engagement were found to have positive relationship among each other.

Many researchers determined employee engagement as an influential factor for individual or organizational performance (Saks, 2006; Rich et al., 2010; Carter et al., 2016, Gupta & Sharma 2016; Anthony- McMann et al., 2016, Bailey et al., 2017). Shuck et al., (2013) concluded that engaged employees would perform better as compared to dis-engaged employees and preferred to stay with the organization on long-term basis. Gutermann et al., (2017) investigated the contributory role of leaders in enhancing followers’ engagement and employee service performance and confirmed positive and significant relationship among the variables. Many researchers found positive relationship and significant impact of employee engagement on OCB (Rich et al., 2010; Rurkkhum & Bartlett, 2012; Gupta and Sharma, 2015). Gupta and Sharma (2015) found that first three components of OCB were the behavioral outcome of engaged employees. Bailey et al., (2017) concluded that most of the research accepted OCB as an output variable while investigating relationship between employee’s behaviors and employee extra-role performance.

Basit (2019) investigated the collective job engagement, and observed that how respectful engagement improved the task performance through job engagement of workers at a larger production unit located in the eastern Pakistan by adopting Rich’ Scale in the
perspective of Kahn theory (1990). He reported positive and significant results and indicated that job engagement was the strong mediation in the relationships, whereas, effect on organizational commitment was stronger than job performance. Huertas-Valdivia, Gallego-Burín and Lloréns-Montes (2019) scrutinized different leadership approaches e.g. “Servant, Empowering and Paradoxical” in order to assess, which approach was best and most appropriate to motivate hospitality’s employees to deliver substantial performance and effect of these leadership approaches on their engagement level through mental empowerment. They shared results of their research study by collection data from 340 hotel staff in Spain by apply SEM for data analysis. Their result reported that leaders who facilitated psychological empowerment for their subordinates had great impact on employee engagement through partial mediation of psychological empowerment, whereas similar relationship found for paradoxical style, in which, employee were fully engaged. “Paradoxical leader behavior is related to how followers handle their work roles that evolve dynamically in response to changing conditions and demands” (Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007). “Leaders who demonstrate acceptance of contradictions and ability to explore coexisting possibilities show followers how to be open, learning-oriented, and flexible toward external challenges and further build a bounded discretionary environment for them”.

Pandey (2019) scrutinized available literature about job or employee performance that comprised of all facets and different workplace, supervisors or employee related factors that directly or indirectly influence it. They categorized these factors by dividing into three divisions like, “Individual, group and organizational” which were taken as “micro, meso and macro level”. They divided all researches done in the context of performance in to two types, one were those in which researchers reported their findings on the basis of results that was established by apply data analysis techniques on survey based data collection. Furthermore, they connected individual resources to job and organizational resources in terms of “physical, cognitive and affective” that how these factors were related and affected by workplace experiences and leadership that they observed during role performance. They highlighted that psychological capital was one of individual resource (Chen, 2015) and Self-efficacy one of individual personality trait. They also indicated that work or job engagement was observed as job resource and organizational
leadership was recognized as organizational resource that were influencing job performance of employees at workplace. They further deliberated on various type of individual and organizational related stressors that interrupted the frequency of employee performance and suggested about the strategies to manage these stressors by managing job demands and supervisory style.

Based upon above discussion about employee engagement as mediator between empowering leadership and employee behaviors (employee service performance and OCB), this research study intends to empirically test the below mentioned hypotheses:

H12a: “Employee engagement mediates the relationship between empowering leadership and employee service performance”.

H12b: “Employee engagement mediates the relationship between empowering leadership and OCB”.

2.9.2 Psychological Capital, Employee Engagement and Employee Behaviors

It has been realized that psychological capital is related to many key outcomes, like: job performance, citizenship behaviors, satisfaction with work and life, turnover intentions (e.g., Harms, Krasikova, & Luthans 2018; Luthans & YoussefMorgan, 2017; Krasikova, Lester, & Harms, 2015; Newman, Ucbasaran, Zhu, & Hirst, 2014; Luthans, Youssef, Sweetman, & Harms, 2013; Avey, Reichard, Luthans, & Mhatre, 2011). Lifeng (2007) investigated the impact of psychological capital on employee performance along with OCB and organizational commitment and found positive relationship among the studied variables.

Kahn (1990) primarily considered the psychological conditions of personal engagement that how these conditions influenced the employee’s self while performing role at workplace. Avey et al., (2011) explained psychological capital and its relation to employee’s attitudes, work behaviors and performance, and concluded that employees having high psychological capital were more likely to be enthusiastically energetic about their engagement at job. Many researchers examined and found that psychological capital and employee engagement were associated with each other positively and
significantly (Sihag & Sarikwal, 2014; Joo et al., 2016; You, 2016; Karatepe & Talebzadeh, 2016; Gupta et al., 2017). Amish and Singh (2017) highlighted the importance of psychological capital regarding employees’ attitudes and behaviors. They noticed positive relationship of all the factors of psychological capital with employee engagement and concluded that employees having positive psychological capital would perform better than those who exhibited lower level of psychological capital. Uddin, Mahmood and Fan (2019), while examining influence of employee engagement on team performance and investigated that how an individual contributed towards the overall performance of a team by conducting their research in the perspective of social exchange theory revolves around positive psychology. Beside this, researchers also scrutinized the mediation effects of individual’s commitment and OCB of the above-said relationship. This research study, having importance due to adopting multi-level modeling techniques through PLS Smart2 and SPSS-21 to examine the variables related to employees and the team, which evaluated their employee engagement level in the context of performance either as employee or as employer that how behavior connoted and stimulated individuals for better performance. They observed that all variables were positively and significantly related to each other, and employee commitment and OCB, both mediated the relationship between individual performance and team performance by indicating full mediation in the process.

The researchers reported enhanced level of employee engagement having positive psychological capital (McDowell et al., 2018; Kang & Busser 2018; Wang et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2017; Park et al., 2015 and Min et al., 2015). Wang et al., (2017) found positive correlation between nurses’ psychological capital and work engagement, whereas, Luthans and Youssef-Morgan (2017), reported high-level individual performance as an outcome of positive psychological capital. Bailey et al., (2017) while arguing about engagement and individual performance pointed out that 52 research studies examined the psychological state of employees involving its consequences. Alessandri et al., (2018) stated that increase in psychological capital ultimately improved the level of work engagement that in return motivated higher performance level. Work engagement was found to be the critical mediator in relationship to psychological capital and OCB (Gupta et al., 2017). In a research study, the researcher observed work
engagement (WE) as strong predictor of both variables task performance and OCB. Pandey (2019) highlighted that psychological capital was one of individual resource (Chen, 2015) and Self-efficacy one of individual personality trait.

Based upon above discussion about employee engagement as mediator between psychological capital and employee behaviors (employee service performance and OCB), this research study intends to empirically test the below mentioned hypotheses:

H12c: “Employee engagement mediates the relationship between psychological capital and employee service performance”.

H12d: “Employee engagement mediates the relationship between psychological capital and OCB”.

2.9.3 Job Characteristics, Employee Engagement and Employee Behaviors

Many research studies, with empirical findings, revealed significant influence of job characteristics on human related attitudes and behaviors while performing a job which ultimately affected individual and organizational results (Fried and Ferris 1987; Humphrey et al. 2007; Fairlie, 2011; Rana et al., 2014; Crawford et al., 2014; Alagaraja & Shuck, 2015; Rai et al., 2017 and Baily et al., 2017). Job characteristics and its connection with psychological conditions of employees, while performing a role and other influential factors, related to work environment and leadership have remained central point of examination in all research studies conducted in the context of employee engagement (Kahn, 1990; Bakker and Demerouti 2007). Saks (2006) examined various antecedents and consequences of employee job and organizational engagement and noticed positive relationship among job characteristics, job and organizational engagement and OCB. Researchers examined employee engagement as a mediator among variables, like: perceived organizational support, value congruence and core self-evaluations and outcomes, like: task performance and OCB (Rich et al., 2010). Christian et al., (2011) in their research study investigated work engagement as mediator in terms of its antecedents and consequences and determined positive relationship of job characteristics and leadership style with engagement, which consequently enhanced the contextual and task performance of employees. Shantz et al., (2013) explained the
mediation role of employee engagement under umbrella of social exchange theory, which highlighted the operational aspect of loyal and trustworthy relationship of the employee and the employer developed by practicing the exchange rules. They empirically concluded that employees performing job having characteristics of variety, autonomy, significance and proper feedback would be relatively more engaged at work places ultimately leading them to improved performance beside higher level of OCB. Agarwal and Gupta (2018) examined mediation of work engagement between job characteristics and turnover intension, confirming mediation. Sugianingrat, Widyawati, Costa, Ximenes, Piedade and Sarmawa (2019) examined the mediating role of two variables, employee engagement and OCB in predicting employee performance while studying ethical leadership as independent variable. Their results established full mediation of employee engagement for explaining employee performance.

Based upon above discussion about employee engagement as mediator between job characteristics and employee behaviors (employee service performance and OCB), this research study intends to empirically test the below mentioned hypotheses:

H12e: “Employee engagement mediates the relationship between job characteristics and employee service performance”.

H12f: “Employee engagement mediates the relationship between job characteristics and and OCB”.
2.10 Conceptual Research Model

Antecedents

- Empowering Leadership
- Psychological Capital
- Job Characteristics

Consequences

- Employee Engagement
- Employee Service Performance
- Organizational Citizenship Behavior

*Figure 2-4: Conceptual Research Model*
Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
3 Research Methodology

There is always an appropriate approach and procedure, with set mechanisms, to solve a particular problem as a part of research process, called as research methodology (Leedy, 1993). This chapter summaries and describes the research methodology which the researcher has adopted to examine the hypotheses developed in the literature review and research techniques applied, therein, at various phases of the research process. This chapter also comprises study variables, measurement scales and data analysis techniques. The present research study follows the research methodology techniques, well known as “Research Onion” suggested by Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill (2012) which consisted of 6 sections: philosophy of research, approach for research, research design or methodological approach, research strategy, requisite time-horizon, approaches for data collection and its analysis techniques.

![Figure 3-1: The research onion](image)

Source: Adopted by Saunders et al., 2015
There are six sections, marked as under:

i. Research Philosophy
ii. Research Approach
iii. Research Design
iv. Participants
v. Instrument for Data Collection
vi. Data Analysis

3.1 Research Philosophy

Research philosophy represents such a framework that deals with the source of knowledge and its nature succeeding with further development in a particular area of research (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill (2012). Briefly, research philosophy strengthens those assumptions with which researchers distinguish various things, which resultanty, assist to adopt and implement a suitable research design accordingly. Therefore, it is essential for researchers to be fully aware of the philosophical support required for the research study, and the suitable strategy to be followed. In principle, addressing philosophy of research includes awareness and schemes to formulate beliefs about the research area.

Saunders et al. (2012) categorized the research philosophy into ontology and epistemology as a two key components. Ontology component of the research philosophy deals with investigation of the nature of reality termed as “What is it”. Objectivism and subjectivism are two prominent dimensions of ontology. Objectivism portrays that phenomena or the object represents its existence independently in reality, regardless of social actors, whereas, subjectivism explains the social phenomena or object developed from the observations and consequences of those actions that social actors exhibit for their existence (Saunders et al 2012; Wahyuni, 2012) which differs from person to person. Epistemology is related to the acceptable knowledge of particular area of research, which is classified into three perspectives: positivism, realism and interpretivism, called as domains of research philosophy (Wang and Nasr, 2010). Positivistic approach of the natural scientist is based on hypotheses-testing, derived from
the theory, entitled as deductive approach using analysis of collected data (research strategy) of observable social entity using measurement scales (Saunders et al. 2012). Positivist adopts highly structured research methodology for hypotheses-testing and confirmation through quantitative research strategy like: experiments, quantifiable observations in surveys and statistical analysis etc. for theory building. Second, realism, just like, positivistic approach, which relates to scientific enquiry for development of knowledge. Realism reveals the truth of reality and explains existence of objects independently in the individual’s mind (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

Third, interpretivism (also known as interpretivist approach), taking different stance, motivates social scientists to interpret meaning of social actions through subjective means. This approach encourages researchers to respect and appreciate differences among individuals/humans, being as social actors, and stresses to follow qualitative analysis rather than quantitative approach like; interviews, case studies, group discussion etc. (Tuli, 2011; Scotland, 2012). Qualitative research methodology, representing inductive approach, objectifies to discover and understand a social phenomenon that needs to be explained (Tuli, 2011).

Fourth is the pragmatism research paradigm as compared to other two research paradigms (Positivist and Interpretivism) which considers research as a continuous process rather than two extreme opposite poles (Wahyuni, 2012). According to the pragmatists, research questions have been considered as significant determinants of the research philosophy (Wahyuni, 2012; Bryman & Bell, 2011). Hence, pragmatists can integrate positivist and interpretivism approaches in one research study in accordance with research questions using multiple research methods like qualitative, quantitative, etc.
Based on aforesaid guidelines, different research paradigms have been scrutinized to select the most suitable approach for the current study. At the start of this research study, the scholar adopted the objectivistic approach based on ontological stance, wherein, the researcher viewed the nature of reality as an external factor and objective, which could be measured using objective methods by adopting questionnaires and survey techniques. On the basis of objectivist ontology, positivism approach, as being epistemological stance of the present study, when the examination depends upon quantifiable data collected from a sample of banking sector population. Similarly, the objective of the current study is to identify the “key antecedents and consequences of employee engagement”.

### 3.2 Research Approach

Following objectivism and positivism, further standardization of the research approach, and the subsequent specific strategy, whether deductive or inductive approach can be actualized. Saunders et al., (2012) argue that in deductive approach, hypotheses are proposed on the guidelines of already developed and existent theories through data collection like: surveys and questionnaires; whereas, inductive research approach is applicable to the development of new theory on the basis of data collected through interviews, focused group discussions and observations. Owing to its objective nature, deductive approach can be replicated, whereas, inductive approach cannot be replicated because of its subjective nature. In the current research study, deductive approach has been adopted as the hypotheses used therein, have been proposed and developed on the basis of already existing theory of employee engagement introduced by Kahn (1990),
with the aims to further explore key antecedents and consequences of employee engagement.

3.3 Research Design

The Research design, as quoted in the research study of Terre Blanche & Durrheim (1999 p.29), is all about to gather data by adopting techniques which must be very much economical with this aim that collected data as relevance to object of research study for further utilization for analysis to get findings. Greener (2008) termed research design as “a master plan to examine a research problem”. Sekaran and Bougie (2010) explained that research design is an intended plan of the researcher to investigate a problem for conducting research on it. Various types of research designs like mono-methods in terms of quantitative or qualitative and multi-methods in terms of collective approach for adopting quantitative and qualitative methods (Saunders et al., 2012, p-163). Quantitative research study is the type of research design through which researchers follow to examine the relationship among different study variables using numerical data and applying requisite statistical techniques (Saunders et al. 2012, p-163). Quantitative research design is linked with experimental and survey research methods, whereas, survey research is frequently carried out through questionnaires, observations and interviews (Saunders et al. 2012, p-163). As per practice in vogue, generally, when researcher intends to do a quantitative study, the required information from respondents, which is normally called “data” is collected in the statistical way, which further utilized and applied for data analysis by adopting various techniques in order to confirm study hypotheses.

In qualitative research method, researchers use multiple data collection and analyses techniques in order to gauge individual’s views and their relationships. Multiple research methods adopt either deductive or inductive approach, and , of course, may be combination of both (Saunders et al. 2012) which reveals that it may be quantitative as well as qualitative research design.

Hence, according to the guidelines of positivist epistemology and objectivist ontology, for quantitative research design, the present research study has adopted the survey
techniques related with deductive approach, considering it as a general strategy in the business related research, because large quantity of data could be possibly collected through surveys, covering a sizable population in a cost-effective way, that could be analyzed further using description and inferential statistics (Saunders et al. 2012).

3.3.1 Type of Research

A descriptive survey is a mode for seeking information from individuals (sample) of the selected population, which help researchers to understand and investigate relationships among variables of the research study. Survey research approach is adopted, usually, for descriptive, exploratory and explanatory research purposes (Robson, 2011). The present study, having descriptive nature, whose objective is to track and study a problem, and afterwards explain relationships among variables selected for this study validating empirical evidence and subsequent conclusion. The quantitative approach applied in this research study facilitates the researcher to test the empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics, being antecedents on employee engagement at workplace, along with impact of employee engagement on employee service performance, and OCB being as consequences of employee engagement; considering their work behaviors through self-reported perceptions of survey respondents about these studied variables. Furthermore, descriptive nature of the research study helped the researcher to understand the underlying mechanisms linking antecedents and consequences with employee engagement.

It has been noticed in various research discussions that the past behavior of an individual is the best reliable predictor of his future behavior. To study and comprehend employees’ behaviors, the best approach is to ask them about a particular ascribed behavior, which may be the only best approach (Botha, 2007) by asking them: how they feel, think, perceive, judge, act and behave in divergent situations. Booysen (2003) stated that most of the research studies, in social sciences, were survey-based and this research methodology was widely acknowledged and used extensively. Survey research design is an appropriate approach because of its advantage to collect responses relatively from larger population. Burns (2000) stated that survey research design actualizes two key benefits: first, to provide survey questionnaires at respondents’ own workplaces having
opportunity to respond accurately with clear mind. Second, with easy format of questions’ wording and relevance of questions to the actual domain of activity, emphasis and cordial interview style, eliminate the doubts of any prejudice while filling in the survey questionnaire. Kerlinger & Lee (2000) suggested that utilizing the survey method for collection of quantitative data from a sample size through a prescribed format (questionnaire), collective opinion could be comprehended and proposed about the total population, keeping in mind, that the sample should be selected in accordance with prescribed scientific research methodology. Therefore, the survey method has remained an appropriate tool to ascertain and understand insights of attitudes, perceptions and behaviors of employee relevant to specific problems. The standardized survey is objective in nature, owing to its higher level of reliability and validity, that restricts the bias-based issues (Baruch and Holtom, 2008). Being a cross-sectional research study, it would facilitate researchers to gather research data from various segments of the selected population at a single point of time (Saunders et al. 2012).

3.3.2 Study Setting

Banking employees were contacted at their workplace settings during their duty working hours and they responded to the questions with free-will and without any interference of any kind. Using a survey approach, the present study was conducted in non-contrived natural settings through properly administering a structured instrument (questionnaire) to examine the relationship and association among the variables studied in the field study.

3.3.3 Time Horizon and Unit of Analysis

The data collection was carried out during January, 2017 to July, 2017 within office timings starting from 9am to 6 pm. As suggested by Cone & Foster (2006), individual participants of the survey were considered as a unit of analysis for collection of data. The researcher measured the differences or similarities among them at single point of time. Employees working at Banks spent substantial time to fill in the composite survey questionnaire. The unit of analysis is mainly represent the level or unit from where, the researcher collected data for research analysis, which can be an individual, group of individuals, organizations or group of organizations like an industry. Since the main
The focus of the present research study is to investigate antecedents and consequences of employee engagement that are related with employees employed at different banks of Pakistan, the units of analysis for the present research study are individual employees. These employees are of officer grade employees like: Customer Services Officers, Cash Officers, Tellers, Collection Officers, Operation Managers and Branch Managers having direct interaction with customers. The data has been collected on one-time basis; therefore, this research study is cross-sectional in nature.

The present research study is aimed at to ascertain individual’s attitude, employee engagement with reference to the antecedents empowering leadership (leadership style), psychological capital (Psychological States) and Job Characteristics (Job Resources) organizational level (human resource management practices) variables. The problem statement was defined, based on extensively discussed literature review on the topic of employee engagement, and framed out the consequent research model. Study variables, and their allied dimensions, were defined and interpreted in order to operationalize them accordingly for this study (chapter 2). The suggested relationships among variables were discussed and explained in the literature review; as a result, hypotheses were proposed to support the research model (chapter 2).

3.4 Participants

Zikmund et al., (2009) states that sampling is a research technique that facilitates researchers to generalize findings of any research study to expand it to the whole population of any selected business enterprise and industry, which commences from target population to sampling frame.

3.4.1 Population Frame

Robson et al., (2008) mentioned about research population consisting of those employees or individuals that any research scholar intended to refer for an investigation. Although, the notion of engagement, in true sense, is for everyone, but the population, for which this research study is intended to generalize its recommendations and findings, comprises all employees working in the banking sector of Pakistan as a target population.
As highlighted in chapter 1 of the present research study, on account of research perspectives for considering population from banking sector of Pakistan, many researchers have been conducting their research studies on banking sector while investigating potential factors that affect performance of employees and overall organizational performance along with employees’ related behaviors (Memon et al., Shah et al., 2018, Islam and Tariq, 2018, Sattar et al., 2015, Rasheed et al., 2013). Therefore, referring many research studies conducted on employees of banking sector across the globe as well as in Pakistan may be supported to explain internal validity of the present study and external validity in terms of generalizability for services industry.

As per Pakistan Economic Survey (2018-19), 4.71 percent growth rate has observed for services sector, which has crossed 55% of overall GDP that is leading sector in the economy of Pakistan. Financial sector is one of the key part of services industry, which consists of banking, insurance and investment management, whereas, banking sector accounts for around three-fourth of Pakistan’s financial sector. Pakistan has a large and diverse banking system, which is contributing substantial share in services sector subsequently in overall economy of Pakistan. This population has been selected based on the researcher’s job experience in Standard Chartered Bank for more than 5 years in HR department that has motivated the researcher to conduct this research study about the banking sector. A banking sector employee faces a lot of job related issues in the form of customer pressure, workload, long working hours, performance stress which make direct impact on employee’s work style. There are 45 different banks operating in Pakistan, out of which, 35 are scheduled banks, and 10 are microfinance banks. Therefore, employees of these 45 banks across Pakistan are the target population of the present research study. State Bank of Pakistan is the regulatory body to look after the affairs of all banks according to formulated rules and regulations, but, however, does not maintain employee-related data about the total strength of employees in a particular bank. As per banking survey report of the year 2016 regarding commercial banks operating in Pakistan, published by KPMG Taseer Hadi & Co formally known as KPMG, reported that 182,866 staff were employed in commercial banks at the cost of Rs: 199,309 million per year. Banking sector is the largest sector that substantially contributes towards Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of Pakistan. Geographically, branches of these banks are located in all
four provinces throughout Pakistan, namely, Federal Capital, Punjab, Baluchistan, Sindh, Khyber-Pakhtoonkhwa and Gilgit-Baltistan. The researcher aimed at to study key antecedents of employee engagement, and their relationship with performance (Service Performance and OCB), therefore, for him, banking sector appeared to be the most suitable choice for exploring this phenomena.

3.4.2 Sampling Strategy

It was not be possible for a researcher to collect data or cover the whole planned research population to investigate, ultimately, selecting a specific sample from that population relevant to the research area. The sample, thus collected may be called as subset or representation of the whole population that is assessable to the researcher (Neil, 2009 Zikmund et al., 2009, p-391). While arguing about the research population, McMillan (2002 p.102) explained the purpose of sampling, wherein, to choose a group of subjects as representatives of a larger group of employees/individuals, from which, the researcher contemplated to get specific information for a quantitative research. The sampling is of two types; either probability sampling or non-probability sampling (Robson, 2011). 200 branches of banks operating at major cities of Pakistan like Standard Chartered, Habib Bank Limited, United Bank Limited, Alfalah Bank Limited, Meezan Bank, Habib Metro Bank, NIB Bank, Muslim Commercial Bank, Faisal Bank Limited, Bank Islami Limited, Soneri Bank, Samba Bank, Khushali Bank, Summit Bank, Dubai Islamic Bank, Allied Bank, The Bank of Kyber and National Bank of Pakistan were selected randomly through probability sampling technique as only known details of branches name and location were available at website of aforementioned banks. Subsequently, 1200 employees of 200 selected branches, were approached by convenient sampling through their branch managers to fill the questionnaire. The researcher personally distributed questionnaire to employees at banks of Islamabad, Rawalpindi and Peshawar and collected accordingly, whereas data from remote cities like Karachi, Quetta and Lahore was collected by sending hard copies to the branches through courier and soft copies through emails.

Selection of accurate sample size of population is highly important to generalize findings of the research study. It has been observed that larger sample size is anticipated to increase precision value as the smaller sample size may not be acceptable for significant
results in some cases (Aron and Aron, 1994). On the other hand, Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggested to get at least 05 responses, against each item of the distributed questionnaire is considered a satisfactory number. However, Saunders et al., (2012) while explaining the sample size, argued that appropriate sample size could be over few hundreds. Ratio of almost 11:1 falls in collected data for the present study. As we applied AMOS for CFA, therefore, by following suggestions of available literature, generally, “CFA is a large-sample technique” (Kline, 2016). Kline (2016) suggested to take sample size from 5:1 to 10:1 as per resources available to collect data conveniently. Kyriazos (2018) discussed in details about different approaches to calculate minimum or acceptable sample size. He referred to the ratio of 10:1 to 20:1 as per complex model if required (Schumacker & Lomax, 2015; Kline, 2016; Jackson, 2003).

3.4.3 Data Collection Procedure

The researcher adopted self-administered questionnaire (attached with the study document as appendix- A) for collection of primary data in order to approach larger number of banking employees using two techniques, like: delivering questionnaire personally or via email/courier service correspondence for better response rate (Nicholas & Bousmaha, 2001). Irrespective of merits and demerits, the self-administered questionnaire provided an opportunity to the respondents to understand contents and context of questions clearly without any ambiguity. The covering page of the research questionnaire outlined objectives of the study, and a statement regarding observance of privacy and confidentiality about their provided information and responses along with guidelines to fill-in the questionnaire with the request to provide demographic data.

The total of 1200 questionnaire were distributed by the researcher himself among employees working in various banks located at Islamabad, Rawalpindi, Wah and Attock, which were within direct approach of the researcher. Similarly, the researcher dispatched questionnaires to various other branches of banks located in remote areas through courier and emails, where the researcher had allied partners or references for assistance. Out of 1200 questionnaires, despite proper follow-up, the researcher was able to receive back 1023 of them showing 85.3 % response rate. Out of 1023, 970 were useable for
consideration and inclusion in the result sheet, meaning 80.8% response rate of the total sample size.

3.4.4 Survey Design

The opted survey technique was a cost-effective and efficient exercise for data collection. The questionnaire was distributed under a covering page ensuring confidentially of respondents’ provided information. The objective of the research study was communicated to respondents which was invariably aimed at to identify some key antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. The contact number was provided to the respondents for any query related to understand question. The data thus collected through the comprehensive survey questionnaires comprising 108 items (questions) were divided into three parts according to study variables deduced through the literature review. First part of the questionnaire consisted of a covering letter addressed to the each respondent introducing him to the research background and its relevant objectives so as to motivate him for voluntary participation with an assurance regarding confidentiality of their responses. The second part of the questionnaire consisted of items of variables based on authenticated and verified measuring scales adopted for research studies to investigate proposed relationships among these variables. The third part of research instrument was all about demographic information related to the respondents regarding their gender, age, education, salary package, experience, bank’s name, city, etc. The sequence of questions was maintained in such a way, which developed respondent’s interest without any bias. 5-point Likert scale was adopted to take responses of respondents considered to be much flexible and preferred manner for research in social sciences to statistically determine significant results (Cooper & Schindler, 2006).

3.4.5 Common Method Variance/Bias

Many researchers argued about common method bias/variance (CMB/V) while conducting cross-sectional type of research and interpretation of relationships among studied constructs (Rindfleisch et al. 2008) and highlighted it as key concern and required to be treated in order to control biasness (Ostroff et al. 2002; Podsakoff et al. 2012).
Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff (2003) argued that there is great and serious influence on research findings if there is problem of common method bias. In order to treat CMB, the researcher tried to incorporate suggestions discussed by Podsakoff et al. (2003) in their research article. The researcher designed questionnaire properly in line with guidelines of Podsakoff et al. (2003) and made it in clear and easy wording to the Banks’ employees in Pakistan to respond easily and accurately. Furthermore, all items labeled properly with columns and rows along with an introductory note to brief about research objectives for their motivation (Terglav et al., 2016, Alfes et al., 2013). Podsakoff et al. (2003) identified many techniques to handle problems of common method bias, in which, Harman’s single-factor test is unique technique to control the key concern of common method bias. Normally, scholars load all studied variables in factor analysis in SPSS and check the result accordingly that whether “majority of the variance can be accounted by one general factor or not”.

3.5 Instruments for Data Collection

Following measuring scales have been adopted to measure the study variables juxtaposed with other variables to ascertain their association.

3.5.1 Empowering Leadership

Empowering behavior of leaders has been measured adopting empowering leadership questionnaire (ELQ-Scale) of Ahearne et al. (2005) which has been referred to in many research studies embedded in the empowerment construct (Zhang & Bartol, 2010; Kim & Beehr, 2017; Jamal & Ali, 2017). There are 12 items covering 4-dimensions of empowering leadership concept based on 5-point Likert scale to get responses from bank employees. Example of items is “My manager allows me to make important decisions quickly to satisfy customer needs”. The Cronbach’s α for empowering leadership is 0.78. (Ahearne et al., 2005, p-949).

3.5.2 Psychological Capital

Psychological Capital, being the second antecedent of employee engagement, has been measured adopting psychological capital questionnaire (PCQ-Scale) presented by
Luthans, Youssef et al., (2007) which has been referred to by many researchers (Luthan et al., 2008; Avey et al., 2011; Baron et al., 2016; Alessandri et al., 2018). PCQ scale consisted of 24 items and 4 dimensions following 5-point Likert scale method for data collection from bank employees to measure it, for example “When things are uncertain for me at work, I usually expect the best”. The Cronbach’s α for psychological capital is 0.83.

3.5.3 Job Characteristics

Job characteristics, being the third antecedent of employee engagement, has been measured by adopting “The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ) devised by Morgeson & Humphrey (2006) which has been extensively referred to in many research studies investigating job characteristics (Parker et al., 2008; Oldham & Hackman, 2010; Piccolo et al., 2010; Wegman et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2018). WDQ scale consisted of 27 items explaining 5 dimensions using 5-point Likert scale for data collection from bank employees to gauge the job characteristics. For example items are: “My job allows me to make my own decisions about how to schedule my work and my job allows me to decide on the order in which things are done on the job”. The Cronbach’s α for job characteristics is 0.92.

3.5.4 Employee Engagement

Employee engagement, being the primary variable of the current study, has been measured by adopting Rich et al. (2010). The scale for measuring employee engagement based on Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement, has been referred to in many research studies (Cole et al., 2012; Alfes et al., 2013; Anitha, 2014; Alan and Gruman, 2014; Anthony- McMann et al., 2017). Most of the measuring scales have remained under extensive criticism due to non-representation of Kahn’s (1990) fundamental conceptualization on employee engagement. The most popular measuring scale Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) introduced by Schaufeli & Bakker (2003) consists of such items that misperceive engagement with the antecedent conditions as advocated by Kahn (1990). Alan and Gruman (2014) stated that, presently, there was a great need to devise a valid and acceptable measuring tool for employee engagement that must be
distinct. They criticized on developing a linkage of employee engagement with burnout construct, as it revealed that UWES measure of engagement was the representation of burnout and not of engagement as also criticized by Cole et al., 2012. Alan and Gruman (2014) showed a serious concern about measuring engagement with UWES measuring scale and highlighted to develop and utilize the measuring scale developed based on Kahn (1990) engagement conceptualization and his theory of engagement. Anthony-McMann et al., (2017) stated that measurement scale for engagement based on Kahn (1990) philosophy interpreted by Rich et al. (2010) was better than ISA Scale designed by Soane et al. (2012). Rich et al. (2010) scale consisted of 18 items using 5-point Likert scale for data collection from bank employees to gauge employee engagement. The Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for employee engagement was 0.93. Examples of items are “At my work, I feel that I am full of energy” and “at my work, I feel deeply involved in my work”.

3.5.5 Employee Service Performance

Employee service performance, being the first consequence of employee engagement, has been measured by adopting measurement scale developed by Borucki and Burke (1999) which has been referred to in many research studies (Liao & Chuang, 2004; Chien, & Hung, 2008; Rank, 2006; Gelderen, Konijn, and Bakker, 2017; Suhartanto, Dean, Nansuri, & Triyuni, 2018). This scale consists of 7 items using 5-point Likert scale for data collection from bank employees on this variable to study the employee service performance. The Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for employee services performance was 0.88. Examples of items are “I am friendly and helpful to customers” and “I ask good questions and listening to find out what a customer wants”

3.5.6 Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), being the second consequence of employee engagement, has been measured by adopting Podsakoff et al. (1990) scale having 20 items using 5-point Likert scale to study the OCB which has been referred to in many research studies (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2005; Christian et al., 2011; Chiang & Hsieh 2012; Chun et al., 2013; Klotz et al. 2017). The
Cronbach’s α for OCB was 0.86. Examples of items is “I help others who have heavy workloads”.

3.6 Data Analysis

Data analyses are the techniques to convert the data collected from respondents to deduce beneficial information and evaluate relationships among variables of the research study under an appropriate mechanism (Saunders et al., 2019, p-44). The researcher utilized Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-20.0) for correlation and PROCESS macro through ordinary least squares (OLS) regression used by Hayes (2017) and Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS - 18) software to conduct confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in order to evaluate the proposed model of the present study.

3.6.1 Preliminary Data Analysis

The researcher conducted preliminary data analysis through SPSS, Version 20. Data screening, data coding, treatment of missing values, normality of data were done by applying techniques of SPSS. Furthermore, the researcher applied descriptive statistics through SPSS to calculate mean, frequencies, standard deviations and correlation. After preliminary analysis, the researcher utilized AMOS for confirmation factor analysis to test measurement model in order to validate model’s fitness and validity of items. PROCESS Macro, an application in SPSS based on regression was conducted to evaluate the influence of antecedents on employee engagement and its relationship with consequences.

3.6.2 Data Screening

Data Screening is an important phase to ensure proper proof-reading and cleaning in order to make data ready for further analysis. The researcher used SPSS for feeding of data into the software for further data screening. Van den Broeck et al., (2005) highlighted that data screening was the most important step for data analysis, which involved treatment of missing values, outliers and normality.
3.6.3 Treatment of the Missing Values

One of the main limitations pertinent to research survey were about missing data in the filled-in questionnaire, which appended because of many reasons, e.g. lengthy questionnaire, employees’ workload related problems at workplaces and clarity related issues of questions. Missing data analysis was normally carried out for two problems relevant to data analysis viz “decreased statistical power and biased estimates of parameters” (Hair et al, 1998). Researchers have argued that the missing data greater than 5% may be troublesome, which must be attended to, seriously (Tabachnik and Fidell, 2007). Schlomer, Bauman, & Card (2010) suggested that the questionnaire involving 25% missing value might be excluded from the dataset which would not be productive and might lead to biased results (Sekaran and Bougie, 2010). There was not any rule of thumb over the range of missing data. Less than 1% missing data considered as normal had insignificant effect on the results, 1-5% is considered as manageable, 5-15 % required sophisticated methods to deal with, whereas, 15% and more made considerable impact on data interpretation (Acuna & Rodriguez, 2004). To treat these missing data three types of procedure could be adopted (Little & Rubin, 2002). Case/Pairwise deletion, imputation and parameter estimation (Acuna & Rodriguez, 2004; Little & Rubin, 2002). In this research study, not more than 3% missing values were observed and had been properly treated by using “replacing missing value with mean” option in SPSS (Saunders, 2011).

3.6.4 Treatment of Outliers

The outlier in dataset is an observation having distinct distance from other observations that apprises researchers about something erroneous with data entry (Hawkins, 1980, Hair et al, 1998) which should be treated and addressed (Cohen et al., 2003). In the current research study, the researcher applied frequency analysis for treatment of outliers, item-by-item in order to ensure that all of them have been treated in the dataset accordingly.
3.6.5 Normality

It is very critically important to check normality of the continuous variables as one of the meaningful assumptions while performing multivariate analysis (Hair et al, 1998). Hence, the researcher had to check normality of all the variables of the study included in the research model before proceeding to data analyses and hypotheses testing (Mellahi and Budhwar, 2010). In order to evaluate, skewness and kurtosis are the most powerful tools to check the normality of variables (Hair et al, 1998; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). Skewness of variables shows symmetry of the distribution, which elaborates that mean value of a skewed variable does not fall in the midpoint of the distribution (Saunders et al, 2009). Positive skewness referred to clustering of cases toward left and long right tail, whereas, converse case is negative skewness (Kline, 1998; Hair et al, 1998; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001, Saunders et al, 2009). Saunders et al, (2009) explained that Kurtosis is related to peakedness or flatness of the distribution as compared to normal distribution. Peaked distribution reflects positive value of kurtosis, whereas, faltered distribution reflects negative value of kurtosis. Range of skewness and kurtosis should be within -2 to +2 under normally distributed data (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). Kline (2005) suggested that value of skewness should be within the range of -2 to 2 when the data is normally distributed, whereas, kurtosis value should not be greater than the value of 10. The skewness values were -.50, -.47, -.63, -1.01, -.45, and -.83 for empowering leadership, psychological capital, job characteristics, employee engagement, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior respectively. Moreover, for variables, including empowering leadership, psychological capital, job characteristics, employee engagement, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior, the kurtosis scores were 1.16, 1.13, 1.06, 1.93, 0.88 and 1.60, respectively. In details, results of skewness and kurtosis have been reported in chapter 4 while discussing results and analysis.

3.6.6 Reliability and Validity of Scales

Reliability of a measurement scale refers to its measurement consistency which replicates the same type of measurement for each time when it measures the same subjects under similar conditions (Adam, Kahn , Raeside & white, 2014). A measure will be entitled to
a reliable scale if it provides similar results when it is repeated. Adams et al. (2014) stated that reliability is the pre-requisite condition for scale validity, which can be determined by three methods: (1) test-retest method, (2) internal consistency and (3) equivalent form (Adams et al., 2014). The present research study adopted internal consistency approach to determine its reliability using Cronbach’s Alpha, which is the most popular method to assess reliability (Churchill 1979). Advocating the acceptable level of Cronbach Alpha, 0.5 to 0.6 is an acceptable level (Nunnally, 1967) for basic research, whereas, Gerbing & Anderson (1988) and Sekaran (2006) stated that acceptable level should be 0.60 and equal or greater than 0.7 is good for reliable scale, whereas, below than 0.5 is not acceptable level. The reliability score for empowering leadership, psychological capital (PsyCap), job characteristics, employee engagement, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) were much higher than the acceptable value 0.60 i.e 0.78, 0.83, 0.92, 0.93, 0.88 and 0.86, respectively. Details have been reported in chapter 4 while discussing results and data analysis.

3.6.7 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics is related to development of definite indices from the collected data of the study (Kothari, 2004) which is intended to measure following:

i. Central tendency (Mean, Mode, Median)

ii. Standard Deviation

3.6.8 The Measurement Model

The confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is a useful method using AMOS for factor analysis and it helps researchers to verify consistency of measures with researcher’s understanding of a construct. It also helps researchers to test the data fitness as compared to the hypothesized measurement model, which is based on theory of the research study. Hence, the researcher checked the validity of adopted instruments through confirmatory factor analysis and for adopted measurement scales, there is no need of exploratory factor analysis (Hair et al., 2010). It is important to check CFA in order to check the validity of scales based on collected data before hypotheses testing. Therefore, CFA (in AMOS) is used to measure the convergent and discriminant validity of the measures used in the
study. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) generates a number of fitness indices which help researchers to determine the construct’s validity (both convergent and discriminant) with regard to measures used in the study (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). The researcher checked the goodness-of-fit of the research model (hypothesized model) through model fitness indices criteria set by Hair, et al., (2010) and Schumacker & Lomax (2004). Hair, et al., (2010) described following three types of fit measure indices:

i. Absolute Fit Indices
ii. Incremental Fit Indices
iii. Parsimonious Fit Indices

The absolute fit indices evaluate ability of the overall model comprising indices, like: chi-square ($\chi^2$), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and goodness of fit index (GFI). Relatively good fit value for RMSEA should be less than 0.08 with chi-square value less than 3.0.

3.6.9 Hypothesis Testing

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) is a powerful tool to perform a number of statistical analyses on the data collected through questionnaire in order to test the proposed research model. The collected data was analyzed in SPSS and applied statistical tools and techniques, like: descriptive statistics, Pearson’s correlation and PROCESS macro as per requirement of the current research study.

3.6.10 PROCESS Macro Technique

Mediation exists between independent variable (X) and dependent variable (Y) through at least one variable, which is termed as mediator (M) (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Researchers believed that mediators were the psychological and behavioral constructs that shifted effects of independent variable (X) to dependent variable (Y) in order to explain, how mediator played its role in the mediation process (Mackinnon, Fairchild & Fritz, 2007, Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Mackinnon et al., (2007) stated that mediator acted as a connecting variable between two variables. Mackinnon and Fairchild (2009) while explaining the mediation process speculated that there was a chain of relationships among
variables. Hayes (2013) presented a method termed as “PROCESS” macro to examine the occurrence of mediation between the independent and dependent variables using bootstrapping statistical technique. This PROCESS macro method was developed by Hayes (2013) based on ordinary least squares (OLS) regression, which used to apply through SPSS. Hayes (2013) explained bootstrapping, which is non-parametric approach, effect-size estimation and re-sampling procedure for hypothesis testing; moreover, that was free from imposing normality assumptions of sampling distribution as also explained by Byrne (2010). Bootstrapping is computationally a concrete method, which involves repeated samples from data set for comparison of parametric values in order to examine indirect effect (Preacher and Hayes, 2008). In bootstrapping, the researcher used 5000 bootstrap samples under model 4 specifications and 95% confidence interval in order to regulate the significance of all hypotheses proposed for mediation effect.

In order to test mediation of the mediating variables, this study also explored the indirect effects of antecedents (Empowering Leadership, Psychological Capital and Job Characteristics) on consequences (Employee Service Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior), through employee engagement.

3.7 Ethical Consideration

The current research study has been conducted in accordance with ethical guidelines of National Defence University, Islamabad, therefore, during research, critical ethical issues relating to individuals and society have been considered (Adams et al., 2014). These critical issues are pertinent to ensuring privacy and confidentiality of information requested by the respondents for the current research study. The researcher initiated the survey questionnaire under a covering letter informing the respondents about aim of the research study, and its practically useful contribution towards social benefits and assured them about their confidential information indicating that there was no need to mention their personal particulars. Contact number was provided to the respondents for any query relevant to questions and the data file was saved having proper password protection to avoid any mishap of information leakage. The questionnaire is attached as Annex – A.
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4 Data Analysis and Results

4.1 Introduction

This chapter of the thesis in hand, presents the data analysis and results, which have been compiled to highlight the purpose of this study; specifically, the chapter explains the descriptive statistics of collected samples and variables of the study. The results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) are presented indicating validity analysis about the instruments used to measure the variables of the study. Along with this, the results for normality of data, reliability analysis and correlation are also depicted. This chapter concludes with the empirical results for conforming testing of hypotheses of the study.

4.2 Characteristics of Participant Employees

This section narrates the attributes of the participant employees designated in this study (Table 4.1). As reported in Table 4.1, out of 970 participating employees of this study, 737 (75.98 %) were males and the remaining 233 (24.02 %) were females. With reference to age groups of these participating employees, 82 (8.45 %) were below 24 years, 513 (52.87 %) belonged to the age group of 25 – 34 years, 322 (33.19 %) belonged to the age group of 35 - 44 years and the remaining 53 (5.46 %) belonged to the age group of 45 years and above. In proportion to their monthly salary package, out of 970 employees, 337 (34.74 %) received PKR 30,000 or below, 274 (28.24 %) received between PKR 30,001 - 50,000, 190 (19.58 %) received between PKR 50,001 - 70,000, 82 (8.45 %) received between PKR 70,001 - 100,000, 75 (7.73 %) received between PKR 100,001 – 150,000 and the remaining 12 (1.23 %) received PKR 150,000 and above. As as the academic qualification of the participating employees is concerned, 229 (23.60 %) employees had either 14 years of education or below, 698 (71.95%) had 16 years of education and the remaining 43 (4.43 %) had 18 years of academic education at their credit.
Table 4-1: Summary of Participant Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>75.98 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>24.02 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Age (in years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upto 24 Years</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8.45 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 Years</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>52.87 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 Years</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>33.19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Years and Above</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.46 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Package (in PKR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upto 30,000</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>34.74 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001–50,000</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>28.24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001–70,000</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>19.58 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70,001–100,000</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8.45 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001–150,000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.73 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,001 or above</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.23 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors and Below (14 Years Education or less)</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>23.60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Degree (16 Years Education)</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>71.95 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS/ M.Phil (18 Years Education)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Employment</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>85.97 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Employment</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>9.79 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Employment</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.23 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Tenure (with current bank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upto 02 Years</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>44.85 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-07 Years</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>42.68 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-13 Years</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.31 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Years and Above</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.16 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Owned Banks</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>38.25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Banks</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>61.75 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to demographics, relevant to the gender, age, salary package and higher academic qualification, data regarding employment status, working experience with their
current bank, and the employer type of the participant employees, were also collected. Out of 970 participant employees, 834 (85.97 %) employees available full time employment status, 95 (9.79 %) had contractual employment and the remaining 41 (3.92 %) employees were working with the bank through third party employment. Referring to the employment tenure with their current banking organization, 435 (44.85 %) employees had a total of two years working experience with their current bank, 414 (42.68 %) employees belonged to the tenure category of 03 – 07 years, 100 (10.31%) employees had a tenure of 08 – 13 years with their current employer and the remaining 21 (2.16 %) had a total of 14 years or above spent with their current employer. In the last, 371 (38.25 %) employees belonged to public banks and the remaining 599 (61.75 %) employees were working with private banks.

4.3 Common Method Bias

By using Harman’s Test (Single Factor) as explained by Podsakoff et al., (2003), the output table given bellow (Table 4-2) reflected twenty seven factors, whereas first unrotated factor of the output explained only 21% of the variance in data and balanced distribution across the other factors explained the rest of the variance. Result showed less than 50% value, which confirmed that there was no CMB problem with regard to the researcher data (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986).
Table 4-2: Harman’s Test (Single Factor) – Common Method Bias

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total % of Variance</td>
<td>Cum. %</td>
<td>Total % of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.344</td>
<td>4.688</td>
<td>25.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.532</td>
<td>3.098</td>
<td>32.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>2.690</td>
<td>35.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.738</td>
<td>2.402</td>
<td>37.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.492</td>
<td>2.186</td>
<td>40.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.389</td>
<td>2.096</td>
<td>42.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.116</td>
<td>1.856</td>
<td>44.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.936</td>
<td>1.698</td>
<td>45.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.878</td>
<td>1.648</td>
<td>47.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.725</td>
<td>1.513</td>
<td>48.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.642</td>
<td>1.441</td>
<td>50.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.599</td>
<td>1.402</td>
<td>51.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.528</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>53.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td>54.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td>55.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>56.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>57.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>58.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>59.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>61.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>62.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>62.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>63.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>64.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>65.646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Item-Wise Descriptive Statistics

This section illustrates the mean and standard deviation of the individual items of each of the construct used in this study. Based upon the responses received back from 970 employees, descriptive statistics (means and standard deviation) of empowering leadership, psychological capital (PsyCap), Job characteristics, employee engagement, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior, are described below:

4.4.1 Item-Wise Descriptive Analysis of Empowering Leadership

The descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) of the individual items of employees’ perceptions of empowering behavior of their leaders are reported in Table 4.3. Responses of participant employees were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from “5 = strongly agree” to “1 = strongly disagree, representing their agreement and disagreement on the statements relating to their leaders’ empowering behavior. Mean values of the empowerment leaders’ behavior, indicated that the employees perceived their managers as facilitators for empowering their subordinates, and shared their viewpoints on routine official matters of the bank in the study. The mean value of overall empowerment leadership, i.e. 3.89, was well above the central value of the Likert scale indicating the presence of employees’ perceptions of empowerment behavior towards their managers.

As reported in Table 4.3, the mean value of most of the items, was greater than 3.00 with two values below 3.00. The highest score (i.e. 4.25) was recorded for the item “my manager helps me to understand how my objectives and goals relate to objective of the company” (EL_1) among all other items used to measure the empowerment leadership construct. These results indicated that employees’ perceptions regarding manager’s assistance regarding the alignment between employee’s objectives and organizational objectives were definitely evident. Contrary to this, “my manager often consults me on strategic decisions” (EL_5) showed the lowest mean score, revealing the manager’s consultation with employees related to strategic decisions, was least practiced in the banks selected for this study.
Table 4-3: Descriptive Statistics of Empowering Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_1</td>
<td>“My manager helps me to understand how my objectives and goals relate to objective of the company”</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_2</td>
<td>“My manager helps me to understand the importance of my work to the overall effectiveness of the company.”</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_3</td>
<td>“My manager helps me to understand how my job fits into the bigger picture.”</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_4</td>
<td>“My manager makes many decisions together with me”</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_5</td>
<td>“My manager often consults me on strategic decisions”</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_6</td>
<td>“My manager gets my opinion on decisions that may affect me.”</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_7</td>
<td>“My manager believes that I can handle demanding tasks.”</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_8</td>
<td>“My manager believes in my ability to improve even when I make mistakes”</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_9</td>
<td>“My manager expresses confidence in my ability to perform at a high level”</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_10</td>
<td>“My manager allows me to do my job my way”</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_11</td>
<td>“My manager makes it more efficient for me to do my job by keeping the rules and regulations simple.”</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_12</td>
<td>“My manager allows me to make important decisions quickly to satisfy customer needs”</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to this, the deviation of employees from the mean score, for the construct of empowering leadership, was also not much different, ranging from 0.75 to 0.96. The highest dispersion was found for the item “My manager allows me to do my job my way” (EL_10) indicated that employees, participating in this study affirmed least agreement regarding this statement. The lowest deviation from the mean was found for the item “My manager expresses confidence in my ability to perform at a high level” (EL_9) amongst all the items of empowering leadership which reflected the optimum level of agreement among the employees regarding this statement.
4.4.2 Item-Wise Descriptive Analysis of Psychological Capital

The descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) pertinent to individual items of psychological capital (PsyCap) are shown in Table 4.4. Responses of participant employees were recorded on a “5-point Likert scale”, ranging from “5 = strongly agree” to “1 = strongly disagree”, representing their agreement and disagreement on the statements relating to their psychological capital. Mean values of psychological capital (PsyCap) indicated that the employees who participated in the study believed themselves of possessing more psychological capital. The mean value of overall psychological capital (PsyCap), i.e. 4.00, was well above the central value of the Likert scale indicating the presence of employees’ perceptions regarding presence of psychological capital (PsyCap).

As reported in Table 4.4, the mean value of most of the items was greater than 3.50 with few items with values below 3.50. The highest score (i.e. 4.23) was recorded for the item “I feel confident in representing my work area in meetings with management” (PsyCap_2) among all other items used to measure the construct of psychological capital. These results indicated that employees’ perceptions regarding their confidence, while presenting their work performance before the top management, were mostly evident. Contrary to this, “I usually take stressful things at work in stride/ progress” (PsyCap_16) showed the lowest mean score (2.81) revealed that employees’ perceptions of the progress, they made, while performing a work if they found any work being stressful, were less present in the bank employees of this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological Capital (PsyCap)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_1</td>
<td>“I feel confident analyzing a long-term problem to find a solution”</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_2</td>
<td>“I feel confident in representing my work area in meetings with management”</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_3</td>
<td>“I feel confident contributing to discussions about the organization’s strategy”</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_4</td>
<td>“I feel confident helping to set targets/goals in my work area.”</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_5</td>
<td>“I feel confident contacting people outside the organization (e.g. suppliers, customers) to discuss problems.”</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_6</td>
<td>“I feel confident presenting information to a group of colleagues.”</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_7</td>
<td>“If I should find myself in a jam at work, I could think of many ways to get out of it.”</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_8</td>
<td>“At the present time, I am energetically pursuing my work goals.”</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_9</td>
<td>“There are lots of ways around any problem.”</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_10</td>
<td>“Right now I see myself as being pretty successful at work.”</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_11</td>
<td>“I can think of many ways to reach my current work goals.”</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_12</td>
<td>“At this time, I am meeting the work goals that I have set for myself.”</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_13</td>
<td>“When I have a setback/ failure at work, I have trouble recovering from it and moving on.”</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_14</td>
<td>“I usually manage difficulties one way or another at work.”</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_15</td>
<td>“I can be “on my own,” so to speak, at work if I have to.”</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_16</td>
<td>“I usually take stressful things at work in stride/progress.”</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_17</td>
<td>“I can get through difficult times at work because I have experienced difficulty before.”</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap_18</td>
<td>“I feel I can handle many things at a time at this job.”</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to this, the dispersion of employees’ responses from the mean score, relevant to the construct of psychological capital, was not also much deviating from the range of 0.70 to 0.97. The highest dispersion was noticed for the item “If something can go wrong for me work-wise, it will go wrong” (PsyCap_20) which indicated that employees who participated in this study had least agreement regarding this statement. The lowest deviation from the mean was observed for the item “I feel confident in representing my work area in meetings with management” (PsyCap_2) amongst all the items of psychological capital (PsyCap) reflected the highest level of agreement among the employees regarding this statement.
4.4.3 Item-Wise Descriptive Analysis of Job Characteristics

The descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) of the individual items of job characteristics are shown in Table 4.5. Responses of participant employees were recorded on a “five-point Likert scale”, ranging from “5 = strongly agree” to “1 = strongly disagree”, representing their agreement and disagreement on the statements relating to their job characteristics. Mean values of job characteristics indicated that the employees who participated in the study, agreed that their job integrated the characteristics comprising autonomy, independence, task significance, skill variety and feedback. The mean value of overall job characteristics construct (i.e. 4.07) was well above the central value of the five-point Likert scale indicating the presence of employees’ perceptions of aforesaid job characteristics.

As reported in Table 4.5, the mean value of all the items of job characteristics was greater than 3.90, which revealed a high-level employees’ agreement to on-the-job characteristics. The highest score (i.e. 4.20) was recorded for two items i.e. “My job requires a variety of skills” (JobC_10) and “My job requires me to utilize a variety of different skills in order to complete the work” (JobC_11) among all the items used to measure the construct of job characteristics. These results indicated that employees’ perceptions, regarding utilization of variety of different skills were most prominently evident. Contrary to this, “My job allows me to make my own decisions about how to schedule my work” (JobC_1) showed the lowest mean score (2.90) indicated that employees’ perceptions of flexibility, they visualized for their jobs regarding self-scheduling of their tasks, were less present in the bank employees under the present study.
Table 4-5: Descriptive Statistics of Job Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Job Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_1</td>
<td>“My job allows me to make my own decisions about how to schedule my work.”</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_2</td>
<td>“My job allows me to decide on the order in which things are done on the job.”</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_3</td>
<td>“My job allows me to plan how I do my work.”</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_4</td>
<td>“My job gives me a chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.”</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_5</td>
<td>“My job allows me to make a lot of decisions on my own.”</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_6</td>
<td>“My job provides me with significant autonomy (independence) in making decisions.”</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_7</td>
<td>“My job allows me to make decisions about what methods I use to complete my work.”</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_8</td>
<td>“My job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.”</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_9</td>
<td>“My job allows me to decide on my own how to go about doing my work.”</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_10</td>
<td>“My job requires a variety of skills.”</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_11</td>
<td>“My job requires me to utilize a variety of different skills in order to complete the work.”</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_12</td>
<td>“My job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills.”</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_13</td>
<td>“My job requires the use of a number of skills.”</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_14</td>
<td>“The results of my work are likely to significantly affect the lives of other people.”</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_15</td>
<td>“My job itself is very significant and important in the broader scheme of things.”</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_16</td>
<td>“My job has a large impact on people outside the organization.”</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_17</td>
<td>“The work performed in my job has a significant impact on people outside the organization”</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_18</td>
<td>“My job involves completing a piece of work that has an obvious beginning and end.”</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_19</td>
<td>“My job is arranged so that I can do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.”</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_20</td>
<td>“My job provides me the chance to completely finish the pieces of work I begin.”</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_21</td>
<td>“My job allows me to complete the work I start.”</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_22</td>
<td>“The work activities of my job themselves provide direct</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and clear information about the effectiveness (e.g., quality and quantity) of my job performance.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JobC_23</th>
<th>“My job itself provides feedback on my performance.”</th>
<th>4.16</th>
<th>.77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JobC_24</td>
<td>“My job itself provides me with information about my performance.”</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_25</td>
<td>“I receive a great deal of information from my manager and coworkers about my job performance.”</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_26</td>
<td>“Other people in the organization, such as managers and coworkers, provide information about the effectiveness (e.g., quality and quantity) of my job performance.”</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobC_27</td>
<td>“I receive feedback on my performance from other people in my organization (such as my manager or coworkers).”</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to this, the dispersion of employees’ responses from the mean score relevant to construct of job characteristics was also not much different, ranging between 0.72 to 0.95. The highest dispersion was observed for the item “My job allows me to make my own decisions about how to schedule my work” (JobC_1), which indicated that employees, who participated in this study, least assented to this statement of job characteristics. The lowest deviation from the mean was found for the item “The work activities of my job themselves provide direct and clear information about the effectiveness (e.g., quality and quantity) of my job performance.” (JobC_22) amongst all the items of job characteristics reflected the highest level of agreement among the employees on this statement.

### 4.4.4 Item-Wise Descriptive Analysis of Employee Engagement

The descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) of the individual items of the construct with regard to employee engagement is reported in Table 4.6. Responses of participant employees were recorded on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from “5 = strongly agree” to “1 = strongly disagree, representing their discerned agreement or disagreement on the statements relating employee engagement. Mean values of employee engagement indicated that the employees who participated in the study, believed that they were engaged at their workplaces. The mean value of overall employee engagement construct was 4.30, well above the central value of the Likert scale, indicating the presence of engagement aspect of employees at their workplaces.
As reported in Table 4.6, the mean value of all of the items of employee engagement was more than 4.20 indicating high level of engagement which employees exhibited at their workplaces. The highest score (i.e. 4.38) was recorded for the item “I strive as hard as I can to complete my job” (EE_5) among all the items used to measure the construct of employee engagement. These results indicated that employees’ feelings of working hard and exercise more efforts to complete their jobs were mostly evident. Contrary to this, “I work with intensity on my job” (EE_1) showed the lowest mean score (4.20) revealing that employees’ feelings of the intensity of efforts at their jobs were less present in the bank employees under the present study.

Table 4.6: Descriptive Statistics of Employee Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE_1</td>
<td>“I work with intensity on my job.”</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_2</td>
<td>“I exert my full effort to my job.”</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_3</td>
<td>“I devote a lot of energy to my job.”</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_4</td>
<td>“I try my hardest to perform well on my job.”</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_5</td>
<td>“I strive as hard as I can to complete my job.”</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_6</td>
<td>“I exert a lot of energy on my job.”</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_7</td>
<td>“I am enthusiastic in my job.”</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_8</td>
<td>“I feel energetic at my job.”</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_9</td>
<td>“I am interested in my job.”</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_10</td>
<td>“I am proud of my job.”</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_11</td>
<td>“I feel positive about my job”</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_12</td>
<td>“I am excited about my job.”</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_13</td>
<td>“At work, my mind is focused on my job.”</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_14</td>
<td>“At work, I pay a lot of attention to my job.”</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_15</td>
<td>“At work, I focus a great deal of attention on my job.”</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_16</td>
<td>“At work, I am absorbed by my job.”</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_17</td>
<td>“At work, I concentrate on my job.”</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE_18</td>
<td>“At work, I devote a lot of attention to my job.”</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to this, the dispersion of employees’ responses from the mean score for the construct of employee engagement was also not much different, ranging from 0.67 to 0.81. The highest dispersion was noticed for the item “I am proud of my job” (EE_10) indicated that employees, participating in this study, showed the least agreement to this statement. The lowest deviation from mean was observed for the item “I strive as hard as I can to complete my job” (EE_5) amongst all of the items of employee engagement reflected the highest level of agreement among the employees on this statement.

4.4.5 Item-Wise Descriptive Analysis of Employee Service Performance

The descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) of the individual items for the construct of employee service performance is divulged in Table 4.7. Responses of participating employees were recorded on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from “5 = strongly agree” to “1 = strongly disagree, representing their agreement and disagreement on the statements relating their service performance behavior. Mean values of employee service performance indicated that the employees participating in the study believed that they exhibited a very positive and friendly behavior while serving customers. The mean value of the overall construct of employee service performance, was 4.32 which was well above the central value of the Likert scale indicating a positive and friendly behavior while dealing with the customers.

As reported in Table 4.7, the mean value of all the items of employee service performance construct was above 4.20. Further, the highest score (i.e. 4.39) was recorded for the item “I am friendly and helpful to customers” (ESP_1) among all the items applied to measure the construct of employee service performance. These results indicated that a favorable, cooperative, helping and friendly behavior was mostly evident among bank employees, while serving customers. Contrary to this, “I suggest items customers might like but did not think of” (ESP_6) showed the lowest mean score (4.22) revealed that employees’ perceptions of the suggestions they divulged to their customers which they did not even know themselves, were less present in the bank employees under study.
Table 4-7: Descriptive Statistics of Employee Service Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Service Performance</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP_1</td>
<td>“I am friendly and helpful to customers.”</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP_2</td>
<td>“I always try to approach customers quickly.”</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP_3</td>
<td>“I ask good questions and listening to find out what a customer wants.”</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP_4</td>
<td>“I am always willing to help customers when needed.”</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP_5</td>
<td>“I point out and relating product/ service features to a customer’s needs.”</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP_6</td>
<td>“I suggest items/options customers might like but did not think of.”</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP_7</td>
<td>“I explain an item’s features and benefits to overcome a customer’s objections.”</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to this, the dispersion of employees’ responses, from the mean score for the construct of employee service performance, was also not much different, which ranged between 0.65 to 0.74. The highest dispersion was noticed for the item “I suggest items/options customers might like but did not think of” (ESP_6) which indicated that employees participating in this study showed least agreement to this statement. The lowest deviation from the mean was found for the item “I am friendly and helpful to customers” (ESP_1) amongst all the items of employee service performance, which reflected the highest level of agreement among the employees mentioned in this statement.

4.4.6 Item-Wise Descriptive Analysis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) of the individual items for the construct of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is reported in Table 4.8. Responses of participant employees were recorded on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from “5 = strongly agree” to “1 = strongly disagree,” representing their agreement and disagreement on the statements relating to their OCB. Mean values of OCB construct indicated that the employees, who participated in the study, believed that they remain
involved in discretionary behaviors very frequently. The mean value of overall OCB was well above the central value of the Likert scale indicating the presence of employees’ involvement in OCB at their workplaces.

As reported in Table 4.8, the mean value of most of the items was greater than 3.50 with few items with values below 3.50. The highest score (i.e. 4.28) was recorded for the item “I obey company rules and regulations even when no one is watching” (OCB_18) among all the items used to measure the construct of organizational citizenship behavior. These results indicated that employees’ perceptions regarding following the rules and regulations of the organization, at their own will, were mostly evident. Contrary to this, “I always find fault with what the organization is doing” (OCB_15) showed the lowest mean score (3.28) revealed that employees’ perceptions, of identifying organizational faults and criticize organization’s ways of doing things, were less present in the bank employees under study.

Table 4-8: Descriptive Statistics of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_1</td>
<td>“I help others who have heavy workloads.”</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_2</td>
<td>“I am the classic “squeaky wheel” that always needs greasing.”</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_3</td>
<td>“I believe in giving an honest day’s work for an honest day’s pay.”</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_4</td>
<td>“I try to avoid creating problems for co-workers.”</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_5</td>
<td>“I keep abreast of changes in the organization.”</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_6</td>
<td>“I consider the impact of my actions on coworker”</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_7</td>
<td>“I attend meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important.”</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_8</td>
<td>“I am always ready to lend a helping hand to those around me.”</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_9</td>
<td>“I attend functions that are not required, but help the company image.”</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_10</td>
<td>“I read and keep up with organization announcements, memos, and so on.”</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_11</td>
<td>“I help others who have been absent.”</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_12</td>
<td>“I do not abuse the rights of others.”</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_13</td>
<td>“I willingly help others who have work related problems.”</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_14</td>
<td>“I take steps to try to prevent problems with other workers.”</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_15</td>
<td>“I always find fault with what the organization is doing.”</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_16</td>
<td>“I am mindful of how my behavior affects other people’s jobs.”</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_17</td>
<td>“I do not take extra breaks.”</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_18</td>
<td>“I obey company rules and regulations even when no one is watching.”</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_19</td>
<td>“I help orient new people even though it is not required.”</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB_20</td>
<td>“I am one of the most conscientious employees.”</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dispersion of employees’ responses from the mean score for the construct of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) was a little bit different, ranging from 0.65 to 1.10. The highest dispersion was found for the item “I am the classic “squeaky wheel” that always needs greasing” (OCB_2) indicated that employees who participated in this study had least agreement regarding this statement. The lowest deviation from the mean was found for the item “I help orient new people even though it is not required” (OCB_19) amongst all the items of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) reflected the highest level of agreement among the employees with respect to this statement.

### 4.5 Normality of Study Variables

In the multivariate data analysis, normality of the variables (only continuous variables) is viewed as one of the critical issues. According to Mellahi and Budhwar, (2010) empirical inferences become less robust in case the distributions of the variables are non-normal. Therefore, before processing the actual data analysis and hypotheses testing, it was deemed necessary to gauge the normality of all the continuous variables, used in this study. There are many approaches, which can be used to evaluate the normality. In this study, the scores of skewness and kurtosis are used to measure normality of the variables.
used in this study. This approach is widely used to check normality of the distribution. Results of skewness and kurtosis are reported in Table 4.9. The skewness values were -.50, -.47, -.63, -1.01, -.45, and -.83 for empowering leadership, psychological capital, job characteristics, employee engagement, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior respectively. Moreover, for variables, including empowering leadership, psychological capital, job characteristics, employee engagement, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior, the kurtosis scores were 1.16, 1.13, 1.06, 1.93, 0.88 and 1.60, respectively. For a normal distribution, the value of skewness should be between -2 and +2, and for kurtosis, the value should not be greater than 10.0 (Kline, 2005). The scores of skewness and kurtosis of all the variables (as shown in Table 4.9) well-complied with the cutoff values, indicated that there was no issue regarding normality of data distribution in case of any variable used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Skewness Statistics</th>
<th>Skewness Standard Error</th>
<th>Kurtosis Statistics</th>
<th>Kurtosis Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Characteristics</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Performance</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

This section of the study sheds light on the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) applied to test the validity of the instruments used to measure the constructs relevant to this study. As this study has adopted measurement instruments from the previous studies, therefore, there is no need to conduct exploratory factor analysis (Hair et al., 2010). For such cases, when any study adopts the already validated measurement instruments, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is suggested to check and confirm the validity of the scales by using collected data for the current research study before hypotheses testing. Therefore, in this study, CFA has been carried out to assess the validity of measurement scales applied to gauge the variables of the study.

4.5.1 Construct Validity

Construct validity is referred to the degree at which questions or items that the researcher adopted or developed to study and scrutinize a construct to represent the studied construct in true sense, and how much accurately, this construct is converted into to reality at workplace. (Drost, 2011; Saunders et al., 2012, p-193). In order to establish the construct validity, it is required to measure the convergent and discriminant validity before commencement of hypotheses testing (Hair et al., 2010) which are sub-types of construct validity. Construct validity of measurement model having all variables, is established by validating accepted values of model fit indices as per threshold level/values which are indicated by the researchers (Awang, 2015; Hair et al., 2010). Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) generates a number of fitness indices, which help researchers to determine the construct’s validity of measurement model (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). All the model-fitness indices used in this study, and their cut-off values are presented in Table 4.10.
Table 4-10: Model Fitness Indices Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fitness Index</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$/d.f.</td>
<td>Less than 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>Less than 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Fist Index (IFI)</td>
<td>0.9 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker Lewis Index (TLI)</td>
<td>0.9 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>0.9 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR)</td>
<td>0.08 and below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The CFA model as shown in Table 4.11 fitted the data well like “root mean square error of approximation” (RMSEA) = 0.034, comparative fit index (CFI) = 0.92, and “standardized root mean square residual” (SRMR) = 0.03.

Table 4-11: Goodness of Fit Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Fit Indices</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisq ($\chi^2$/d.f.)</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.2 Convergent Validity

Convergent validity refers to the extent at which the items show agreement (convergence) towards the construct for which those items are used to measure it (Campbell & Fisk, 1959). Further, factor-loading value of each of the item along with Average Variance Extracted (AVE) for every studied construct were considered for convergent validity
(Hair, et al., 2009; Schumacker & Lomax, 2004, Awang, 2015). According to them, the factor-loading of an item, towards its respective latent variable, should be greater than 0.50 and only those items were used to compute variables for which factor-loading value was 0.50 or above (Hair et al., 2010). Convergent validity is established through AVE values that should be greater than 0.5 (Awang, 2015; Hair et al., 2010). Values of AVE of the study are greater than 0.5 as shown in Table 4.12, which demonstrates establishment of convergent validity.

**Table 4-12: Average Variance Extracted Values of Constructs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>0.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>0.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Characteristics</td>
<td>0.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Service Performance</td>
<td>0.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>0.562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5.3 Discriminant Validity

Distinctiveness or uniqueness of two constructs in the model is the discriminant validity as introduced for the first time by Campbell & Fisk (1959). Discriminant Validity concludes about the constructs, whether they are highly correlated among themselves or not through the Square Root of AVE value of a specific construct that should be greater than the value of correlation. The table no 4.13 represents the values of square root means of AVE of the constructs (variables) along with values of correlations between the construct (studied variables), which demonstrates that square root values of AVE of constructs are greater than the corresponding correlation values in different rows and columns which confirmed the discriminant validity of constructs in the measurement model.
Table 4-13: Fornell and Larcker (1981) discriminant validity table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Characteristics</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Performance</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>0.751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The bold values in diagonal are square root of average variance extracted (√AVE).

4.6 Reliability Analysis

This section discusses reliability analysis of the variables of the present research study. Cronbach’s alpha was used to test the reliability of the measurement scales used to gauge the constructs mentioned in this study. A value of 0.60 and above for a construct is acceptable, which ensures reliability of the constructs (Spector, 1992; Moss, et al., 1998). The results of the reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) for all the constructs, used in this study, are presented in Table 4.14. These results showed that all the variables had a reliability score ranging from 0.78 to 0.93, which were well above the cut-off value of 0.60. The reliability score for empowering leadership, psychological capital (PsyCap), job characteristics, employee engagement, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) were well above than the acceptable value 0.60 i.e 0.78, 0.83, 0.92, 0.93, 0.88 and 0.86, respectively.
### Table 4.14: Reliability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Job Characteristics</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Employee Service Performance</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.7 Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation Results

This section represents the mean values, standard deviation scores and correlation among the variables of the study. All these results are reported in Table 4.15. Average age of the employee who participated in the study was 32.50 (SD = 6.60) years. Accounting average employee’s tenure of employment with the current bank which an employee spent was 3.75 (SD = 3.24) years. Using the 5-point Likert Scale, the average scores for empowering leadership, psychological capital, job characteristics, employee engagement, employee service performance and OCB were 3.89 (SD = 0.46), 4.00 (SD = 0.41), 4.07 (SD = 0.49), 4.30 (SD = 0.51), 4.32 (SD = 0.53) and 4.09 (SD = 0.45), respectively.

With regard to correlation analysis, all the correlation values among the key variables of the study were found significant. Employee’s gender was found significantly related ($r = 0.11$, $p < .01$) to only empowering leadership perceptions of the employees. Employees’ age factor was noticed to be significantly related to empowering leadership ($r = 0.14$, $p < .01$), psychological capital ($r = 0.16$, $p < .01$), job characteristics ($r = 0.21$, $p < .01$), employee engagement ($r = 0.11$, $p < .01$), service performance ($r = 0.12$, $p < .01$) and OCB ($r = 0.09$, $p < .01$). In addition to this, employee’s education was only significantly related to job characteristics ($r = 0.07$, $p < .01$). In terms of the last control variable (tenure), it was significantly related to empowering leadership ($r = 0.13$, $p < .01$),
psychological capital ($r = 0.11$, $p < .01$), job characteristics ($r = 0.19$, $p < .01$), employee engagement ($r = 0.07$, $p < .01$), and service performance ($r = 0.06$, $p < .01$).

Moreover, the correlation results of the key variables showed that empowering leadership was related to psychological capital ($r = 0.51$, $p < .01$), job characteristics ($r = 0.45$, $p < .01$), employee engagement ($r = 0.35$, $p < .01$), service performance ($r = 0.36$, $p < .01$) and OCB ($r = 0.37$, $p < .01$). Further, psychological capital (PsyCap) was significantly related to job characteristics ($r = 0.65$, $p < .01$), employee engagement ($r = 0.52$, $p < .01$), service performance ($r = 0.48$, $p < .01$) and OCB ($r = 0.53$, $p < .01$). Next, job characteristics was also found to be significantly related to employee engagement ($r = 0.60$, $p < .01$), service performance ($r = 0.48$, $p < .01$) and OCB ($r = 0.54$, $p < .01$). In case of the correlation of employee engagement, it was significantly related to service performance behavior of the employees ($r = 0.54$, $p < .01$) and OCB ($r = 0.62$, $p < .01$). Finally, service performance was also found to be positively related to the OCB of the employees ($r = 0.61$, $p < .01$).

Conclusively, these correlation results demonstrated that, amongst all the predictors of employee engagement, job characteristics had the strongest ($r = 0.60$, $p < .01$) correlation with employee engagement, whereas, empowering leadership showed the weakest relationship ($r = 0.35$, $p < .01$) with the engagement level of the employees. Furthermore, employee engagement was strongly related to organizational citizenship behavior of the employees ($r = 0.62$, $p < .01$), one of the outcome variables of employee engagement, compared to the correlation value with the other outcome variable i.e. employee service performance ($r = 0.54$, $p < .01$). Overall, these results illustrated that all the key variables of the study (empowering leadership, psychological capital, job characteristics, employee engagement, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior) were concomitant and significantly inter-related.
**Table 4-15: Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tenure</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Psychological Capital</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Job Characteristics</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employee Engagement</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Service Performance</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. OCB</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.61*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p <0.05.

**p <0.01.
4.8 Hypotheses Testing

In this section, the results of hypotheses testing are presented.

4.8.1 Direct Relationship

The direct impact of independent variables on dependent variable in the conceptual research model observed in an analysis through an approach given by Preacher and Hayes (2010) in their PROCESS macro within SPSS.

4.8.1.1 Empowering Leadership, Employee engagement and Outcome Behaviors

H1 of the study posited that employees’ perceptions of the empowering behavior of their leaders are positively related to their engagement level at the workplaces. H 2 & 3 of the present research study investigated that there was positive and significant relationship between empowering leadership (EL) and output variables: employee service performance (ESP) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) respectively. Moreover, employee’s gender and age of employees were taken as control variables in the analysis. The results values are presented in Table 4.16. These results demonstrate that empowering leadership is significantly related to employee engagement (β = 0.38, p < 0.01), after controlling the effects of the aforementioned control variables. These findings revealed that a one-unit change in empowering leadership would cause 0.38 units change in the engagement level of the employees working in the banks operating in Pakistan. Similarly, results demonstrate that empowering leadership is significantly related to employee service performance (β = 0.23, p < 0.01) and organizational citizenship behavior (β = 0.17, p < 0.01) after controlling the effects of the aforementioned control variables. These findings revealed that a one-unit change in empowering leadership would cause 0.23 units change in the employee service performance and 0.17 unit change in the organizational citizenship behavior of the employees working in the banks operating in Pakistan. Overall, these results empirically tested the hypotheses H1, H2 and H3 of the study and confirmed accordingly.
Table 4.16: Impact of EL on EE, ESP and OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate (β)</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>P- Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at **p<.01 level (1-tailed), Predictors: EL-Empowering Leadership, Dependent Variable in the relationships: EE – Employee Engagement, ESP- Employee Service Performance, OCB – Organizational Citizenship Behavior

4.8.1.2 Psychological Capital, Employee engagement and Outcome Behaviors

H4 of the study presupposed that employees’ perceptions in terms of their psychological capital were positively related to their engagement level at the workplaces. H5 & 6 of the present research study investigated that there was positive and significant relationship between psychological capital (PsyCap) and output variables: employee service performance (ESP) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) respectively. Moreover, employee’s gender and age of employees were taken as control variables in the analysis. The results values are presented in Table 4.17. These results demonstrate that psychological capital is significantly related to employee engagement (β = 0.63, p < 0.01), after controlling the effects of the aforementioned control variables. These findings revealed that a one-unit change in psychological capital would cause 0.63 units change in the engagement level of the employees working in the banks operating in Pakistan. Similarly, results demonstrate that psychological capital is significantly related to employee service performance (β = 0.34, p < 0.01) and organizational citizenship behavior (β = 0.31, p < 0.01) after controlling the effects of the aforementioned control variables. These findings revealed that a one-unit change in psychological capital would cause 0.34 units change in the employee service performance and 0.31 unit change in the organizational citizenship behavior of the employees working in the banks operating in Pakistan. Hence, hypotheses H4, H5 and H6 of the study are empirically verified.
Table 4.17: Impact of PsyCap on EE, ESP and OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate (β)</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>→ EE</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>→ ESP</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>→ OCB</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at **p<.01 level (1-tailed), Predictors: PsyCap-Psychological Capital, Dependent Variable in the relationships: EE – Employee Engagement, ESP- Employee Service Performance, OCB – Organizational Citizenship Behavior

4.8.1.3 Job Characteristics, Employee engagement and Outcome Behaviors

H7 of the study postulated that employees’ perceptions in terms of their job characteristics (JC) were positively related to their engagement level at the workplaces. H8 & 9 of the present research study investigated that positive and significant relationship existed between job characteristics (JC) and output variables: employee service performance (ESP) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) respectively. Moreover, employee’s gender and age of employees were taken as control variables in the analysis. The results values are presented in Table 4.18. These results demonstrate that job characteristics is significantly related to employee engagement (β = 0.62, p < 0.01), after controlling the effects of the aforementioned control variables. These findings revealed that a one-unit change in job characteristics would cause 0.62 units change in the engagement level of the employees working in the banks operating in Pakistan. Similarly, results demonstrate that job characteristics is significantly related to employee service performance (β = 0.27, p < 0.01) and organizational citizenship behavior (β = 0.25, p < 0.01) after controlling the effects of the aforementioned control variables. These findings revealed that a one-unit change in job characteristics would cause 0.27 units change in the employee service performance and 0.25 unit change in the organizational citizenship behavior of the employees working in the banks operating in Pakistan. Overall, on the basis of these results, H7, H8 and H9 of the study are empirically verified.
Table 4-18: Impact of JC on EE, ESP and OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate (β)</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JC</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JC</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JC</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at **p<.01 level (1-tailed), Predictors: JC-Job Characteristics, Dependent Variable in the relationships: EE – Employee Engagement, ESP- Employee Service Performance, OCB – Organizational Citizenship Behavior

4.8.1.4 Employee Engagement and Employee Service Performance

H10 of the study proposed that employee engagement was positively related to employee service performance. Moreover, employee’s gender and age were taken as control variables in the analysis. The results values are presented in Table 4.19, which demonstrate that employee engagement is significantly related to employee service performance engagement (β = 0.48, p < 0.01), after controlling the effects of the aforementioned control variables. These findings revealed that a one-unit change in employee engagement would cause 0.48 unit change in the level of the employees service performance of employees in the banks operating in Pakistan. Overall, on the basis of these results, H10 of the study has been empirically confirmed.

Table 4-19: Impact of EE on ESP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate (β)</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at **p<.01 level (1-tailed), Predictors: EE – Employee Engagement, Dependent Variable: ESP-Employee Service Performance
4.8.1.5 Employee Engagement and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

H11 of the study proposed that employee engagement was positively related to the organizational citizenship behavior. Moreover, employee’s gender and age were taken as control variables in the analysis. The results values are presented in Table 4.20. These results demonstrate that employee engagement is significantly related to organizational citizenship behavior (β = 0.49, p < 0.01), after controlling the effects of the aforementioned control variables. These findings revealed that a one-unit change in employee engagement would cause 0.49 unit change in the level of the organizational citizenship behavior of employees in the banks operating in Pakistan. Overall, on the basis of these results, H11 of the study is empirically verified.

**Table 4-20: Impact of EE on OCB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Construct Path</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate (β)</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EE → OCB</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>21.09</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at **p<.01 level (1-tailed), Predictors: EE – Employee Engagement, Dependent Variable: OCB-Organizational Citizenship Behavior
**Table 4-21: Direct Hypotheses Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>“Empowering leadership has significant relationship with employee engagement”.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>“Empowering leadership and employee service performance are positively related to each other”</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>“Empowering leadership and organizational citizenship behavior are positively related to each other”</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>“Psychological capital has significant relationship with employee engagement”.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>“Psychological capital and employee service performance are positively related to each other”</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>“Psychological capital and organizational citizenship behavior are positively related to each other”.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>“Job characteristics has significant relationship with employee engagement”.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>“Job characteristics and employee service performance are positively related to each other”.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>“Job characteristics and organizational citizenship behavior are positively related to each other”.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>“Employee engagement has significant relationship with employee service performance”.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>“Employee engagement has significant relationship with organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)”.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.2 Testing of Mediation

Researchers argued about the well-known method for examining mediation process among research variables which was introduced by Baron and Kenny (1986) and highlighted that significant relationship between an antecedent and consequence of a mediating variable is essential, whereas, X and MY path should be significant in the relationship (Preacher & Hayes, 2008; Hayes, 2009; Mackinnon, 2009). The present study tested mediation of employee engagement between antecedents and consequences through method of PROCESS macro given by Preacher and Hayes (2013).

There were three antecedents i.e., empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics and two consequences i.e., employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior of employee engagement which played the role of mediating variable. Hayes (2013) provided many models in consideration of bootstrap sample as per requirement of research models. In the present research study, the researchers adopted Model No 4 of “PROCESS macro” approach developed by Hayes (2013) in-built in SPSS considering 5000 bootstrap samples. PROCESS macro application is based on ordinary least squares (OLS) regression which is a form of linear regression. Prior to carry out analyses of data set, all noticeable signs were unit-weighed to get observed composite scores for each of the variables taken under analysis. Afterward, these scores were standardized accordingly.

4.8.2.1 Empowering Leadership, Employee Engagement and ESP

The PROCESS Macro was applied to test the H12a developed by Hayes (2013), a in-built application for SPSS considering 5,000 bootstrap samples suggested as per specifications given under Model 4 for examining a simple mediation model of variables. As shown in Figure 4.1, empowering leadership had a positive and significant influence or impact on employee engagement indicating values like: β as 0.38; t = 11.10; p < .01. Employee engagement positively and significantly influenced the employee service performance (β = .48; t = 16.39; p < .01). Results indicated that after controlling employee engagement, the researcher observed a significant and direct positive effect of empowering leadership on employee service performance (β = .23; t = 6.91; p < .01). Furthermore, the researcher observed that employee engagement
mediated the influence of empowering leadership on employee service performance with a “point estimate of 0.18 and a 95% bias-corrected confidence interval of 0.13 to 0.24”, thus the aforementioned results supported the H12a having partial mediation in the relationship. It is also important to point out that analysis indicated that the control variables, age and gender had no significant effects on employee service performance.

Figure 4-1: Simple mediation model (EL-EE-ESP)

4.8.2.2 Empowering Leadership, Employee Engagement and OCB

The PROCESS Macro was applied to test the H12b developed by Hayes (2013), a in-built application for SPSS considering 5,000 bootstrap samples suggested as per specifications given under Model 4 for examining a simple mediation model of variables. As shown in Figure 4.2, empowering leadership had a significant positive influence on employee engagement indicating values like: $\beta = .38$; $t = 11.70$; $p < .01$). The researcher observed that employee engagement significantly influenced OCB in a positive way as per values of $\beta = .49$; $t = 21.09$; $p < .01$. Results showed that after controlling for employee engagement, the researcher observed that empowering leadership had a significant and direct positive effect on OCB ($\beta = .17$; $t = 6.65$; $p < .01$). Furthermore, the results verified that employee engagement acted as mediator while examining the impact of empowering leadership on OCB with a “point estimate of 0.19 and a 95% bias-corrected confidence interval of 0.13 to 0.24”, thus results supported the H12b having partial mediation in the relationship. It is also important to
report that analysis indicated that control variables, age and gender had no significant effects on OCB.

![Simple mediation model diagram](EL-EE-OCB)

**Figure 4-2: Simple mediation model (EL-EE-OCB)**

### 4.8.2.3 Psychological Capital, Employee Engagement and Employee Service Performance

The PROCESS Macro was applied to test the H12c developed by Hayes (2013), a in-built application for SPSS considering 5,000 bootstrap samples suggested as per specifications given under Model 4 for examining a simple mediation model of variables using psychological capital as independent variable (X), employee service performance as dependent variable (Y) and employee engagement as a mediator (M). As shown in Figure 4.3, psychological capital had a significant positive impact on employee engagement ($\beta = 0.63; \; t = 18.64; \; p < .01$). Employee engagement significantly and positively influenced employee services performance by observing values of $\beta$ as 0.41; $t = 12.94; \; p < .01$. The researcher observed that employee engagement acted as mediator by considering significant and positive direct impact of the psychological capital on employee service performance by indicating values of $\beta$ as 0.34; $t = 8.68; \; p < .01$. Furthermore, the results indicated that employee engagement mediates the impact of psychological capital on employee service performance with a “point estimate of 0.26 and a 95% bias-corrected confidence interval of 0.20 to 0.33”, thus results supported the H12c having partial mediation. It is also important to report
that the analysis indicated that control variables, age and gender had no significant effects on employee service performance.

**Figure 4-3: Simple mediation model (PsyCap-EE-ESP)**

4.8.2.4 Psychological Capital, Employee Engagement and OCB

The PROCESS Macro was applied to test the H12d developed by Hayes (2013), a in-built application for SPSS considering 5,000 bootstrap samples suggested as per specifications given under Model 4 for examining a simple mediation model of variables using psychological capital as independent variable (X), OCB as dependent variable (Y) and employee engagement as a mediator (M). As shown in Figure 4.4, the researcher found significant and positive impact of psychological capital on employee engagement by observing values of $\beta$ as 0.63; $t = 18.64; p < .01$. Similarly, the researcher observed significantly positive impact of employee engagement on OCB by observing values of $\beta$ as 0.42; $t = 16.73; p < .01$. Results showed that after controlling the employee engagement, psychological capital had a significant and direct positive effect on OCB ($\beta = .31; t = 10.01; p < .01$). Furthermore, the researcher observed by evaluating results that employee engagement mediated the influence of psychological capital on OCB with a “point estimate of 0.26 and a 95% bias-corrected confidence interval of 0.21 to 0.32”, thus results supported the H12d having partial mediation. It is also important to report that the analysis’s output indicated that control variables, age and gender had no significant effects on OCB.
4.8.2.5  *Job Characteristics, Employee Engagement and Employee Service Performance*

The PROCESS Macro was applied to test the H12e developed by Hayes (2013), a in-built application for SPSS considering 5,000 bootstrap samples suggested as per specifications given under Model 4 for examining a simple mediation model of variables using job characteristics as independent variable (X), employee service performance as dependent variable (Y) and employee engagement as a mediator (M). As per Figure 4.5, the researcher observed significant and positive influence of job characteristics on employee engagement by indicating values of β as of 0.62; t = 22.69; p < .01, whereas, employee engagement significantly and positively influenced the employee services performance by observing values of β as of 0.40; t = 11.86; p < .01. The researcher also observed the results after controlling the employee engagement that there was significant and direct positive effect of job characteristics on employee service performance by indicating values of β as of 0.27; t = 7.43; p < .01. Furthermore, the results labelled that employee engagement mediated the impact of job characteristics on employee service performance with a “point estimate of 0.25 and a 95% bias-corrected confidence interval of 0.19 to 0.31”, thus results supported the H12e having partial mediation. It is also important to report that the analysis’ output indicated that control variables, age and gender had no significant effects on employee service performance.
4.8.2.6 **Psychological Capital, Employee Engagement and OCB**

The PROCESS Macro was applied to test the H12f developed by Hayes (2013), an in-built application for SPSS considering 5,000 bootstrap samples suggested as per specifications given under Model 4 for examining a simple mediation model of variables using job characteristics as independent variable (X), OCB as dependent variable (Y) and employee engagement as a mediator (M). Results indicated in Figure 4.6, the researchers observed a significant positive impact of job characteristics on employee engagement by considering values of β as of 0.62; t = 22.69; p < .01, whereas, employee engagement also significantly and positively influenced OCB by observing values of β as of 0.40; t = 15.20; p < .01. Furthermore, by controlling the employee engagement in the relationship, job characteristics was found to have significant and direct positive effect on OCB by indicating values of β as 0.25; t = 8.77; p < .01. Hence, the researcher observed by evaluating results that employee engagement mediated the impact of job characteristics on OCB with a “point estimate of 0.25 and a 95% bias-corrected confidence interval of 0.20 to 0.30”, thus results supported the H12f having partial mediation. It is also important to report that analysis indicated that control variables, age and gender had no significant effects on OCB.
Figure 4-6: Simple mediation model (JC-EE-OCB)

Table 4-22: Summary of Results of Mediation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12a</td>
<td>EL $\rightarrow$ EE $\rightarrow$ ESP</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12b</td>
<td>EL $\rightarrow$ EE $\rightarrow$ OCB</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12c</td>
<td>PC $\rightarrow$ EE $\rightarrow$ ESP</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12d</td>
<td>PC $\rightarrow$ EE $\rightarrow$ OCB</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12e</td>
<td>JC $\rightarrow$ EE $\rightarrow$ ESP</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12f</td>
<td>JC $\rightarrow$ EE $\rightarrow$ OCB</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: EL-Empowering Leadership, PC-Psychological Capital, JC- Job Characteristics, EE-Employee Engagement, ESP-Employee Service Performance, OCB-Organizational Citizenship Behavior, LL-Lower Limit, UL- Upper Limit, CI-Confidence Interval
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H12a</td>
<td>“Employee engagement mediates the relationship between empowering leadership and employee service performance”.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12b</td>
<td>“Employee engagement mediates the relationship between empowering leadership and OCB”.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12c</td>
<td>“Employee engagement mediates the relationship between psychological capital and employee service performance”.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12d</td>
<td>“Employee engagement mediates the relationship between psychological capital and OCB”.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12e</td>
<td>“Employee engagement mediates the relationship between job characteristics and employee service performance”.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12f</td>
<td>“Employee engagement mediates the relationship between job characteristics and OCB”.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.9 Conclusion

The aforementioned chapter presented the empirical findings of this research study, specifically, this chapter commenced with the introduction of the demographic characteristics of the participant employees profiled in this study. This chapter highlighted the descriptive statistics of every individual item of the variables used in this study were provided, followed by Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to establish the construct validity (convergent and discriminant validity) of the measuring instruments used to validate the constructs of the study. Furthermore, this chapter provided the reliability results of the constructs as well as the correlation analysis and its subsequent results. This chapter is concluded by presenting the results of hierarchical linear regression and Hayes’s PROCESS macro applied for examining mediation of employee engagement. The next chapter will be opened up for discussion about these empirical results of the study along with their theoretical and practical implications.
Chapter 5

Discussion of Results and Conclusion
5 Discussion of Results and Conclusion

5.1 Introduction

The chapter No 5 of the present research study scrutinizes the results along with research implications, for further exploration regarding the domain of employee engagement, and for managers to exercise and implement such practices, which motivate employees to exhibit and promote high level of engagement with their jobs and organizations at workplace. This chapter comprises of six sections. In the first section, results have been explained with respect to their findings covering all research questions discussed in the first chapter. Subsequently, in the 2nd section of this present chapter, research contribution of the present study in the currently available literature, and further, its practical implications in organizational practices have been argued and discussed. Afterwards, in the third section of this chapter, research limitations of the researcher, while conducting the present study, have been highlighted. In the fourth section of this chapter, future research directions to advance exploration of employee engagement in different paradigms have been suggested to the prospective future researchers on this subject for any possible improvement. Fifth section provides practical implications for leaders and managers to formulate and implement such policies to further probe the issue of employee engagement. Finally, the sixth section consists of conclusion regarding the present research study.

5.2 Discussion of Results

The argumentative discussion about results of this research study, as explained in chapter 4, has been consolidated and analyzed with respect to six meaningful questions mentioned in chapter 1 to highlight the intra-link associations among the various variables. The relevant questions have been logically devised and answered regarding the aforementioned variables as outlined below:-
5.2.1 Research Question No. 1: Role of Employee Engagement in Banking Sector

*What is the importance of employee engagement at workplace settings of banking industry?*

Working life of an individual or employee comprises his or her daily routine interactions and interpersonal conflicts as an essential element of the process, wherein, individuals, having varying interests and different backgrounds, interact with each other to pursue matters of personal interests, organizational goals and specific objectives. The available literature on the subject that guides academic researchers to recommend and devise various types of relationships prevailing among different aspects of workplace employee behaviors and organizational practices that ultimately contribute to a number of theoretical models with empirical evidence from the world over (Jehn, 1995, Simons & Peterson, 2000, Lu et al., 2011).

However, after 28 years of research, the subsequent debates of researchers and business experts, the subject of employee engagement, in various research paradigms has been given paramount importance because of its focus on creating sustainable culture of continuous improvement (Maurer, et al., 2018). On the other hand, considerable controversy persists among researchers on its theory, measurement scales, and further exploration of antecedents and consequences, as empirical evidence (Baily et al., 2017, Mackay et al., 2017, Saks and Gruman, 2014). Presently, it is imperative to explore potential antecedents of employee engagement in order to achieve higher level of employee performance that might be ultimately helpful and productive for leaders and HR consultants to devise effective policies for practical implementation (Gupta & Sharma, 2018). It has been observed that this inconsistency in the available literature about employee engagement persisted because of dual nature of opinion, either due to its unique construct or just only as being opposite to burnout (Baily et al, 2017; Shuck et.al, 2017; Rich et al., 2010; Saks and Gruman, 2014). Hence, the present research study pursued the objective to hold off these conflicts in the literature of employee engagement, wherein, this study examined the influence of leader’s empowering behavior, employee’s psychological capital and employee’s job characteristics on
employee engagement along with employee’s services performance and organizational citizenship behavior as consequences of employee engagement. Moreover, the major portion of employee engagement literature is rooted in the burnout construct and confined to burnout theory rather than in original engagement theory introduced by Kahn (1990). Therefore, the ultimate object of the current research study is to share suitable contribution with the literature by exploring employee engagement on the basis of “Kahn Theory of Engagement” by revealing potential mechanisms rooted in Kahn’s (1990) theory. This research study is aimed at to provide and strengthen the available literature related to employee engagement based on Kahn’s theory to dig into workplace behaviors that affect employee engagement at specific workplace settings with resultant outcomes accordingly. Moreover, specifically, the role of empowering leadership, psychological capital, job characteristics examined as antecedents and employee service performance and OCB have been studied as consequences, in the context of Pakistani culture, mainly, focusing on banking sector, being a service industry.

5.2.2 Research Question No. 2: Role of Empowering Leadership

What is the impact of Empowering Leadership on employee engagement, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior as an influential antecedent to employee engagement?

The second question of the present research study examines the influence of leader’s empowering behavior on employee engagement, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior while working at workplace settings of the banking sector. As extensively discussed, empowering leadership construct in chapter 2, while elaborating this phenomena in relationship to employee engagement and outcome employee behaviors like employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior, it was stated that leadership styles, having basis in “situational” and “contingency” theories, were criticized due to the absence of behavior’s factor and trait-related aspects in most of the earlier leadership styles that motivated researchers to consider dominating aspects, like: autonomy, power sharing, participation of employees in decision-making (Spreitzer, 1995, Manz and Sims (1989, 1991, 2001). Following the
aforesaid researchers’ work on empowerment or autonomy, many researchers investigated it empirically considering different workplace settings among various cultures (Zhang and Bartol, 2010). Cheong et al., (2016) explained the empowering leadership in facilitating employees to shun their sluggish attitudes and be attentive to job assignments and accept responsibilities for their performance, thereby, increasing their work-roles effectiveness, and encouraged them for adoption of proactive behaviors like OCB (Martin et al., 2013, Cheong et al., 2016).

Following Kahn’s theory (1990), based on Role Theory (Cottrell, 1942), Job role was supposed to be an important aspect to explain employee engagement as how possibly an individual could invest his self-energy while performing a role to attain high-job performance. Kahn (1990) indicated employee’s physical, cognitive and emotional presence regarding attachment of his self, with assigned role performance side by side feelings of attentiveness for highly focused absorption in his job. The role theory explains the workplace attitudes and requisite aspects related to these workplace behaviors. On this basis, the role of leader’s behaviors was incorporated in the research model to identify its influence on employee engagement. In order to determine empowering leadership, and correlate it with other factors, researchers have recognized positive and significant correlation between empowering leadership and employee engagement in their research studies (Sharma & Kirkman, 2015, Erkutlu & Chafra, 2015, Stander & Stander, 2016, Jong, 2017, Bailey et al., 2017). Ali et al., (2018) reported improved impact of empowering leadership on performance of banking sector employees. Lee et al., (2018) observed positive and significant influence of empowering leadership on both employee performance either individual or team along with organizational citizenship behavior. Cheong et al., (2018) found positive relationship between empowering leadership and outcome variables of individual performance and OCB.

As per table 4.14, the results represent a positive and significant relationship as observed by the researcher between empowering leadership and employee engagement having r-value of 0.35 (p < .01) Similarly, empowering leadership has positive and significant relationship with employee service performance by observing r-value of 0.36 (p< .01) and organizational citizenship behavior (r=0.37, p< .01. As per table 4.20,
results of PROCESS macro, model 4 indicate that empowering leadership and employee engagement are significantly interrelated to each other ($\beta = 0.38$, $p < 0.01$) which manifest the significant role of empowering leadership style in effectuating the employee engagement level in the banking sector. Similarly, results represent that empowering leadership is significantly related to employee service performance ($\beta = 0.23$, $p < 0.01$) and OCB ($\beta = 0.17$, $p < 0.01$). Thus, results supported the proposed H1, 2 & 3. These results are consistent with results and findings of the above-mentioned research studies indicating that empowerment behavior of the managers enhances the engagement level of employees, their service performance and OCB at their workplaces. It is also imperative to indicate that, in banks, most of the staff having direct access to customers, take various decisions at their own end concurrent with bank’s policies for delivering requisite services to customers. Hence, it is empirically confirmed that empowering leadership, employee engagement, employee service performance and OCB are inter-related and conform to the findings of aforementioned researchers.

5.2.3 Research Question No. 3: Role of Psychological Capital

What is the nature of relationship and impact of “Psychological Capital on employee engagement, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior” as a key antecedent to employee engagement?

Datu et al., (2018) while examining relationship between psychological capital and employee engagement, they emphasized and suggested the researchers to investigate relationship of employee’s positive states such as psychological capital and engagement matching with his performance (Newman et al., 2014, du Plessis & Boshoff, 2018). The correlation and PROCESS macro results in SPSS contained in the present study will contribute substantial knowledge to the available literature on employees’ psychological states by confirming positive and significant relationship between psychological capital and employee engagement ultimately improving the employee service performance and OCB. It was argued, and hypothetically anticipated, that employees having positive psychological capital, in return, motivate themselves to express higher level of engagement at workplace, ultimately resulting in either in-role
or extra-role improved job performance. Results of correlational analysis supported the proposed hypotheses like: employee engagement (r=0.52, p < 0.01), employee service performance (r=0.48, p < 0.01) and OCB (r= 0.53, p < 0.01). More specifically, our results of PROCESS macro analysis indicate that psychological capital plays a significant role in promoting employee engagement (β = 0.63, p < 0.01), employee service performance (β = 0.34, p < 0.01) and OCB (β = 0.31, p < 0.01) when employees perform their ascribed job roles.

This research study has eminently investigated and examined the objective role of psychological capital as an important antecedent of employee engagement of those employees, who are working in the banking sector consonant with Kahn’s (1990) theory which spelled out the positive aspects of psychological states of an individual. It has been observed in the available literature on the construct of psychological capital and employee engagement that most of the research has been carried out on the basis of JD-R model rooted in the burnout construct, besides the fact that employee engagement is itself a distinctive construct (Rich et al., 2010, Baily et al., 2017). The findings of this research study are in-line with Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement that states that employees invest their full energy and absorb their selves in specific roles while performing their jobs are encouraged by positive psychological capital. Therefore, research findings of the study are consistent and conform to the aforementioned research studies conducted on the same constructs and relationships, wherein, researchers explored and examined the psychological capital as an important antecedent or aspect to improve and enhance engagement level of employees relating to their job-roles. (Consiglio et al., 2016, Liu et al., 2017, Datu et al., 2018, Plessis & Boshoff, 2018). Luthans and Youssef-Morgan (2017), reported high-level individual performance as an outcome of positive psychological capital. Researchers observed psychological capital and employee engagement as a significant predictor of task performance and OCB, both (Bakker et al., 2012; Jung & Yoon, 2015; Lather & Kaur, 2015; Gupta et al., 2017). This study resolves and advocates that psychological capital is a potential aspect for employees working in the banking sector to get themselves engaged at workplace and exhibit improved service performance and extra-ordinary behaviors like OCB. Thus, results supported the proposed H4, 5 & 6.
5.2.4 Research Question No. 4: Role of Job Characteristics

What is the role of job characteristics while analyzing its relationship with employee engagement, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior?

Job characteristics are the fundamental factors that mainly influence and make effect on the engagement level of an employee as these facets of job characteristics are directly related to characteristics of a job role, the core element of Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement. It has observed that most of the research either qualitative or quantitative on employee and organizational-related outcomes is raised and built on Job Characteristics Model (JCM) introduced by Hackman and Oldman’s (1980), which classifies five potential job features considered as motivational belongings of a particular job in terms of “task variety, identity, significance, autonomy and feedback”. Similarly, Kahn’s (1990) theory of employee engagement was also centered with Job Characteristics Model, which theorized that the psychological conditions like: “(i) meaningfulness, (ii) experienced responsibility and (iii) knowledge of results” mediated the link among facets of job characteristic and organizational related outcomes. Many research studies have reported positive and significant relationship between job design aspects, individual’s attitudes and subsequent behaviors like performance and OCB (Morgeson and Nahrgang 2005, Fried and Ferris 1987; Humphrey et al., 2007). Furthermore, in the context of relationship between job characteristics and employee engagement, Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement, which is based in Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) JDM, explains that elements of job characteristics affect people’s attitudes and their resultant behaviors. Kahn (1990) submitted that job characteristics create such environments and working conditions, wherein, employees personally feel encouraged to get themselves engaged with their job-roles.

In the present study, job characteristics have been selected as a core antecedent of employee engagement because of the reason that this variable performs a prominent and significant role in affecting employee engagement, service performance and OCB as extensively discussed in chapter 2 i.e. review of literature (Saks, 2006; Bakker and Demerouti, 2007; Rich et al., 2010; Barrick, Mount, & Li 2013; Shantz et al., 2013;
The results of the research study confirmed the hypotheses suggested in the literature (Chapter 2) about the positive relationship between job characteristics, employee engagement, employee service performance and OCB. Correlation results indicate that job characteristics is significantly related to employee engagement (0.60, p < 0.01), employee service performance (0.48, p < 0.01) and OCB (0.54, p < 0.01), whereas, correlation results showed that job characteristics were found to be the strongest predictor of employee engagement as compared to other two predictors: empowering leadership and psychological capital. On the other hand, results of PROCESS macro as directed by Hayes (2013) in SPSS showed that job characteristics had significant positive relationship with engagement level of the bank employees (β = 0.62, p < 0.01), employee service performance (β = 0.27, p < 0.01) and OCB (β=0.25, p < 0.01). Thus, results supported the proposed H7, 8 & 9 and confirmed the results, in-line with findings of previous research studies conducted in the aforesaid area of research (Saks, 2006; Crawford et al., 2010 & 2014; Saks and Gruman, 2014; Baily et al., 2017). Hence, based on Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement, it is presumed that in the presence of encouraging job characteristics at workplace enhance the level of employee engagement during job role performance, which will impact on employee service performance and organizational citizenship behaviors of employees.

5.2.5 Research Question No. 5: Employee Engagement and Service Performance

What type of relationship exist between employee engagement and employee service performance as a consequence of employee engagement in the banking sector employee of Pakistan?

The present research study examined the relationship and influence of employee engagement on employee service performance being an antecedent of employee engagement, that is, employee’s in-role performance in case of front line employees working in banking sector.
For general perception, as a starting point, this credit goes to Kahn (1990) who introduced the term engagement in his theory of personal engagement. Investigating engagement construct based on Kahn’s work, two factors: “performance of work tasks and self-investment of personal resources” have remained under extensive consideration so as to understand employee engagement in its true perspective (Shuck et al. 2017; Christian et al., 2011). Any definition of engagement should incorporate active level of pushing ahead (pull forward) towards employee performance as a part of personal resources utilization while performing a job role (Kahn, 1990). Mostly, all operationalization of engagement, available in the literature, have proportion of this nuance, whereas, engagement, being an active state position, denotes employee’s self-energy that keeps him moving forward and not to stand still (Biggs et al., 2014). Based on Kahn (1990) theory of engagement, it was predicted that there might be a positive link between employee engagement and employee service performance.

In the previous research, as enunciated in chapter 2, while elaborating the association between employee engagement and employee service performance, positive and significant relationship was documented between each other at different workplace settings. Subsequently, results of correlation (r = 0.54, p < .01) and PROCESS macro in SPSS (as β = 0.48, p < 0.01) specified significant relationship between employee engagement and outcome variable of employee service performance confirming the proposed hypotheses having positive relationship between these two variables. These results are also in-line with findings of previous research studies conducted on the same relationships in varying contexts and workplace settings as discussed in chapter 2 of literature reviews (Anitha, 2013; Breevaart et al., 2014b; Sharma, 2015; Carter et al., 2016, Gutermann et al., 2017). However, most of previous research studies have investigated some general form of employee performance behavior such as in-role performance, task performance and job performance with employee engagement. These research findings cultivate and unfold behaviors of engaged employees in the banking sector concerning their improved service performance having better and enhanced understanding of empowered leadership style along with encouraging job characteristics and superior level of psychological capital. Hence, tenth hypothesis also supports the proposed relationship that, in the banking sector, engaged employees show better service performance as compared to dis-engaged employees.
5.2.6 Research Question No. 6: Employee Engagement and OCB

What is the relationship between employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior as a consequence of employee engagement?

The sixth question addressed in this research study, relates to the employee engagement with employee’s extra-role performance, reckoned in the literature as “organizational citizenship behavior” on the basis of Kahn’s (1990) theory of employee engagement.

According to Kahn’s (1990) concept on engagement, an employee is directly connected with his role performance that how he attaches himself to his physical, cognitive and emotional behaviors that represent his response to work and allied stakeholders. Kahn (1990) elaborated that an engaged employee musters up all his capabilities to perform a job showing his vigilance and attentiveness at work, connectivity and focus on accomplishment of his goals. On the other hand, a dis-engaged employee withdraws and remains aloof and indifferent to his job-role with respect to his presence physically, cognitively and emotionally. In-line with Kahn’s (1990) philosophy, Rich et al. (2010) stated that engaged employees perform efficiently at workplace using their hands, heart and head. They further advocated that the concept of engagement was a comprehensive construct manifesting complete representation of the employee-self as compared to other similar constructs like: job Commitment, job satisfaction and job involvement. Rich et al. (2010) also found positive relationship between employee engagement and OCB as a performance-based outcome.

The aforementioned results of correlation analysis and regression analysis, as mentioned in chapter 4 table: 4.19, indicate that employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior are significantly related to each other. Results of correlation analysis (r value 0.62, P < .01) indicate strong positive relationship between both variables which demonstrate that bank employees, having higher level of employee engagement, convey their extraordinary behaviors for customers to facilitate them beyond their formal service performance, wherever, they visit any bank for banking transactions. On the other hand, while discussing results of PROCESS macro analysis in SPSS, beta value 0.49 (β = 0.49, p < 0.01) represents that the factor of
employee engagement significantly affects the increasing trend of organizational citizenship behavior of banking sector employees who facilitates customers. These observed results are concordant with Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement that engaged employees put their full energy to exhibit optimum level of extraordinary performance and also, validate the assumptions referred to the literature review, which affirm that, employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior are positively and significantly related to each other and engaged employees show extraordinary discretionary efforts to facilitate customers accordingly. These research findings are harmonious and in-line or consistent with findings of various research studies, wherein, researchers examined the relationship of employee engagement & OCB and determined it as a consequence of employee engagement (Rich et al., 2010; Christian et al., 2011; Byaruhanga & Othuma, 2016; Anthony- McMann et al. 2016; Ko et al., 2017; Eldor & Vigoda-Gadot, 2017; Bailey et al., 2017). Because of their flexible and generalizable characteristics nature, these research findings can be extended and applied to any other workplace setting other than the banking sector in Pakistan, but, however, considering certain imitations as discussed in this chapter.

5.2.7 Research Question No. 7: Mediating role of employee engagement

*Does employee engagement mediate between the relationship of antecedents and consequences?*

Hypothesis 12 (a to f) was presumed to explore and examine mediation role of employee engagement between key antecedents, empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics taken in this research study and vital consequences, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior. Following Hayes (2013) PROCESS macro in SPSS, bootstrapping results presented in Table 4.21 & 4.22 confirmed the partial mediation in all six sub hypotheses of H12, in which, results demonstrated the significant direct relationship after controlling the effect of mediator. These results and findings are in-line with previous findings of many research studies, which taken employee engagement as mediator (Shantz et al., 2013; Saks, 2006; Christian et al., 2011; Rich et al., 2010; Saks & Gruman, 2014; Baily et al., 2017; Agarwal & Gupta, 2018; Alessandri et al., 2018).
### Table 5-1: Key Findings of the Research Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Empowering Leadership behavior is positively related to Employee Engagement as an antecedent and also positively related to employee service performance and OCB”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Psychological Capital positively is related to Employee Engagement as an antecedent and also positively related to employee service performance and OCB”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Job Characteristics is positively related to Employee Engagement as an antecedent and also positively related to employee service performance and OCB”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>“Employee Engagement is positively related to Employee Service Performance being a consequence of Employee Engagement”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>“Employee Engagement is positively related to Organizational Citizenship Behavior being a consequence of Employee Engagement”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>“Employee engagement partially mediates the relationship between antecedents and consequences”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Research Contribution

The current research study carried out to explore the antecedents and consequences of employee engagement, is envisaged and intended to make noteworthy theoretical contribution, and advance the available literature on the construct of engagement in general. This research study has scrutinized the empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics as antecedents of employee engagement, whereas, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior as consequences of employee engagement. Overall, this research study significantly provides substantial support for various distinct relationships of many studied variables linked among each other, thereby, making a considerable contribution and potential input to the current available literature and knowledge on employee engagement.

1. First of all, the present research study significantly contributes a useful additional knowledge to the debate and literature on employee engagement for academician and business experts, both, which have mostly remained under the shadow of burnout concept. As extensively deliberated in chapter 2 that many approaches rooted in burn-out research after de-tracking Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement on the basis research studies done by Maslach & Leiter (1997) and subsequently by Schaufeli et al. (2002), along with research by Saks (2006) following role theory has been utilized to explain the employee engagement by applying various mechanisms. The present research study is an extension of the research based on Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement that is acknowledged as the prime theory of engagement concept, once overlooked and neglected by Maslach and Leiter (1997) and Schaufeli et al. (2002) who investigated employee engagement as an antipole/opposite to burnout (Rich et al. 2010; Saks and Gruman, 2014). Based on Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement, this research study investigated and contributed to those antecedents that were directly related to the level of employee engagement influenced by organizational (Empowering Leadership), individual (Psychological Capital) and job (Job Characteristics) related determinants. Therefore, the present research study identifies a practically adoptable mechanism by which
employees might get themselves engaged at their workplaces producing fruitful results.

2. Second, the core objective of the current research study is to scrutinize employee engagement concerning its definition, influential antecedents and productive consequences in the context of banking sector in Pakistan. The available literature describes that most of the researchers have ignored Kahn’s (1990) initial conceptualized personal engagement in their research work. Many different conceptualizations postulated on engagement are available in the literature contributed by academic researchers and business experts after Kahn’s theory of engagement. 86% of these research studies rooted in Utrecht Group relating to this area of research, are still not dominant and researchers have suggested for further exploration on the guidelines provided by Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement (Baily et al. 2017; Anthony- McMann, et. al, 2016; Saks and Gruman, 2014). Therefore, this research study has contributed, with empirical-based evidence in the context of Pakistani banking sector for exploration of antecedents and consequences of employee engagement, validating Kahn (1990) theory. Cole et al. (2012) opined about personal engagement, based on Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement commenting that it was more realistic and practicable than work engagement based on framework of Maslach and Leiter (1997) and Schaufeli et al. (2002).

3. Third, in addition to theoretical contribution, submitted in this research study, a significant methodological contribution has been proposed. Analyzing various measurement-related issues, linked with employee engagement as discussed in chapter 2, this research study has examined the employee engagement utilizing measurement scale developed by Rich et al. (2010) on the basis of Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement because of persistent disagreement in the literature about the measurement scales for employee engagement (Anthony- McMann, et. al, 2016; Saks and Gruman, 2014, Shuck et al, 2017). Baily et al. (2017) argued that significant gap continued to prevail about measurement of employee engagement under the umbrella of UWES domain. It has been revealed that burnout showed negative, very weak or almost no relationship with any dimension of employee engagement, but researchers adopting UWES approach
proclaim engagement as opposite to burnout. However, according to Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement and viewpoints of many other researchers, engagement is not an opposite phenomena to burnout (Saks & Gruman, 2014). As concluded by Saks and Gruman (2014), development of a valid and undisputed measurement scale for employee engagement, was still a challenge for researchers to move forward in this regard. Substantial evidence is available in the literature to criticize the research on engagement concept, based on job burnout perspective, as UWES measurement scale representing burnout, remains a matters of serious concern if researchers continue to accept and adopt UWES as a primary scale to gauge work engagement (Cole et al., 2012), whereas, most of recent research on employee engagement is based on “burnout-antithesis–framed measurement scale”. Hence, adopting measuring scale based on Kahn’s (1990) theory, and results of this research study provide an evidence to confirm its validity within other social cultures and countries like Pakistan.

4. Fourth, this research study provides a complete view of key antecedents of employee engagement including “Empowering Leadership, Psychological Capital and Job Characteristics” that are highly effective in fostering employees’ engagement level specifically, banking sector employees and others in general. These findings of the research study visualize and stress upon the necessity to probe distinct relationships among other variables falling under the domain of these antecedents. By focusing on this area, it is expected that future researchers will be encouraged to explore other diverse patterns of these antecedents as mediators or moderators, discerning limitations of the present study due to its confined focus restricted only to antecedents, and consequences of employee engagement.

5. Fifth, the current research study also presents a comparatively better holistic view of the consequences of employee engagement by noticing conspicuous work behaviors like: employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior. Harrison, Newman and Roth (2006) pointed out that work behaviors and behavioral intentions remained the pivotal constructs in the area of individual-related organizational research. These output variables, in the area
of employee engagement research, have been considered in order to study erratic performance of engaged or dis-engaged employee (Rich et al. 2010, Shuck et al. 2017, Baily et al. 2017). Therefore, according to the study results, discussed in chapter No 4, demonstrate that there is a positive and significant relationship, which exists between, antecedents: “empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics” and employee engagement based on Kahn’s (1990) theory. Moreover, these antecedents are the vital signs that appear with key indicators to ascertain better engagement level of employees at workplace providing meaningful information and better understanding of engagement concept. Specifically, this research study is contemplated to develop and contribute towards offering and testing of a theoretical model based on Kahn’s (1990) theory and highlight many pathways to explore the employee engagement for developing and arriving at a unanimous single consensus.

6. Furthermore, this research study also responded to research call of many researchers (Rich et al., 2010; Christian et al., 2011, Baily et al., 2017) for testing of employee engagement as mediator and moderator among various relationships in context of task and contextual performance for better organizational. Results discussed in Table 4.21 and 4.22 indicate that employee engagement mediates between all studied antecedents, empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics and consequences, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior.

5.4 Practical Implications

The current research, meaningfully important, has been ascribed to the employee engagement, with the expectations, that it would guide and support organizations in Pakistan in formulating their strategies and polices, considering this aspect /component appropriately.

1. The framework of the present study would be formally acceptable to the managers and leaders working in the influential financial related banking industry of Pakistan in order to consider and recognize the key elements of highly important phenomenon employee engagement while implementing their
rules and regulations with particular reference to their organization and cultural settings.

2. The current study applies to requisite requirements to the study work environment in which employee engagement is being examined to ascertain those potential variables that are particularly relevant to employee performance. In this current research study, three core antecedents (empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics) and two consequences (employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior) associated with employee engagement were examined. It is much important for managers in banks of Pakistan to be aware of obstacles that might make jobs more difficult and challenging, with a view to improve employee performance ignoring the aspect of employee engagement that will consequently increase their optimum performance level due to increase in engagement level. However, facilitating empowering leadership behavior along with positive employee psychological capital and encouraging job characteristics at work, may motivate employees to get them more engaged at workplace. The relationship between these studied variables also guides to accord high importance to dominating factors that affect employee engagement at workplace.

3. Many findings of research studies and engagement indicators provided by many consulting firms like Gallup (Gallup Survey - 2016), Deloitte (Report - 2015) have reported decreasing trends of employee engagement among employees across the globe. The alarming issue, which has been observed, is that most of the organizations merely measure engagement level of employees rather than addressing this phenomena and facilitating such practices that motivate them to get engaged at workplace. Therefore, it is necessary to change their focus from measuring employee engagement to addressing it. Managers should realize to transform their conventional workplace practices and facilitate employees so as to improve their level of engagement. It is also important to clarify about the objectives either to gauge the engagement level, or to increase the employee engagement. For improvement in employee engagement proactively, there is a need of business-driven HR strategy in order to highlight those areas where improvements can bring about a tremendous difference, like: leadership style,
psychological capital of employees and fundamental job characteristics for fostering employee engagement that would invariably reveal in-role and extra-role performance. This could be done through training activities like case studies, workshops and group discussion.

4. The findings of the present research study will help bank managers to recruit such candidates having qualities like enthusiastic and energetic attitudes and have positive feeling for work as well for his employer, varieties of skill set to perform the job role.

5. It is also important for bank managers to re-design employees’ job in accordance with job characteristics of employees and pre-requisite parameters to perform the job.

5.5 Research Limitations

Regardless of many important findings and aforesaid fruitful study contributions, it is important to consider the following limitations of the present research study like any other research study, which may be taken as learning tips for future research studies accordingly:

1. Foremost limitation of this current study is the examination of associations among the variables on the basis of utilization of cross-sectional data, as, data was collected and assembled at single point of time and respondents responded accordingly. Hence, it will also appropriate to conduct a longitudinal research study in order to confirm the causal relationship between variables.

2. Second limitation of the present research study is the exclusive utilization of single source which means that the banking sector employees responded to independent and dependent variables through Likert Scale Rating technique excluding the possibility of common variance method (Podsakoff et al. 2003) as the data was cross-sectional like other studies conducted in the area of organizational and individual behavior. On the other hand, researchers may collect data through other techniques especially mixed methods like qualitative data collection, in which researchers may conduct interviews or focused group
discussions, in order to evaluate them better than only responding to given questionnaires.

3. Third, being the linear relationships among variables, is another limitation that might be catered in future research within such conditions in which curvilinear relationship should be examined.

4. Fourth, potential limitation of the current study relates to its unmeasured aspects, either antecedents or consequences. Many other additional factors might influence the employee engagement and relationships examined in this study. In this current research study, employee engagement is limited to three key antecedents: empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics, whereas, two key consequences: employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior. Evaluation of employee engagement is associated with workplace factors that are directly or indirectly associated with it, therefore, future researchers might consider other potential variables to investigate employee engagement in different workplace settings (Anthony-McMann et al. 2016; Baily et al. 2017; Saks and Gruman, 2014).

5. Fifth, limitation of the current study is to consider bank employees in general regardless of their job classification, designation, domains and departments that restricts to generalize our findings to a specific department or domain of the bank which department is highly engaged or dis-engaged. Future research can be undertaken to collect data on the basis of their departments, designations, domains comparative analysis and evaluation about level of engagement among employees working in different departments of a bank. On the other hand, multilevel data may be collected to examine the level of engagement in subordinates required for changing the sampling techniques of future research studies.

6. Sixth, limitation of the study pertains its socio-cultural context, which relates to collection of data as a whole from many types of banks for the researcher through conveniently available resources operating in various cities of Pakistan across all provinces rather by comparing different banks either private or public. The results of this research study may be interpreted with caution for generalization due to collection of data from employees as a whole. If scope of
the study is applied to represent only single bank like Habib Bank Limited or Muslim Commercial Bank from all provinces of Pakistan, then results might vary accordingly. Additionally, this research study was conducted on the population of banking sector, therefore, results are limited to only banking sector employees, and results might fluctuate in case of other business sectors.

5.6 Future Research Avenues

The primary objective of this current research study was intended as an attempt to conduct research in order to get an empirical confirmation regarding how key antecedents: empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics influence employee engagement along with potential consequences of employee engagement, like: employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior in the context of banking sector institutions in Pakistan. This research study is an effort to point out the problems of employee engagement that are virtually overlooked at banks in Pakistan. The understanding of this situation at organizational and national level would definitely require some time involving further research keeping in view of Pakistani cultural, demographic and economic background to visualize and develop requisite policies for future successful business activities. As per literature review in chapter 2, there are many terminologies, like: personal engagement, work engagement, job engagement, organizational engagement, etc. Shuck et al (2017) suggested to substitute all these terms with employee engagement in order to proceed further to reach at an agreement on its definition, theory and measurement scale.

The matter of discourse and thought, relevant to the sphere of activities, implicating employee engagement in this study, neither have been exclusively complied within proportion to the prevalent business scenario in Pakistan nor have been completely examined in accordance with the measurement scales devised, based on Kahn’s (1990) theory. Nevertheless, it is optimistically believed that this study would be valuable for the prospective future researchers ambitious of investigating the phenomena further on the footings of Kahn’s work, taking into account, Pakistan’s socio – economic environments, along with allied variables.
Hence, future research may focus on following:

i. As the current study was cross-sectional, researchers may replicate this research study in terms of longitudinal study in Pakistan’s context that examines the influence on employee engagement considering before and after specific time-period that is beleaguered to improve and develop levels of such engagement.,

ii. Conduct research study in the area of employee engagement using multilevel analysis techniques, like Hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) would be beneficial for making advancements in literature.

iii. Future research should be carried out to examine the productive role of plausible mediators, like: dispositional, motivational or situational among antecedents and consequences of employee engagement.

iv. Carry out future research studies to inspect the role of moderators between the relationships of antecedents, consequences and on the mediation mechanisms.

v. Future research may be conducted to analyze role of each dimension of three studied antecedents and others dimensions of performance, like: counter productive work behaviors, productivity, efficiency, innovation and creativity. As there are four dimensions of psychological capital and five dimensions of job characteristics and future researchers may investigate magnitude of relationship of each dimension of psychological capital and job characteristics that, which dimension most influentially effects employee engagement.

vi. It is also imperative to examine the role of other influential leadership styles such as “shared, collectivist, distributive and adaptive” (Heifetz et al., 2009; Yammarino et al., 2012 and Caulfield and Senger, 2017). These leadership styles can potentially add limitation to well-known transformational and transactional leadership styles mainly, in enlightening the development and maintenance of employee engagement in dynamic and self-motivated working contexts.

vii. Future researchers may compare engagement level of employees working in private banks with employees working at public banks or with Islamic banks, which may provide evidence of engagement on the basis of employees’ education, experience and age factors as this research study only examined the engagement level of bank’s employees as whole.
5.7 Conclusion

The present research study supports the arguments of Kahn’s (1990) theory of engagement along with significant contribution towards existing knowledge about employee engagement in the context of banking sector. Empowering leadership style (Organizational factor), psychological capital (individual factor), job characteristics (job factor) how employees perceive these valued aspects which lead them to reciprocate with positive employees’ attitudes and resultant behavior (Employee Service Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior). Results of the study confirmed the positive and significant relationship of three antecedents: empowering leadership, psychological capital and job characteristics with employee engagement. Findings of the research study also confirmed the significant relationship of employee engagement with two consequences: employee service performance and OCB. Furthermore, findings also confirmed the employee engagement being strong mediator between antecedents and consequences. Besides, many antecedents discussed in the literature of employee engagement, results of this research study validated the positive contributory role of empowering leadership behavior, psychological capital which employees possess along with particular job characteristics. Similarly, results validated that employee engagement, employee service performance and organizational citizenship behavior remained positively and significantly related to each other. Employees working in the banking sector accorded value to empowering leadership style and encouraging job characteristics. The findings of the present research study highlight importance of employee engagement and suggest managers to formulate and develop such policies and practices for employee selection process and training that facilitate and foster favorable employee attitudes and behaviors which eventually influence organizations specifically.
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