UNIVERSIDAD DE ESPECIALIDADES ESPÍRITU SANTO

Facultad de Artes Liberales

PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AND ITS

RELATION WITH ENGAGEMENT: TEAM VS SUPERVISOR

TRABAJO DE TITULACIÓN QUE SE PRESENTA COMO REQUISITO PREVIO A

OPTAR EL GRADO DE PSICOLOGÍA ORGANIZACIONAL

Nombre del estudiante:

Nicole A. Melendres

Tutor:

PhD. María Vera Perea

Samborondón, Diciembre, 2018

Abstract

Organizations usually pursue their employees' desire of being synchronized, without diminishing their well-being. The following study attempts to identify how agreements in perceived organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) between employees and supervisors affect the levels of engagement. The participants were 608 employees and 86 supervisors from 7 different Ecuadorian companies. Four categories were created according to the agreement between the supervisor and the team's perceived OCB using standard deviation. ANOVA analysis allowed to identify the engagement differences on each of the categories. The results demonstrated that engagement levels had their maximum values in low disagreement categories for both employees and supervisors, though categories of high agreement/disagreement have adequate levels of engagement. These results contribute to agreement perspective studies in organizations, and discover that low levels of disagreement of team's perceived OCB can generate positive results, hence boosting further research.

Keywords: Perceived OCB, Engagement, Work Teams, Supervisors

Perceived Organizational Citizenship Behavior and its relation with Engagement: Team vs

Supervisor

Effectiveness in team work is a topic of interest for many organizations due to the attainment of productivity increase and corporate goals accomplishments (Davies, Margerison, & McCann, 1988). In order to achieve it, companies need to have employees who show good behavior, and informally support its members for the sake of the company, also known as Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) (Emami, Alizadeh, Nazari, & Darvishi, (2012). OCB refers to a non-formally required job behaviors, which support the functioning of the organization's social context (Stoner, Perrewé, & Munyon, 2011). Companies benefit from having this type of employees, because due to their extra role performance they maintain a balance and adequate functioning (Dash, 2014). However, sometimes employees' ratings of perceived Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) can be higher than the supervisors' ratings. This is because managers may be more focused on OCB and on achieving organizational goals, while employees consider individual, peer group, and union goals as more important (Turnipseed & Rassuli, 2005 p. 240). These results bring evidence on how different perspectives can affect a perceived organizational aspect. If an employee feels their performance is not being appropriately recognized or it is criticized by its supervisor, there will be low OCB (Miner, Glomb & Liao, 2002), causing the organization to experience turnovers, absenteeism, and low job satisfaction (Smith, 1983). As Benlian (2014) affirms, when the perceptions of teams match those of their leaders, team OCB will be enhanced (p. 224).

According to Gil, Ramón and Sánchez-Manzanares (2008) work teams are considered information processors including cognitive processes such as: transactional memory systems, collective cognition, team learning (Rico, Alcover de la Hera, & Tabernero, 2010), and perception (Gerrig, 2013). Specifically, the existence of perception is so fundamental and inevitable for individuals and groups that it even takes part in several work-related studies.

Among these studies is the one by González-Romá and Peiró (2011, 2010) regarding the foundation of collective climate in organizations, which is shaped by the set of employees' individual perceptions; collective climates can influence the productivity and OCB of employees (Joyce and Slocum, 1984). Another important contribution that visualizes the role of perceptions in the work context is the study by Erdem, Ozen and Atsan (2003). It shows the relationship between the perceptions of trust and OCB inside work teams, establishing that when there is a greater perception of team confidence, there is also an increase on the perceived OCB of it.

Another factor to consider when talking about efficiency of a company is engagement. This concept refers to the positive, affective, emotional and work-related mental well-being of the employees inside an organization (Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008). Inside teams it takes the name of "Collective Engagement", which is nothing more than the engagement that each of the members of a group or team perceive (Bakker, Albrecht, & Leiter, 2011). However, several factors can influence the levels of engagement such as working environment, or team and co-worker relationship (Anitha, 2014). Therefore, with the same resources and in an equally challenging environment, some teams might develop a higher level of engagement than others, due to the affective, cognitive, and motivational outcomes of different interaction patterns (Costa, Passos, & Bakker, 2014, p.4).

It has been proved how engagement has an impact on OCB. This relationship is explained because employees who are engaged will perform with energy, dedication and concentration (Mallick, Pradhan, Tewari, & Jena, 2014). Therefore, they will experience a strong connection with their job prompting to them to excel their job tasks (Sridhar & Thiruvenkadam, 2014). In addition, according to Salanova and Schaufeli (2008) engagement can increase proactive behavior, understanding proactive behavior as a behavior characterized by initiative, self-efficacy, and responsibility (Crant, 2000). As OCB behaviors refers to taking charge of activities by own free will, it can be assumed why OCB can be influenced by engagement. Because, while experiencing welfare, employees are capable of contributing to the effectiveness of companies with their excellent performance results at work (Dávila & Finkelstein, 2013).

This makes perceived OCB and engagement relationship so interesting because both terms connect to the overall behavior of the team. As the well-being of the work team members (obtained through engagement) relates to an adequate job OCB, it should be a matter of interest for companies and managers who are keen on being competitive and efficient (Gabčanová, 2011).

The purpose of this study is to identify how the level of agreement/disagreement in perceived OCB between the work team and its supervisor´s influences the engagement in both of them. Understanding how both sides see the OCB of the team, would help to understand the synchrony between the team and its supervisor. Which, being corroborated with their engagement levels, would reveal the state of psychological well-being experienced by both parties within this relationship. By understanding how the perceived OCB agreement generates engagement, managers and companies would be able to work together in order to achieve a positive perceived OCB that is congruent among work teams and supervisors. This

practice will be beneficial when organizational common procedures (e.g. feedback, motivation, unit assessment, measurement of unit productivity, etc.) are applied, which guarantees the general well-being of the team.

Through the preceding studies, we prove how team's perceived OCB is individually linked to agreement and engagement. The attempt of this study is to unveil the relationship among these variables and the way they can influence the actual OCB of work teams. In order, to achieve this, it is needed to describe the settings of perceived OCB agreement/disagreement among employees and supervisors in which engagement levels can vary.

High Perceived OCB Agreement = High Levels of Engagement

The agreement regarding performance perceptions of the work teams and supervisors will ease team processes (Benlian, 2014; Lim & Klein, 2006). This is because work teams might feel more empathy with their supervisors, making them more confident and satisfied while on duty. Thus, increasing the probability of efficacy beliefs about their own performance and the engagement development (Salanova, Llorens, & Schaufeli, 2011). Therefore, as OCB implies extra activities of the job performance, it can be assumed its agreement also will be associated with high levels of engagement, because as Wahyu (2012) states engagement among employees can improve OCB (p.51). Consequently, one could think that agreement on perceived OCB among work teams and supervisors also will be boosted by engagement.

Whenever this agreement occurs it will be a sign of a good functioning inside the team along with its supervisor. Since it might be a result of a high-quality Leader- Member Exchange (LMX) relationship coming from the motivational aspect, this construct stimulates

its positive association with employees' performance and well-being (Breevaart, Bakker, Demerouti, & van del Heuvel, 2015). Therefore, this study proposes the following hypothesis:

> H_1. - Work teams and supervisors that coincide in high levels of agreement on unit OCB will have higher levels of engagement compared to the average.

High Perceived OCB Disagreement = Low Levels of Engagement

On the other hand, differences in perceived OCB between teams and their managers will have strong adverse effects on team OCB, this because of the principles of perceptual distance (Gibson, Cooper, & Conger 2009). Consequently, poor OCB outcomes will be associated to lower levels of engagement, which in the long term will affect the psychological well-being of the employees (Bakker, et al., 2008).

Therefore, one can assume that disagreement on perceived OCB among work teams and supervisors might be the responsible for low engagement levels. Whenever this incongruence occurs, it will demand a further analysis of the relationship between work team and supervisor. This due to it might be a result of the lack of recognition (Islam, 2013), or social loafing (Karau & Williams, 1993) in case of high levels of work teams' perceived OCB versus low levels of supervisors' perceived OCB of the teams.

In other cases, it might be a result of overconfidence from the supervisor to his/her employees (Russo & Schoemaker, 1992; Russo & Schoemaker, 2016) in case of high levels of supervisors' perceived OCB of the teams versus low levels of work teams' perceived OCB. Therefore, this study proposes the following hypothesis:

H_2. - Work teams and supervisors who disagree about the perception of the unit's OCB will have lower levels of engagement compared to the average.

Therefore, due to the same as in the previous situation, we can conclude that perceived OCB is a relevant relationship since this cognitive process can influence the generation of engagement and the productivity of the work team.

In any case, the agreement or disagreement between the team's perceived OCB and the supervisor's perception of the team's OCB would allow to obtain a diagnosis of the supervisor-employees relationship and the teamwork of the unit. Additionally, it will be possible to detect opportunities in case of differences due to the disagreement regarding the OCB of employees, in order to take actions to guarantee the effectiveness of the team and its contribution to organizational productivity.

Method

Participants

Participants included 608 employees and 89 supervisors from 7 different Ecuadorian companies, which make to 89 work units. The employees' sample encompassed 41.6% of women and 57.02% of men. The average age of the participants was 36 years (SD=10.64). The education level of the participants was mainly college-level (47.8%) and their nationality was in most cases Ecuadorian (92.8%). Only 2.6% of the participants had other nationalities such as Cuban, Venezuelan, Spanish, Armenian, Belgian, Colombian, American, and Chilean. With respect to the supervisors' sample, it included 43% of women and 53.5% of men. The average age of the participants was 42 years old (SD=10.31), most of them having a college degree (53.5%). Their nationality was also in most cases Ecuadorian (95.4%), with a remnant of 2.4% having other nationalities, such as Chilean and Iraqi.

Measures

Perceived OCB. Was identified through an organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) questionnaire formerly used by Huang and You (2011), based on Smith et al. (1983), Williams and Anderson (1991), and Podsakoff, Ahearne, and MacKenzie (1997). The scale contains 10 items describing employees' behaviors towards their organizations in two OCB dimensions: OCBI (Cronbach´s alpha = 0.76) was measured with four items (e.g., "I help others who have heavy workloads"). OCBO includes six items (Cronbach´s alpha = 0.79) (e.g., "I make suggestions to improve the organization").As the objective of the study is not only to measure the perceived OCB of the work team, but also the supervisor´s perceived performance of the team. There were conducted to versions of the questionnaire, one for Employees and one for Supervisors. Items in the Employees version were as examples detailed before. Whereas, in supervisor´s version questionnaire items were developed regarding to the OCB of the work team unit they lead (e.g., My unit volunteer for tasks that are not required). All items were in Spanish and scored on a five-point response format ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Engagement. To determine engagement levels, this study used the short version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) in Spanish (9 items) validated by Schaufeli, Bakker and Salanova (2006). This measure includes 9 items regarding the three dimensions: vigor, dedication, and absorption. Each of them was measured with three items (e.g., "In my job, I feel bursting with energy"- Vigor Dimension) (Cronbach´s alpha = 0.92). All items were measured with a seven-point response format ranging from 0 ("never") to 6 ("every day").

Procedure

Each organization received a formal invitation to participate in the research project. Those who voluntarily decided to take part of it were called in in groups from each of the 7 companies to anonymously fill out a paper-and-pencil questionnaire. Each participant filled

in the questionnaires in Spanish. The groups consisted of employees and supervisors from different departments and work units which in total made up 89 pairs.

Data Analysis

The objective of this paper is to know how the agreement between the employees' work OCB perception and their respective supervisors' perception of the team's OCB influence the generation of engagement. The analysis conducted try to follow the steps of the investigation of Torrente, Salanova, and Lorens (2013). Therefore, the data analysis went through the following five steps.

Firstly, setting up of teams. - Members' Responses about perceived OCB for each team were brought together to determine the agreement of each work unit with the R_{wg} Index (Reliability Within Groups). Further analyses, were developed with the 86 remaining units.

Secondly, subtraction of quantities. - The results of the supervisors' team OCB perception were subtracted from each team's agreement score to obtain a result that reflects the difference between these amounts.

Thirdly, Standard Deviation Analysis. – The results of the subtractions of the previous step took part to analyze the SD of these measures. SD analysis separates quantitative data symmetrically and considers the lowest and maximum levels of distance among scales, which allows the construction of categories and its parameters (Harrison & Klein, 2007).

Fourthly, construction of categories according to SD results. - A scale for OCB was created, whose indicators were ranks that run between SD quantities, by adding/subtracting them. Negative amounts represent a disagreement in favor of employees (employees believe they perform better than the supervisor). Positive amounts on the other hand, represent a disagreement in favor of supervisors (supervisors believe their team perform better than the

employees). Higher values (no matter the sign) represent low agreement, whereas lower values (no matter the sign) represent high agreement.

The results were classified under the following categories: 1) Teams that have a OCB similar to that of the supervisor received a 0 code (Agreement); 2) Teams whose supervisor scored slightly better than the team's OCB received a 1 code (Low Disagreement by Supervisor); 3) Teams whose Supervisor scored highly better than the team´s OCB received 2 code (High Disagreement by Supervisor); 4) Teams that had a slightly better criteria about their OCB than their supervisors' received a 3 code (Low Disagreement by Employees); 5) Teams that had a highly better criteria about their OCB than their supervisors' received a 4 code (High Disagreement by Employees).

Finally, the study ran an ANOVA Analysis using SPSS v. 22 to determine the differences of the group categories regarding their engagement levels.

Results

Table 1 shows the media, standard deviation, Cronbach alpha, and correlations among the variables of the study.

Table 1.

Descriptive Analysis (N Supervisors=89; N Employees=608)

Variable	Mean		SD		α	1	2	3
	Employees	**Supervisor**	**Employees**	**Supervisor**				
1. OCB	4,34	3,97	0,318	0,826	0,85	0,395**	1	0,652**
2. Engagement	5,05	5,16	0,549	0,795	0,92	0,438**	0,567**	1

Note. **p<.001. Employees` correlations are above the diagonal, while supervisor`s correlations are under the diagonal

Firstly, the R_{wg} Index allows us to obtain the level of agreement inside each unit. Only 3 units did not present an agreement among the team; therefore these groups did not pass to the forward analysis (OCB $\bar{x}$ = 0,836, SD=0,171).

Secondly, the subtractions between employees' and supervisors' responses about OCB perception provides with the amount of difference between each unit as in the prior step to form the categories.

Thirdly, a SD Analysis was carried out on the subtractions, obtaining a SD value of 0,762 for in-role OCB and 0,863 for extra-role OCB. Fourthly, the following categories were created: Category 1. Low Disagreement by Supervisor (media plus one SD), Category 2. High Disagreement by Supervisor (media plus two SD), Category 3. Low Disagreement by Employees (media subtract one SD), Category 4. High Disagreement by Employees (media subtract two SD).

Table 2 shows how many teams belong to each category regarding in-role OCB and extra-role OCB. The results show that most of the teams have agreement with their supervisor about their OCB (OCB: N=62).

Table 2.

Categories for OCB (N=86)

Categories	OCB
0. Agreement	62
1. Low Disagreement by Supervisor	2
2. High Disagreement by Supervisor	0
3. Low Disagreement by Employees	16
4. High Disagreement by Employees	6

Finally, the ANOVA Analysis used the employees' and supervisors' engagement as a dependent variable, and the categories as the independent variable. In the case of *OCBI*, the highest values for team engagement belong to the category 4 (High Disagreement by

Employees). This demonstrates that the levels of team engagement are higher when the team scores its OCB higher than its supervisor. In contrast, the team engagement is lower when the supervisor scores slightly better than the team, which corresponds to category 1 (Low Disagreement by Supervisor). Regarding supervisor engagement, the highest media values for team engagement belong to category N. 1 (Low Disagreement by Supervisor). This demonstrates that the levels of the supervisors' engagement are higher when this role scores their team's perceived OCB slightly higher than the team itself. Meanwhile the supervisors' engagement is lower when the teams score their OCB highly better than the supervisor's (category N.4 High Disagreement by Employees). The second highest quantity is category N.0 (Agreement) followed by Category N. 3 (Low Disagreement by Employees).

Regarding *OCBO* and employees' engagement, the highest media results belong to Category N. 3 (Low Disagreement by Employees). This demonstrates that the levels of team engagement are higher when the team scores its OCB slightly better than its supervisor. Whereas, the engagement is lower when the supervisor scores slightly better than the team (Category N.1 Low Disagreement by Supervisor). The second highest quantity is category N.0 (Agreement) followed by Category N. 4 (High Agreement by Employees). Regarding supervisor engagement, the highest media results belong to Category N. 1 (Low Disagreement by Supervisor). This shows that the levels of the supervisors' engagement are higher when their scores do not differ much than those of the teams' scores. On the other hand, the supervisor's engagement is lower when the team scores slightly better than him/her Category N.3 (Low Disagreement by Employees). Table 3 shows the Medias of each category for in-role OCB and extra-role OCB.

Table 3.

Medias of Categories ((N Supervisors=86; N Employees=608))

Engagement	CATEGORIES	OCB		
		Media	F	p

Employees	0.Similarity	5.04	0,35	0.79
	1. Low Disagreement by Supervisor	4.82		
	3. Low Disagreement y by Employees	5.15		
	4. High Disagreement by Employees	5.07		
Supervisor	0.Similarity	5.29	2.68	0.05
	1. Low Disagreement by Supervisor	5.43		
	3. Low Disagreement by Employees	4.69		
	4. High Disagreement by Employees	5.02		

Note. Category 2 (high disagreement by supervisor) was omitted due there was no participants in this category.

Once having the results, it makes sense to state that these partially confirm the hypotheses. Certainly, work teams and supervisors that coincide in high levels of agreement on unit OCB have higher levels of engagement (H_1) as it can be confirmed by Category N.0 in Table N.3 for both Employees' and Supervisor's Engagement. Nonetheless, these results are not the highest compared to the media, if we look at Category N.4 in Employees' Engagement and Category N.1 in Supervisor's Engagement. Hence, it can be affirmed disagreement in work teams indeed generates low levels of engagement (H_2) although it is not on all the disagreement categories.

Discussion

This study attempted to identify how the agreement on perceived OCB between employees and supervisors affects the engagement levels. There was an expectancy that teams and supervisors who agree on their perception of the unit's OCB (Category N.0 Agreement) would have higher levels of engagement (H_1), however it was not so. For employees, the categories with the highest values were N.4 (High Disagreement by Employees). With respect to supervisors, the highest values for engagement were from category N.1 (Low Disagreement by Supervisor). To conclude, the highest levels of engagement occur in different situations (categories) for both supervisors and employees.

At the same time, it was expected that work teams and supervisors who disagree about the perception of the unit's OCB (Category N.1 to 4) would have lower levels of engagement compared to the average (H_2).

However, this was not totally confirmed, as the lowest levels of engagement for employees belong to category N.1 (Low Disagreement by Supervisor) for OCB. Nonetheless, the supervisors' lowest levels of engagement came from (Low Disagreement by Employees) for OCB. It's noticeable in this case, that disparity in high levels of engagement focuses mainly on low disagreement.

These findings do not totally support the hypotheses, but they are meaningful to the in-role and extra-role OCB. They demonstrate a tentative proof on how OCB can be influenced by its own perception, thus affecting the employees' well-being levels and their efficiency. The introduction section covered the importance of employees working aligned with the organizational objectives.

However, similarity categories have significant engagement values; this synchrony is attained in the team, connotes a healthy working environment (Anitha, 2014). In addition, A study elaborated by Matta, Scott, Koopman, and Conlon (2015) regarding LMX quality of relationship, reveals whereas agreement exists from both employees and supervisors, the engagement and OCB are high.

Nevertheless, these results of the disagreement categories reveal a contradictory path, because disagreement categories unfold an apparent dysfunction inside the unit when supervisors experience low engagement levels while the employees' engagement levels are at their maximum. Though, this study does not focus on the working environment of the unit, so an explanation to this phenomenon needs further research for deeper comprehension.

Furthermore, it turns out normal that the supervisors' engagement levels are higher when they don't differ much from their teams' perceived OCB. That's because it causes a

sense of satisfaction with the job done by the employees under his charge. Self-efficacy beliefs in managers could explain this. When managers experience self-efficacy believes, their psychological arousal increases, causing them an inner feeling about being able to create an engaged work team (Luthans and Peterson, 2002).

In other words, when managers develop self-efficacy beliefs, they think their subordinates are working engaged, which in turns seems to also increase their own engagement levels according to the gain spiral of resources and work engagement (Salanova, et al., 2010). In addition, it is curious how higher levels of engagement exist when there is low disagreement on both supervisor and employees. The engagement levels are higher in opposite ways for both of them. It is clear now that when employees believe their in-role OCB is highly better, their engagement is higher too (Category N.4). And when they believe their extra-role OCB is slightly better their engagement is higher as well (Category N.3). However when any of these categories occur, the supervisors' engagement shows its lowest levels.

Therefore, work teams and supervisors who disagree about the perception of the unit's OCB have lower levels of engagement compared to the average (H_2). This means disagreement reflects in high levels of engagement for the other. Several backgrounds could be the reason to these results, just like performance overestimation, when high disagreement exists, and the engagement of the employees is high whereas the supervisors' is low due to the absence of supervisors' developmental feedback (Xingshan, 2015). Otherwise, it could be that in reality supervisors do not actually see the teams' potential due to underestimation or absence of communication with the team (Mishra, Boynton, & Mishra, 2014).

On the contrary, when the disagreement is low and the engagement of the supervisor is high but the employees' is diminished, it could be as a result of underestimation by the team about its own OCB due to the absence of supervisor developmental feedback

(Xingshan, 2015). Or as previously mentioned, due to the lack of recognition systems within the organization (Islam, 2013), or because of overestimation or excess in team confidence by the supervisor (Karau & Williams, 1993).

To conclude, this study tries to understand the effect of engagement on the agreement of perceived OCB. It also presents an approach for organizations to make a diagnosis on the engagement levels and the relationship among its supervisors and employees through the perceived OCB agreement between them. Its results can contribute to design more target-oriented organizational strategies for work teams. The findings present partial support to the hypotheses, revealing that disagreement of team's perceived OCB influences the engagement levels in disproportionate amounts for both supervisors and employees. This means, increasing one's engagement, while diminishing the other's. These results contribute to the agreement perspective in organizations, and unfold a research path to continue exploring agreement in perceived OCB and engagement relationship.

Theoretical and practical implications

Regarding theoretical implications, this study analyzes the agreement between the two levels of the organization, which brings in a more comprehensive study of the perceived OCB. Indeed, the findings open up the belief that disagreement not always means bad results or low levels of well-being. Thus, it broadens the study's interest in the relationship between perceived OCB and engagement, since it has brought up the possibility of contributing to a better relationship between supervisor-work teams.

Exploring the differences in perceived OCB can contribute to continue in the research of new ways to maintain a synchrony between these two levels of the organization, as well as other organizational aspects that can generate engagement.

Regarding practical implications, this study can offer an approach for organizations to make a diagnosis on how their supervisor-employee relationship is. The agreement in perceived OCB indicates how the members of the organization perceive the work done.

As Phillips, et al. (2014) state, teams tend to variate their OCB according to their own or to their managers' outlooks. This illustrates the importance of identifying in which category of this study they appear. Acknowledging this allows the application of adequate strategies to maintain the behavior (in case of agreement) or to work on bridge gaps (in case of disagreement). However, the implementation of these strategies should no happen before revising the engagement levels, because as we already know from before, disagreement does not always represent bad results.

In this way, companies cannot only guarantee the accomplishment of organizational objectives, or the efficiency of the team, but also the mental well-being of its members.

Limitations and further research

The results of this research will improve if upcoming studies add other influencing OCB variables at both individual and group level, such as organizational climate, working environment, team and coworker relationship, organizational justice, emotional intelligence, or self-efficacy beliefs specifically. Also, it will be interesting if forward research studies consider the analysis of team appraisal in contrast to the team's perceived OCB. Plus, since this study is cross-sectional, its results are not applicable on all contexts. Finally, the participant's culture could also influence the results; even though only a minority of them comes from other countries.

References

Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee

    performance. *International journal of productivity and OCB management*, *63*(3), 308.

    doi: 10.1108/IJPPM-01-2013-0008

Bakker, A., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a Model of Work Engagement. *Career*

    Development International, 13(3), 209-223. doi: 10.1108/13620430810870476.

Bakker, A. B., Albrecht, S. L., & Leiter, M. P. (2011). Work engagement: Further reflections on the state of play. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *20*(1), 74-88. doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2010.546711

Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, *22*(3), 187-200. doi.org/10.1080/02678370802393649

Benlian, A. (2014). Are we aligned… enough? The effects of perceptual congruence between service teams and their leaders on team performance. *Journal of Service Research*, *17*(2), 212-228. doi.org/10.1177/1094670513516673

Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & van den Heuvel, M. (2015). Leader-member exchange, work engagement, and job performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *30*(7), 754-770. doi.org/10.1108/JMP-03-2013-0088

Costa, P. L., Passos, A. M., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). Team work engagement: A model of emergence. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *87*(2), 414-436. doi.org/10.1111/joop.12057

Dash, S., & Pradhan, R. K. (2014). Determinants and consequences of organizational citizenship behavior: A theoretical framework for Indian manufacturing organizations. International Journal of Business and Management Invention, 3(1), 17-27.

Dávila, M. C., & Finkelstein, M. (2013). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Well-being: Preliminary Results. *International Journal of Applied Psychology*, *3* (3), 45-51. doi: 10.5923/j.ijap.20130303.03.

Davies, R., Margerison, C., & McCann, D. (1988). Team Management. Marketing

    Intelligence & Planning, 6(1), 32–39. doi:10.1108/eb045761

Emami, M., Alizadeh, Z., Nazari, K., & Darvishi, S. (2012). Antecedents and consequences

    of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB*). Interdisciplinary Journal of*

    Contemporary Research in Business, *3* (9). Available at SSRN:

    https://ssrn.com/abstract=2083512

Ferda, E., Janset, O., & Atsan, N. (2003). The relationship between trust and team OCB.

    Work Study, 52(7), 337-340. doi: 10.1108/00438020310502633.

Gabčanová, I. (2011). The employees the most important asset in the organizations. *Human*

    Resources Management & Ergonomics, 5(1), 30-33. Retrieved from

    https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/290b/c33376526ee0a3b6a7a7131f7dbe389eef28.pdf

Gerrig, R. J. (2013). *Psychology and Life* (20th Ed.). United States of America: Pearson

Education.

Gil, F., Rico, R., & Sánchez-Manzanares, M. (2008). Eficacia de equipos de trabajo.

    [Efficiency of Work Teams]. *Papeles del Psícologo, 29*(1), 25-31. Retrieved from

    http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=77829104

González-Roma, V. (2011). El clima de los equipos de trabajo: Una propiedad

    configuracional. [Work team climate: A configurational property]. *Papeles del*

    Psicólogo, *35* (1), 48-58. Retrieved from

    http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=77817210006

González-Roma, V., Peiro, J. M., Lloret, S., & Zornosa, A. (2010). The validity of collective

    climates. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72*, 25-40. doi:

    10.1348/096317999166473

Gibson, C. B., Cooper, C. D., & Conger, J. A. (2009). Do you see what we see? The complex effects of perceptual distance between leaders and teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(1), 62.

Harrison, D., & Klein, K. (2007). What's the difference diversity constructs as separation variety or disparity in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*(4), 1199-1228. doi: 10.5465/AMR.2007.26586096

Halbesleben, J. R. (2010) A Meta-Analysis of Work Engagement: Relationships with Burnout, Demands, Resources, and Consequences. In: Bakker, A.B. and Leiter, M.P (Eds.), *Work Engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research* (pp. 102-117). New York, United States of America: Psychology Press.

Huang, C. C., & You, C. S. (2011). The three components of organizational commitment on in-role behaviors and organizational citizenship behaviors. *African Journal of Business Management*, *5*(28), 11335-11344. doi.org/10.5897/AJBM10.1623

Islam, G. (2013). Recognizing employees: reification, dignity and promoting care in management. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, *20*(2), 235-250. doi.org/10.1108/13527601311313490

Joyce, W. F., & Slocum Jr, J. W. (1984). Collective climate: Agreement as a basis for defining aggregate climates in organizations. Academy of management journal, 27(4), 721-742.

Karau, S. J., & Williams, K. D. (1993). Social Loafing: A meta-analytic review and theoretical integration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*(5), 681-706. doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.4.681

Luthans, F., & Peterson, S. J. (2002). Employee engagement and manager self-efficacy. *Journal of Management Development*, *21*(5), 376-387. doi.org/10.1108/02621710210426864

Mallick, E., Pradhan, R. K., Tewari, H. R., & Jena, L. K. (2014). Organizational citizenship behavior, job performance and HR practices: A relational perspective. Management and Labour Studies, 39(4), 449-460.

Matta, F. K., Scott, B. A., Koopman, J., & Conlon, D. E. (2015). Does seeing "eye to eye" affect work engagement and organizational citizenship behavior? A role theory perspective on LMX agreement. Academy of Management Journal, 58(6), 1686-1708.

Mishra, K., Boynton, L., & Mishra, A. (2014). Driving Employee Engagement: The expanded role of Internal Communications. *Journal of Business Communications, 51*(2),183-202. doi: 10.1177/2329488414525399

Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*(2), 262-270. doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.2.262

Rico, R., Alcover de la Hera, C. M., & Tabernero, C. (2010). Efectividad de los Equipos de Trabajo, una Revisión de la Última Década de Investigación (1999-2009). [Work Team Effectiveness, a Review of Research over the last Decade (1999-2009)]. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones* , *26*(1), 47-71. Retrieved from http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=231316501004

Russo, J. E., & Schoemaker, P. (1992). Managing overconfidence. *Sloan Management Review*, *33* (2), 7-17. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/224961298?accountid=36753

Russo, J & Schoemaker, P. (2016). Overconfidence. In M. Augier & D. J. Teece (Eds.) *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Strategic Management* (pp.1-11). Palgrave Macmillan: UK. doi:10.1057/978-1-349-94848-2-323-1.

Salanova, M., Llorens, S., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2011). "Yes, I can, I feel good, and I just do it!" On gain cycles and spirals of efficacy beliefs, affect, and engagement. *Applied Psychology*, *60*(2), 255-285. doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2010.00435.x

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and psychological measurement*, *66*(4), 701-716. doi: 10.1177/0013164405282471

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*(4), 655-663. doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653

Stoner, J., Perrewé, P., L., & Munyon, T. P. (2011). The role of identity in extra-role behaviors: Development of a conceptual model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *26*(2), 94-107. doi: 10.1108/02683941111102146

Sridhar, A., & Thiruvenkadam, T. (2014). Impact of Employee Engagement on Organization Citizenship Behaviour. BVIMSR's Journal of Management Research, 6(2), 147-155.

Torrente, P., Salanova, M., & Llorens, S. (2013). Spreading engagement: On the role of similarity in the positive contagion of team work engagement. Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones, 29(3), 153-159. doi.org/10.5093/tr2013a21

Turnipseed, D. L., & Rassuli, A. (2005). Performance perceptions of organizational citizenship behaviors at work: A bi-level study among managers and employees.

British Journal of Management, *16*(3), 231-244. doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2005.00456.x

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, *17*, 601-617. doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.225

Xingshan, Z. (2015). Positive and negative supervisor developmental feedback and task performance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* , *36*(2), 212-232. doi:10.1108/LODJ-04-2013-0039