

ISMAEL BYARUHANGA

UNIVERSITY OF RWANDA-COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS, RWANDA

PATRICK BIKADHO OTHUMA

MAKERERE, UGANDA

EMPLOYEE EMPOWERMENT, TRUST, ENGAGEMENT, AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR (OCB)

Abstract:

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between empowerment, trust, engagement and OCB. The research questions used to achieve the above purpose were; what is the relationship between empowerment, and OCB, trust and OCB, and employee engagement and OCB. A conceptual framework relating the independent variables to the dependent variable was developed. A cross sectional survey design was used to collect quantitative data. The researcher used simple random sampling and questionnaires were developed to collect data from respondents. A representative sample of 376 respondents was selected from targeted population 545. The researcher used two regression models on employees' and supervisors' views on dependent variable (OCB) and both regression results revealed a significant positive relationship ($r = .50, p \leq .01$) and ($r = .41, p \leq .01$) respectively between empowerment and OCB. This is an indication that empowerment was the most significant predictor of OCB. While there exist conflicting views among employees and supervisors on relationship between trust and employees engagement and the dependent variable (OCB). The regression analysis on employees' views indicates significant positive relationship between engagement and OCB, while the opposite is true in the regression analysis on supervisors' view. However, the regression analysis on supervisors' views indicates significant positive relationship between trust and OCB and the opposite is true with the result from employees view on trust. However, given the conflicting views on trust and employee engagement still we recommended that management should adopt supportive organizational practices, policies and procedures as a priority, continuous monitoring of empowerment, trust, and engagement climate if OCB is to be exhibited by employees.

Keywords:

Altruism, habitual late reporting and early departure, absenteeism and irresponsible behaviors, engagement, organizational compliance

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Health service is key to socio-economic progress and quality of health services of any country depends to a large extent on the Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (Happy 2004). Happy (2004) asserted that the absence of employees OCB in most hospitals is attributed to lack of employee empowerment, trust and engagement. Empowerment behaviors would increase job satisfaction and subsequently resulting in more OCBs (Ahearne, Mathieu, & Rapp, 2005). Moyer and Henkin (2005) are of the view that empowering subordinates will serve objectives leading to organization citizenship behaviors among the employees. Organizational Citizen Behavior is a multi-dimensional concept that includes all positive organizationally relevant behaviors of individual organizational member including traditional in-role behaviors, organizationally functionally extra-role behaviors, and political behaviors, such as full and responsible organizational participation (Wagner, 2000).

Forrester (2000) looked at empowerment as understanding what power is, arguing that it involves the capacity to obtain results you want. Nigan (2000) suggested that empowerment leads to increased interpersonal trust between managers and employees, and those trust-building practices such as procedural justice, fulfillment of promises, collaboration, and open communication. According to Watt and Shaffer (2005) trust creates a safe environment where employees get involved in OCB.

Appropriate empowerment of employees seems to offer the price of generating feelings of engagement to the service encounter and freedom to use that power to meet customer needs that arises. Bevan, Barber and Robinson (1997) describe an engaged employee as someone 'who is aware of work context, and works closely with colleagues (OCB) to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization'.

However, despite the contribution of employees empowerment, trust and engagement to OCB, most hospitals in Nebbi and Zombo Districts of the West-Nile sub region exhibits disempowerment, distrust and disengagement environment which has led to continued absence of OCB, consequently affects the quality of health services.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

The literature review highlights literatures on four major variables in the conceptual framework. These are empowerment, trust, engagement, and OCB.

2.1 Empowerment

Psoinos & Smithson (2002) looked at empowerment as a sociological sense that reflects the process by which less powerful employees are given the opportunity to gain more power and control over specific life expectations. To achieve empowerment, managers must be sure that staffs at the lowest level have the right mix of information, knowledge, and the ability to make decisions about all aspects of work and rewards to work autonomously of management control and direction (William & Hazer, 2000). Thomas and Velthouse (1990) post that Empowerment means that power within the organization is distributed to a broader range of employees at more levels of the hierarchy.

On the other hand, Conger and Kanungo (1988) refer to empowerment not as a feeling or a result, but as a leadership behavior that fosters favorable outcomes such as follower persistence and self- efficacy. In this sense, empowerment is a motivational construct practiced by management with the intent of moving follower's action (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). Empowerment is the process of passing authority and responsibility to individuals at lower levels in the organization (Forrester, 2000). He further argued that empowerment is to understand what power is and suggested that it involves the capacity to obtain results you want.

The psychological approach focuses on intrinsic motivation rather than managerial practices used to increase individual's level of power. Through such an approach, the emphasis is upon perception and beliefs of power, competence, control, and self efficacy (Psoinos & Smithson, 2002). Empowerment depends on the creation of conditions appropriate for "heightening" motivation for task accomplishment through the development of strong sense of personal efficacy (Conger& Kanungo, 1988).

Thomas and Velthouse (1990) extended the general approach taken by Conger and Kanungo (1988), and viewed empowerment as a multi-dimensional construct and developed a cognitive model of empowerment. They defined the term as the increased intrinsic task motivation, which involves the general conditions by an individual pertaining directly to task that produce motivation and satisfaction and outlined four conditions, or “tasks assessments”, which they claim are the basis of worker empowerment. Elements of the work environment affect these task assessments, which in turn reflect whether the individual acted in the empowered manner or not. They argued that empowerment is multi-faceted and defined it as increased intrinsic motivation that manifests itself in a set of four conditions or dimensions: competence, impact, meaning, and self determination.

Competence- refers to ability to perform task or self-efficacy or personal mastery in relation to one’s work. To successfully empower employees, managers must make sure that staffs at the lowest level have the right knowledge, skills and ability about all aspects of work.

Impact - refers to ability/the belief that one can influence or determine organizational outcomes. In other word it is the capacity of individuals or groups to make choices and transform those choices in to desired actions and outcomes (<http://web.wordbank.org>). **Meaning** - refers to the value of the work or the importance placed on a given job based on one’s values. Central to the empowerment process are actions which both individual and collective assets, and improve the efficiency and fairness of the organizational context (<http://web.wordbank.org>). **Self determination** - refers to ability to initiate and regulate actions or the autonomy in making decisions about one’s work (Avolio & Bass, 2002). The higher an individual “scores” in each of these elements, the greater the sense of empowerment (Greasly et al., 2005).

Structural empowerment is about how the organization is structured. Empowerment is more successful in a decentralized or matrix structure than in a centralized structure because it gives power and involvement of employees in decision making which allows free interactions with managers.

Psoinas and Smithson (2002) suggested that to empower successfully it is necessary to examine the role of managers/leaders, as they have considerable impact upon the psychological sense of empowerment held by the employee. The way in which managers/leaders can

implement and maintain empowerment strategies is multi-dimensional. Holt, Love and Nigan (2000) found that it is necessary for managers to give people the power to do their job. The dynamic relationship of the leader with employees is frequently cited as crucial in the empowerment literature. Hales (2001) argued that the leader is responsible for creating a common goal, which they communicate and share.

2.2 Trust

Trust is necessary for people to work together on common projects, even if only to the extent that all parties believe they will be compensated in full and on time. It is by-product of successful collective action and economic success (Leadbeater, 1999). Moyer and Henkin (2005) posts that when there is interpersonal trust, there is the feeling that employers will not take advantage of staff there by influencing perception of fairness among subordinates at work which in turn enhances their ability to trust their supervisors. Subordinates involved in low quality relationships are likely to have low level of trust and emotional support and few, if any benefits (OCB) outside the requirements of the formal employee constructs (Dienesch & Liden, 1986) as a result of the low quality relationship supervisory trust are likely to be low.

Ferres, Connell and Travoglionne (2004) contend that in order for subordinates to develop trust in the supervisor, the supervisor needs to take the initiative in the initiation of the process. Likewise, Cremer, Dijke and Bos (2006) are of the view that leader's enactment of fair procedures communicate to employees that they are valued and worth members of the organization and that the supervisor or manager can be trusted in treating them well through out their stay within that organization. Being treated fairly is something highly regarded by subordinates and as such the behavior of the superior (being fair) significantly influences employees sense of self esteem and perception of supervisors' trustworthiness. Similarly, Bijlsma and Koopman (2003) examine trust in the manager as a key to performance. These two authors note that trust is an aspect of organizational performance because it enables cooperation. Most researchers have developed the view that good performance involves an aspect of extra role behavior and trust within the work place (Erturk 2007, Turnispeed and Rassuri, 2005). The supervisory climate is likely to influence the subordinates' ability to trust the supervisor and this will directly impact on performance (Erturk, 2007).

Trust is the belief or willingness to believe that one can rely on the goodness, strength and ability another person or group or persons (Lin, 2001). This is based on the below five constructs of trust suggested by (Kramer & Tyler, 1996).

Honesty- trusting behavior consists of actions that increase one's vulnerability to another whose behavior is not under one's control (Chao, 1990). He further argues that given the possibility of opportunistic behavior, trust is an essential ingredient when two parties are locked into the relationship. Lack of trust is more costly than promoting it; trust builds partnership, moral contract, and loyalty. Trust is the perception that a partner's word or promise is reliable and a party will fulfill his/her obligation in the relationship (Chao, 1990).

Orientation- Bullen and Onyx (1999), states that trust entails willingness to take risk in social context. People act this way based on confidence that others will respond as expected and will act in mutually supportive way or at least that others do not intend to harm. Munene, Mumanyira, and Rwemigabo, (2006) contends that, trust is the willingness of departmental members to become vulnerable to exploitation by offering free services, or information that may not be reciprocated.

Reliability/dependability- trust is a set of normative rules determining what behavior is permissible and what constitutes a violation of trust (Lin, 2001). The partnership entails relations involving mutual dependence where each party's action influences the other and the situation by the very nature calls for cooperation. Chao (1990) argues that trust entails a long term engagement and reflects a condition of mutual dependence where both parties are in position to influence the other by their behavior. Trust facilitates decentralization, it increases truthful communication, and it leads to collaboration over the allocation of scarce resources (Kramer & Tyler, 1996).

Friendliness- is central for trusting relationships to both institutional and interpersonal relationships. In fact, research suggests that in the new organizational environment, friendliness has replaced the hierarchical model of control that was prevalent in the traditional organizations (Nambi, 2009).

Competence- it is the confidence that persons who manifest trustworthiness and place extensive trust in one another will be able to accomplish much more than a comparable team lacking that trustworthiness and trust (Lin, 2001).

2.3 Engagement

Bevan, Barber and Robinson (1997) describe an engaged employee as someone ‘who is aware of work context, and works closely with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization’. Robinson, Perryman, and Hayday (2004) posts that, an engaged employee is someone who: is positive about the job; believes in, and identifies with, the organization; works actively to make things better; treats others with respect, and helps colleagues to perform more effectively; can be relied upon, and goes beyond the requirements of the job; sees the bigger picture, even sometimes at personal cost; keeps up to date with developments in his or her field; looks for, and is given, opportunities to improve organizational performance.

The conference Board in the United States (2006) defines engagement as ‘a heightened connection that an employee feels for his or her organization’. Armstrong (2009) posts that; engagement is closely linked to high organizational commitment. High organizational commitment can increase engagement and high engagement can increase commitment. But people can be engaged with their work even when they are not committed to their organization as long as it gives them the opportunity to use and develop their skills. This may be the case with some knowledge workers. For example, researchers may be mainly interested in the research facilities and the opportunity to make a name for themselves. They therefore, join and stay with an organization only if it gives them the opportunity they seek.

Towers Perrin (2007) states that, employee engagement refers to the extent to which employees put discretionary effort in to their work, beyond the minimum to get the job done, in the form of extra time, brainpower or energy. The Gallup consulting organization (2006) as cited in Armstrong (2008) advances three types of employees; the engaged, not engaged, and the actively disengaged. They describe engaged employees as builders who want to know the desired expectations of their roles so as to meet and exceed them. This category of employees performs consistently at high levels and love using their talents and strengths to move the organization

ahead. The not engaged employees are those who tend to concentrate on tasks rather than goals. The actively disengaged are those who consistently are against every thing. They are not just unhappy at work, but they also act out of their un-happiness sowing seeds of negativity at every opportunity.

Wollard (2009) describes employee engagement as a personal decision, not the organization's. He goes ahead and divides employee engagement into three basic components of emotional, behavioral, and cognitive. He argues that employee engagement has no physical properties but is manifested and measured through behavior. Armstrong (2008) posts that; the significance of engagement is at the heart of employment relationship. It is about what people do and how they behave in their roles and what make them act in ways that further the achievement of the objectives of both the organization and themselves. However, there are a number of factors that influence level of engagement. These include the work itself, work environment, leadership, opportunities for personal growth, and opportunity to contribute.

The work itself. Armstrong (2008) posts that; the work itself can create job satisfaction leading to intrinsic motivation and increased engagement. The factors involved are interesting and challenging work, responsibility (feeling that the work is important and having control over one's own resources), autonomy (freedom to act), scope to use and develop skills and abilities, the availability of resources required to carry out the work, and opportunities for advancement.

The work environment. An enabling, supportive and inspirational work environment creates experiences that impact on engagement by influencing how people should regard their roles and carry them out. An enabling environment will create the conditions that encourage high-performance and effective discretionary behavior. These include work processes, equipments and facilities, and the physical conditions in which people work. A supportive environment will be one in which proper attention is paid to achieve a satisfactory work-life balance, emotional demands are not excessive, attention paid to provide for healthy and safe working conditions, job security a major consideration, and personal growth needs taken into consideration (Armstrong, 2008).

Leadership. The degree to which jobs encourage engagement and positive discretionary behavior very much depend on the way in which job holders are led and managed. Managers and

team leaders often have considerable discretion on how jobs are designed, how they allocate work, and how much they delegate and provide autonomy. They can spell out the significance of the work people do. They can give them the opportunity to achieve and develop, provide feedbacks that recognize their contributions (Armstrong, 2008).

Opportunity for personal growth. Most people want to get on. As Lawler put it in 2003, ‘people enjoy learning, there is no doubt about it, and it touches on an important “treat people right” principle for both organizational and people; the value of continuous, on-going training and development’. Learning is a satisfying and rewarding experience and makes significant contribution to intrinsic motivation. Alderfer (1972) emphasize the importance of the chance to grow as a means of rewarding people. He wrote: “satisfaction of growth needs depends on a person’s finding the opportunity to be what he/she most fully and become what he/she can”. The opportunity to grow and develop is a motivating factor that directly impacts on engagement when it is an intrinsic element of the work.

Opportunity to contribute. Engagement is enhanced if employees have a voice that is listened to. This enables them to feed their ideas and views upwards and feel that they are making a contribution Armstrong (2008). A model developed through research by Incomes Data Services (2007) has three dimensions of employee engagement. These include:

Rational - understanding why and how to achieve the organization’s goals and investing discretionary effort to perform better. **Emotional** - Engagement refers to employee perceptions of their emotional attachment to or identification with the organization. Here, employees identify with the organization, internalizes its values and attitudes, and comply with its demands. **Motivational** - values for organization and also self motivated or willingness to invest discretionary effort to achieve goals and objectives. Incomes Data services (2007) asserts that for business and employees to reap the full benefits of engagement, people must be connected to the business or organization in all the three levels above.

2.4 Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The persistence with which OCBs has been studied by different scholars illustrate its important effect on research and practice, and the extent to which management systems have come to relied on its usefulness when appraising the performance of the workforce (Wagner, 2000). Because of

the importance of good citizenship for organizations, understanding the nature and sources of “organizational citizenship behavior” (OCB) has long been a high priority for organizational scholars (Organ 1998). Much as there has been rapid growth and development in OCB research since the term was coined by Organ (1988), a recent study by Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000) points out the important weakness of this stream of research. The literature has focused more on understanding the relationship between organizational citizenship and other constructs, rather than carefully defining the nature of citizenship behavior itself. Podsakoff et al. (2000). They also posts that “unless we pay more attention to our conceptualization of OCB and its measures, we are in danger of developing a stream of literature that may prove to be of little value to the field in the long run”.

Organizational Citizen Behavior has been defined in literature as a multi-dimensional concept that includes all positive organizationally relevant behaviors of individual organizational member including traditional in-role behaviors, organizationally functionally extra-role behaviors, and political behaviors, such as full and responsible organizational participation (Wagner, 2000). According to Podsakoff et al. (2000) leadership appears to have a strong influence on an employee’s willingness to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors. The quality of relationship, between the subordinate with his or her leader, influences organizations citizenship behavior. Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, & Bachrach (2002) focused on the influence of organizational citizenship behavior upon outcomes such as organizational individual effectiveness. In their study they concluded that OCB contribute to the organizational effectiveness by reducing administrative and maintenance costs, increasing productivity through promoting interpersonal relationships and the organization’s image.

OCB have been categorized on the basis of common themes or dimensions, and include altruism or helping behavior, conscientiousness, organizational compliance, individual initiative and civic virtue Organ (1988). Organ (1988) defined OCB as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization”.

OCBs are therefore extra role behaviors or contributions that employees freely and spontaneously carry outside their formal job requirements. It is about “going beyond the call of duty” and cannot be demanded for by the supervisors or the organization (Organ & Konovsky,

1989) and its omission is not punishable (Tepper, Zellers & Duffy, 2002). According to Organ (1998), employees engaged in OCB when they believe that their relationship with the organization is one of a social exchange. This social exchange, which should be mutually beneficial, has the elements of equity and interpersonal relationships (Watt & Schaffer, 2005). Examples of OCBs include, reporting early for work, volunteering to help colleagues with their work. Organ (1998) has identified five types of OCB as follows:

Altruism- This is discretionary behavior that is performed in helping a co-worker, customer or supervisor. It is also referred to as neighborliness or pro-social behavior. **Conscientiousness-** This refers to faithful adherence to rules about work (for example, coming to work on time, not taking too many coffee breaks and not leaving early) and carrying out ones duties beyond the minimum requirements. **Civic virtue-** This is the responsible participation and constructive involvement in the political life or governance of the organization for example attending meetings and giving constructive contributions on issues. **Sportsmanship-** These are actions that enhance internal relationships and include the willingness to forebear minor and temporary personal inconveniences without any fuss, appeal or protest. **Courtesy-** These are actions aimed at preventing problems for fellow workers and include being mindful of the effects of ones behavior on others, not abusing others rights, preventing problems with other people, giving advance notices or reminders, passing along information and alerting others in the organization about changes that may affect their work.

2.5 Empowerment and OCB

Employees' empowerment leads to organizational effectiveness (Lee & Koh, 2001). Empowerment in both private and public sectors is another way to give rise to the intensity of effort (Kim, 2004). Empowerment behaviors would increase job satisfaction and subsequently resulting in more OCBs (Ahearne et al., 2005). The perception of high level autonomy and influence on work with the possibility of using one's competencies have a strong influence on mobilization of discretionary behaviors of the employees (Ahearne et al., 2005).

Various studies have shown that employees who have a degree of empowerment exhibit high levels of OCB. Empowered employees are able to do their work without unnecessary distractions (William & Hazer, 2000). A study by Podsakoff et al. (2000) showed that

individuals are more likely to go beyond their formal job requirements when they are empowered in their jobs intrinsically to complete tasks successfully. Watt and Shaffer (2005) proposed that empowered employees are encouraged and enabled to exercise initiative and perform OCBs.

Moye and Henkin (2005) examined the relationship between employee behavior and empowerment. According to the outcomes of the study, once employees are empowered, they are much happier and ready to do their best; however the opposite is true, the employees who are not let to participate will have no intention of being more productive than they are because they will not trust their managers enough to be satisfied. Further more; Moye and Henkin (2005) are of the view that empowering subordinates will serve objectives leading to organizational effectiveness. OCBs can be referred to as some kind of effective performance (Watt & Shaffer, 2005).

Podsakoff et al. (2000), Taylor (2003) suggested that, employees perform OCBs with greater frequency when they perceive a fair means exist within the organization and their representative make allocation of decisions (i.e. procedural justice). Cardona, Lawrence and Bentler (2004) are of the view that social exchange relationship influence OCB. These positive social relationships can be as a result of empowering staff and involving them in the organizational decision making process. Somech and Bogler (2002) found a positive relationship between employee OCB and participation (empowering and involving employees in decision making). According to their study, once employees are empowered and involved in the process of setting ideas, they are likely to exhibit extra role behaviors at work (OCBs).

Honnger and Applebaum (1998) argued that empowerment is in two forms namely; organizational and individual. Under organizational empowerment, the employing institution creates structures and opportunities for people to exercise more control over their tasks. The individual forms of empowerment relates to an increased sense of self efficacy (Conger & Kanugo, 1988 as cited in Kiberu, 2009). In considering this view, the researcher notes that empowerment behaviors includes enhancement of the meaningfulness of the work, and fostering participation in decision making, expressing confidence in high performance and encouraging autonomy. It is suggested that empowerment behaviors are positively related to OCBs through a variety of mechanism. For example, when employees gain confidence in their work as a result of competence based interventions, their perception of self efficacy would increase which would result in an increased motivation to extra efforts in form of OCBs (Conger & Kanugo, 1988).

On the other hand, when employees gain autonomy as part of empowerment and fostered to participate in decision making, their sense of ownership and responsibilities for work outcomes could increase which would subsequently increase the likelihood that they would be willing to do what it takes to make the organization successful (Kiberu, 2009). Also, enhancing the meaningfulness of work could result in greater job satisfaction, which could lead to more OCB thus, to the extent that empowerment behavior cause employees to become more satisfied with their jobs, more confident in their ability to perform and have greater sense of responsibility for their work, they will be willing to work harder and go beyond job prescribed roles to make the organization perform effectively (Kiberu, 2009).

According to Ahearne et al. (2005) it is hypothesized that leader empowerment behaviors would increase job satisfaction, subsequently resulting in more OCBs. They further found that encouraging autonomy, enhancing the meaningfulness of work, and expressing confidence in performance all had significant indirect effects on OCB that accounted for 58% of the variance in group level citizenship behavior. The effects on OCB of enhancing the meaningfulness of work and expressing confidence in high performance was mediated by both perception of group potency and group job satisfaction. In contrast, the effect of encouraging autonomy in OCB was mediated by job satisfaction only. Thus this study posts that empowerment of employee may have important effects on OCB.

Hackman et al. (2009) argue that participation in decision making is one of the characteristics of employee empowerment that have been found to lead to engagement in OCBs in various contexts. Participation in decision making is a joint decision making that is a product of shared influence by a superior by his/her employee (Bijlsma & Koopman, 2003). It was found to effect job satisfaction and as such, it reasonable to assume that employees satisfied with their jobs will among others exhibit more OCBs, for example where there is presence of good superior-subordinate relationship has some how increased bearing towards making the subordinates perform better OCBs (Piwang, 2009).

Watt and Shaffer (2005) perceived an empowered work environment as essential for the performance of OCB. They also proposed that empowered employees are encouraged and enabled to exercise initiatives and perform OCBs. Empowerment increases task motivation resulting from individuals' positive orientation to work role. In other wards employees require

the flexibility that job autonomy provides to be able to perform. For OCBs to be displayed, the employees must be empowered.

Lappier (2007) confirms that, for supervisors to ensure their own success at achieving management objectives they need to involve employee in daily decision making and other empowering roles in order to encourage them to exhibit extra role behavior. He further contends that the supervisor's ability has a significant positive effect on the subordinate ability to offer the supervisor extra role efforts. Sias and Jablin (1995) contends that once staff do not trust in the supervisory policies within the organization they are likely to lose respect in the policies and the supervisors thereby rendering the supervisory climate failing.

Purcell et al. (2003) states that, discretionary behavior refers to the choices that people at work often have on the way they do the job and the amount of effort, care, innovation, and productive behavior they display. It can be positive when people 'go the extra mile' to achieve high level of performance. It can be negative when they exercise their discretion to slack at their work.

2.6 Empowerment and Trust

Moye and Henkin (2005) examined the trusting-relationship between employee behavior and empowerment. According to the outcomes of the study, once employees are empowered, they are much happier and ready to do their best; however the opposite is true, the employees who are not let to participate will have no intention of being more productive than they are because they will not trust their managers enough to be satisfied. Nigan (2000) suggested that empowerment leads to increased interpersonal trust between manager and employees, and that trust-building practice such as procedural justice, fulfillment of promises, collaboration, and open communication, in turn results in strengthened organizational commitment.

Sias and Jaablin (1995) contends that once staff do not trust the supervisory policies within the organization, they are likely to lose respect in the policies and the supervisors thereby rendering the supervisory climate failing. Organ (1988) stated that employees interpret procedural justice to mean that employer can be trusted to protect their interest. The supervisor's behavior is fundamental in determining the level of interpersonal trust in work unit. Supervisor's

behavior include sharing appropriate information, allowing mutuality of influence, recognizing and rewarding good performance and not abusing the vulnerability of others.

2.7 Trust and OCB

Moye and Henkin (2005) in their study of employee behavior found that once there is trusting relationship between employees and employer, employees become much happier and ready to do their best; however the opposite is true, the employees who are not let to participate will have no intention of being more productive than they are because they will not trust their managers enough to be satisfied. Strong interpersonal relationship within an organization ultimately facilitates its success (Shah, 2000). Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) noted that firms trust comprise a critical source of sustainable organizational advantage. Based on their work, citizenship behavior enhances firm functioning by contributing to the development of trust in organizations. Thus the execution of organization activities may be more efficient when employees working within a company trust each other (Fisher & White, 2000). Trust is a critical success element to employment relationship and facilitates risk taking by employee hence OCBs.

Kramer and Tyler (1996) trust reduces uncertainty about the future and the necessity for continually making provisions for the possibility of opportunistic behavior among employee. Trust lubricates the smooth, harmonious functioning of the organization by eliminating friction that specifies the behavior of employee who does not trust each other. Munene et al. (2006) contends trust among departmental members facilitates their vulnerability to exploitation by offering free services, or information that may not be reciprocated.

Wayne, Shore and Liden (1997) discovered that the relationship between supervisors and employees at the work place will directly influence trust perception in management within the organization. This is likely to impact on employee belief and trust in management's ability to fulfill its obligations of recognizing and rewarding desired employee attitudes and behavior. Once such acts are perceived as fair, trust in the supervisor is likely to be established. In deed as seen in the findings of Dienesch and Liden (1986) it is difficult to separate trust from perception of work relationships at the work place. In her findings, Minsky (2002) supports the above facts when she revealed that one possible cause of the lack of stronger results regarding positive work outcomes in line with performance in a work environment might be due to the lack of trust

between supervisors and subordinates. Many authors have attempted to describe trust in supervisors and according to Moye and Henkin, (2005) trust in one's immediate supervisor is often described as; an interpersonal trust that stems from day-to-day interactions between the trustier and trustee. It adds to the creation of a safe environment where employees get involved in OCB (Watt & Shaffer, 2005).

Ferres, Connell and Travoglione (2004) support the view that trust in supervisor is a central feature in the relationship between the supervisors and their staff. Trust in supervisors as seen by Watt and Shaffer (2005) further mediates the relationship between employees and supervisors. According to Lappier (2007) the demonstration of a supervisor's positively or negatively influences the subordinates' willingness to provide the supervisor with the extra role behavior (OCB). In other words, once the subordinates at work are convinced that trust exists at the work place and that the supervisor reflects personal degree of kindness towards other people with a genuine concern for their welfare, they are likely to be motivated to display extra role behavior (OCB). Most researchers have developed the view that good performance involves an aspect of extra role behavior and trust within the work place (Erturk, 2007, Turnispeed & Rassuri, 2005). The supervisory climate is likely to influence the subordinate's ability to trust the supervisor and this directly impact on the performance (Erturk, 2007).

2.8 Empowerment and Engagement

There is a close link between high level of engagement and positive discretionary behavior (Armstrong 2008). As described by Purcell et al. (2003), discretionary behavior refers to the choices that people at work often have on the way they do their jobs and the amount of effort, care, innovation, and productive behavior that display. It can be positive when people 'go an extra mile' to achieve high level of performance. It can be negative when they exercise their discretion to slack at their work. Positive discretionary behavior is more likely to happen when people are engaged with their work.

Research cited by Incomes Data Services (IDS) (2007) has identified two key elements that have to be present if genuine engagement is to exist that is, employees understanding their role, where it fits in the wider organization and how it aligns with business objectives. The second is the emotional aspect, which has to do with how people feel about the organization,

whether their work gives them a sense of personal accomplishment and how they relate to their manager.

2.9 Engagement and OCB

Bevan, Barber and Robinson (1997) describe an engaged employee as someone 'who is aware of work context, and works closely with colleagues (OCB) to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization'. Robinson et al. (2004) posts that, an engaged employee is someone who: is positive about the job; believes in, and identifies with, the organization; works actively to make things better; treats others with respect, and helps colleagues to perform more effectively; can be relied upon, and goes beyond the requirements of the job; sees the bigger picture, even sometimes at personal cost; keeps up to date with developments in his or her field; looks for, and is given, opportunities to improve organizational performance. Engaged people at work are positive, interested in and even excited about their jobs and prepared to go the extra mile to get them done to the best of their ability (Armstrong, 2008).

Engagement refers to employee perceptions of their emotional attachment to or identification with the organization. Here, employees identify with the organization, internalizes its values and attitudes, and comply with its demands. This facilitates OCB. Robinson and Perryman (2004) simply define employee engagement as a positive attitude held by the employee. They stipulate that engagement has a clear overlap with the more exhaustively researched concepts of citizenship behavior (OCB). They however, urge that engagement is two way, meaning who in turn has a choice about the level of engagement to offer the employer.

Kiberu (2009) posts that; employee engagement is key driver of organizational effectiveness and work force performance. Smith & Edmonstone (2001) describe employee engagement as a combination of commitment to the organization and its values plus a willingness to help out colleagues (OCB). They further assert that employee engagement goes beyond job satisfaction and is not simply motivation and not about driving employees to work harder, but about providing the conditions under which they will work more effectively or in other words, it's about releasing employee discretionary behavior. This facilitates OCBs.

Towers Perrin (2007) argued that engaged employees put discretionary effort in to their work and move beyond the minimum to get the job done, in the form of extra time, brainpower

or energy. According to Vazirani (2005) “Engaged” employees are builders, they want to know the desired expectations for naturally curious about their company and their place in it, they perform at consistently high levels, they want to use their talents and strengths at work every day and work with passion and they drive innovation and move their organization forward. Robinson et al. (2004) posts that, engaged employees are aware of business context and work with colleagues to improve performance within their job for the benefit of the organization. They have positive attitudes towards the organization and its values.

2.10 Conclusion

From the above review of literature, it is evident that employee empowerment has an influence on individual’s initiative to exhibit extra role behavior (OCB). However, it will take variables like trusting relationship and employee engagement to influence the level of OCB.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research design

The researcher used a cross sectional survey emphasizing a quantitative research approach. This helped to provide data regarding employee empowerment, trust, engagement, and OCB.

3.2 Target population

The target population was 545 employees; of which 110 were from Nyapea hospital, 173 from Angal, 230 from Nebbi hospital, and 32 from Paidha Health centre.

3.4 Sampling design

The researcher used convenience sampling method. This procedure was chosen because it enabled the researcher to identify those potential respondents who were readily available and willing to answer questionnaire.

3.5 Measurement

The items in the questionnaires were linked to a six point scales ranging from strongly agree as a response of 6 to strongly disagree as a response of 1. This helped respondents rate their responses accordingly. The measures included the following:

- Empowerment: This was measured using the adopted instrument by Spreitzer (1995). Empowerment constructs indicators of: Competence, Impact, Meaning and Self determination, were captured as reflected by relevant statements on each in the measuring instrument.
- Trust: This was measured using Kramer and Tyler (1996) at 6 point scale to capture dimensions such as reliability/dependability, honesty, competence, orientation and friendliness.
- Engagement: This was assessed using scales developed by PILA using 6 point scale.

- OCB was measured using four dimensions of altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue as modified by Podsakoff et al. (1990). The researcher used a 6 point scale to quantify the variables.

3.6 Data collection procedure

Data was collected from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data was collected using self administered questionnaires. While secondary data was obtained from review of documents such as journals, reports, planning documents, memos, and files. 377 questionnaires distributed of which 253 giving 67.1% response rate.

3.7 Data processing and Analysis

The data was collected using the data collection instrument chosen; i.e. using questionnaires, edited and coded. Descriptive and inferential statistics was produced with the help of SPSS. Descriptive statistics was used to describe the sample using cross-tabulation. For inferential statistics, correlation was applied to establish the relationships between the study variables. Other statistical tools such as regression were also used to establish which variable had the greatest influence on the dependent variable. T test and ANOVA tests were also used to analyze the differences in levels and perception of research variables.

3.8 Reliability and validity

A pretest for research instrument was done to determine their validity and reliability. Validity determined whether the instrument covered the content that it was supposed to measure. The relevance, clarity, simplicity, and ambiguity of the instruments were confirmed by the supervisors. Reliability tests were carried out to check for consistence of research instruments that were used. The questionnaires were then checked for accuracy and completeness using an alpha Cronbach test of more than 0.7 as seen in table 2.

Table 2 :Reliability Test

Variable	Cronbach alpha	N	Mean
Empowerment	.97	24	4.27
Trust	.97	20	4.08
Engagement	.98	27	3.84
Ocb 1	.91	23	3.91
Ocb 2 (Supervisor)	.98	23	4.04

Source: Primary data

3.9 Ethical considerations

In order to ensure ethical research principles, the researcher obtained an introductory letter from Makerere University Business School and took the initiative to seek permission to undertake the study in Nebbi and Zombo District hospitals/health centers. The research was purely academic. Confidentiality and anonymity of the respondents was strongly guarded.

3.10 Limitations/Problems faced.

The researcher faced a number of challenges:

- i. ICT knowledge gap led to delay in capturing and processing data as the researcher's word processing speed was very low. The researcher had to employ someone.
- ii. Poor perception of the research objective and motive made it difficult to access important information which was needed to carry the study. The researcher had to remain patient to gain access to the vital information.
- iii. Not having respondents' response within the set timeframe was solved by re scheduling the meetings with the respondents.

- iv. An inadequate financial resource was a major challenge as it affected the researcher's movement, production of research instruments, and respondents' motivation. This was somehow solved by getting research assistants in those organizations.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.0 Introduction

In this chapter, the results were tested in accordance with the objectives of the study. A total of 253 questionnaires were analyzed and the results obtained using cross tabulation, Pearson's correlation and regression analysis. Other tests like T test and ANOVA test were done as presented in the appendix 1 and 2 respectively.

4.1 Sample characteristics

The sample was grouped and compared by various characteristics and the results are presented in the tables below:

Table 3: Respondents by Hospitals/ Health center

Hospital/Health centre		Frequency	Valid %
Valid	Paidha	25	9.9
	Angal	76	30.0
	Nyapea	59	23.3
	Nebbi	93	36.8
	Total	253	100.0

Mean= 2.8696

Standard deviation=1.02488

Source: Primary data

According to the table above, Nebbi and Angal hospitals registered the highest percentage of 36.8% and 30% of respondents respectively.

Table 4: Respondents by gender

Gender		Frequency	Valid %
Valid	Male	132	52.2
	Female	121	47.8
	Total	253	100.0
Mean= 1.4783		Standard deviation=.50052	

Source: Primary data

Of the total respondents, 52.2% were male, and 47.8% women. The researcher tried to make considerations for gender disparities although there still do exist some insignificant gap.

Table 5: Respondents by marital status

Marital status		Frequency	Valid %
Valid	Single	49	19.4
	Married	190	75.1
	Widow	12	4.7
	Widower	2	.8
	Total	253	100.0

Mean= 1.48696

Standard deviation=.50668

Source: Primary data

Table 5 above shows that of the total respondents, the greatest percentage (75.1%) were married, 19.4% was single, while widower and widow presented 5.5%.

Table 6: Respondents by age

Age Range		Frequency	Valid %
Valid	20-29	41	16.2
	30-39	121	47.8
	40-49	75	29.6
	50-59	13	5.1
	60-69	3	1.2
	Total	253	100.0

Mean= 2.2727

Standard deviation=.83614

Source: Primary data

The table above shows that 47.8% of the respondents were between 30-39 years, 29.6% were aged between 40-49 years. This indicates that majority of the employees were in their middle age, the productive workforce of any country.

Table 7: Respondents by educational background

Educational background		Frequency	Valid %
Valid	Certificate	100	39.5
	Ordinary Diploma	121	47.8
	Bachelors Degree	28	11.1
	Post graduate Diploma	02	.8
	Masters Degree	02	.8
	Total	253	100.0

Mean= 1.7549

Standard deviation=.74217

Source: Primary data

The analysis revealed that 47.8% of the respondents had ordinary diplomas, 39.5% had certificates. Bachelor's degree, post graduate diplomas and master's degree totaled to 12.7%. Majority of the employees were ordinary diploma holders.

Table 8: Respondents by year of service

Year of service		Frequency	Valid %
Valid	Less than 1 year	20	7.9
	1-2 years	58	22.9
	2-4 years	84	33.2
	4-6 years	69	27.3
	6-8 years	18	7.1
	8-10 years	4	1.6
	Total	253	100.0

Mean= 3.0751**Standard deviation=1.11550*****Source: Primary data***

Out of the total respondents of 253, 33.2% served between 2-4 years, 27.3% were in service between 4-6 years, 22.9% served between 1-2 years, 7.9% served less than 1 year, 7.1% served between 6-8 years, 1.6% served between 8-10 years. This is an indication that employees do not stay long in the health sector.

Table 9: Respondents by year of establishment

Year of establishment		Frequency	Valid %
Angal	1954	79	31.2
Nebbi	1973	90	35.6
Paidha	1982	25	9.9
Nyapea	1987	59	23.3
Total		253	100.0

Mean= 2.25302

Standard deviation=1.13356

Source: Primary data

The figure above shows that the highest percentage of respondents were from the older hospitals, that is; Angal and Nebbi hospitals established in 1954 and 1973 respectively while the newly established hospital and health center established in 1987 and 1982 respectively recorded the lowest percentage of respondents. This is an indication that years of establishment have impact on the number of employees.

Table 10: Number of workers by Hospitals/Health Centre

Number of Workers		Frequency	Valid %
Paidha	32	25	9.9
Nyapea	110	59	23.3
Angal	173	79	31.2
Nebbi	230	90	35.6
Total		253	100.0
Mean= .92493		Standard deviation=.99118	

Source: Primary data.

Table 10 above revealed that 35.6% of the respondents came from hospital/health centre with the highest number of employees, followed by 31.2% from the second highest, 23.3% from third highest and the least come from health centre with the lowest number of employees that is 9.5%. This is an indication that representations were balanced.

Table 11: Number of beds by hospitals/health centre

Number of Beds		Frequency	Valid %
Paidha Health Centre	1-50	24	9.5
Nyapea	101-150	89	35.2
Nebbi and Angal	151-200	140	55.3
Total		253	100.0
Mean= .36363		Standard deviation= .89652	

Source: Primary data

Nebbi and Angal hospitals registered the highest number of beds representing 55.3%, while Paidha health centre registered the lowest number of beds representing 9.5%.

Table 12: Number of Nurses by hospitals/health centre.

Number of Beds		Frequency	Valid %
Paidha Health Centre	1-20	25	9.9
	21-40	1	.4
Nyapea	41-60	58	22.9
Nebbi and Angal	61-80	169	66.8
Total		253	100.0

Mean= .4664

Standard deviation= .92360

Source: Primary data

From the table above, 9.9% of the hospitals/health center had nurses between 1- 20, 22.9% of the hospitals had nurses between 41- 60, 66.8% of the hospitals had nurses between 61- 80 which presented the highest percentage and this is an indication that hospitals/health centers with large population of nurses presented the largest percentage of the samples.

4.2 Relationship between the study variables

Pearson correlation coefficient (r) was used to test for the relationships between the variables basing on the objectives of the study. Results are presented in the table below, and interpreted in the sub-section thereafter.

Table 13: Bivariate zero order correlation

Correlations	Empowerment	Trust	Engagement	OCB 1
Empowerment	1			
Trust	.84**	1		
Engagement	.78**	.72**	1	
OCB 1	.69**	.59**	.66**	1
OCB 2	.64**	.60**	.55**	.47**

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Primary data

4.2.1 Empowerment and OCB

The result revealed that there is a significant positive correlation relationship between empowerment and OCB1 ($r = .69, p \leq 0.01$), empowerment and OCB2 ($r = .64, p \leq 0.01$). This implies that when employees are empowered they are more likely to exhibit more OCB.

4.2.2 Trust and OCB.

The result showed a positive correlation relationship between trust and OCB1 ($r = .59, p \leq .01$) and OCB2 revealed positive relationship ($r = .60, p \leq .01$). This means that OCB is more likely to be exhibited when employees have trusting relationship.

4.2.3 Employee engagement and OCB.

The result revealed a significant positive relationship between employee engagements and OCB1 ($r = .66, p \leq .01$), OCB2 ($r = .55, P \leq .01$). This implies that the higher employee engagement the higher they exhibits OCB.

4.2.4 Empowerment and Trust.

The results indicates a significant positive relationship between empowerment and trust ($r = .84, p \leq .01$). This means that empowerment climate will result in to trusting relationship between the supervisors and employees.

4.2.5 Empowerment and Engagement.

There is a significant positive relationship between empowerment and engagement ($r = .78, p \leq .01$). An indication that empowerment environment will lead to employees engagement.

4.3 Regression analysis

Regression was used to determine the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable. That is, the effect of empowerment, trust, and employee engagement on OCB as shown in the table below:

Effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable

Table14: Regression analysis of Employees' views on OCB

	Un-Standardized		Standardized	T	Sig	R	R	Adj	F	Sig
	Coefficients		Coefficients							
	B	Std Error	Beta				Sq	R sq		
(Constant)	1.63	.19		11.76	.00	.71	.51	.50	85.42	.00
Empowerment	.32	.09	.45	4.84	.00					

Trust	.18	.07	-.02	-.18	.86
Engagement	.08	.07	.32	4.38	.00

Dependent Variable: Self Report OCB

Source: Primary data

Regression on employees self report on OCB indicates the prediction up to 50.2% of the dependent variable (adjusted $r = .50$). The model was significant (sig. f change = .00). Unlike in the supervisors' views, employee engagement is significant at the level of .00 and trust was insignificant at Beta = -.02, sig. = .86. While in both employees' and supervisors' view, empowerment was significant (Beta = .45, sig. = .00) and (Beta = .36, sig. =.00). This is an indication that empowerment was a constant since it was significant in both regressions.

Table 15: Regression analysis of supervisors' views on Employees' OCB

	Un-Standardized		Standardized	T	Sig	R	R	Adj	F	Sig
	Coefficients		Coefficients							
	B	Std Error	Beta			R Sq	R sq			
(Constant)	1.63	.19		8.47	.00	.65	.42	.41	58.86	.00
Empowerment	.32	.09	.36	3.56	.00					
Trust	.18	.07	.24	2.59	.01					
Engagement	.08	.07	.09	1.14	.26					

Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behavior by Supervisors.

Source: Primary data

The supervisors' rating on the dependent variable OCB, indicates that Empowerment, Trust and employee Engagement significantly predicted up to 41% of dependent variable (adjusted $r = .41$). The regression model was significant (sig. f change = .00). The most significant predictor of OCB was Empowerment (Beta = .36, sig. = .00) and Trust (Beta = .24, sig. = .01). While employee Engagement (Beta = .09, sig. = .26) was insignificant. This implies that it is Empowerment and Trust that affect the level of OCB according to supervisors' rating unlike in the employees' self rating which indicates that Trust was insignificant instead of employee

engagement. The results of both regression analyses indicate that empowerment is the only constant variable.

4.4 Summary

From the analysis, empowerment, trust, employee and engagement predicted 41% of the dependent variable (OCB), with empowerment and trust as significant predictors of OCB as per supervisors' views. While result of the employees' views revealed the prediction up to 50% with empowerment and engagement as significant predictors unlike the case of supervisors' views on engagement. This is an indication that empowerment is a constant variable. Other tests like independent T test indicates no significant difference in the perception except on trust and engagement and ANOVA test revealed no significant difference as shown in the appendix 1 and 2 respectively. This helped the researcher to make discussions and recommendations that can be adopted by hospitals and health centers and Ministry of health. In the next chapter, the researcher takes an in-depth presentation of the discussion, recommendations, and conclusion of the study.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents a discussion, conclusion, and recommendations of the findings presented in chapter four in relation to the objectives of the study and review of literature. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first is on the discussion, second conclusion and third is on the recommendations and areas of further research.

5.1 Discussion of the findings.

5.1.1 Relationship between empowerment and OCB.

The findings on both supervisor and employees' views revealed a strong positive correlation between empowerment and OCB. This means that if empowerment climate exist, then employees are more likely to exhibit high level of OCB. The finding was in line with the earlier research findings on the relationship between empowerment and OCB. An example was Ahearne et al. (2005)'s view that empowerment behaviors would increase job satisfaction and subsequently resulting in more OCB. A study by Podsakoff et al. (2000) showed that individuals are more likely to go beyond their formal job requirements when they are empowered in their jobs intrinsically to complete tasks successfully. Empowered employees are encouraged and enabled to exercise initiative and perform OCB (Watt & Shaffer, 2005).

Moye and Henkin (2005) are of the view that, empowering subordinates will serve objectives leading to organizational effectiveness. OCB can be referred to as some kind of effective performance (Watt & Shaffer 2005). Podsakoff et al. (2000), Taylor (2003) suggested that, employees perform OCB with greater frequency when they perceive a fair means exists within the organization and their representative make allocation of decisions (procedural justice. Happy (2004) asserted that the absence of employee OCBs in most hospitals is attributed to lack of employee empowerment. For example in 2005, a patient in Nyapea hospital died due to lack of knowledge and skill empowerment of employee (Staff Minutes, 2010). It should however, be noted that when examining the regression of variables, empowerment was registered as the

highest predictor of OCB. The results emphasized the importance of empowerment in the prediction of OCB.

5.1.2 Relationship between Trust and OCB.

The result on supervisors' view revealed a significant positive correlation between trust and OCB. This shows that for OCB to be exhibited by employees, trusting relationships need to be positive. However regression analysis on employee's views shows insignificant relationship, an indication that, to employees trust doesn't matter for them to exhibit OCB and it is inborn. While the positive correlation between Trust and OCB in supervisors' regression analysis is supported by Moye and Henkin (2005) in their study of employee behavior found that once there is trusting relationship between employees and employers, employees become much happier and ready to do their best; however, the opposite is true. Strong interpersonal relationship between organizational members ultimately facilitates its success (Shah, 2000). Fisher and White (2000) are of the view that execution of organizational activities may be more efficient when employees working within a company trust each other. Trust is a critical success element to employment relationships and facilitates risk taking by employees hence OCB (Kramer & Tyler, 1996).

Kramer and Tyler (1996) argued that trust reduces uncertainty about the future and the necessity for continually making provisions for the possibility of opportunistic behaviors among employees. Trust lubricates the smooth, harmonious functioning of the organization by eliminating frictions that specifies the behavior of employees who do not trust each other. Munene et al. (2006) contends that trust among departmental members facilitates their vulnerability to exploitation by offering free services or information that may not be reciprocated (OCB).

Wayne et al. (1997) discovered that, the relationship between supervisors and employees at the work place will directly influence trust perception in management within organization. This is likely to impact on employee belief and trust in management's ability to fulfill its obligations of recognizing and rewarding desired employee attitudes and behavior. Once such acts are perceived as fair, trust in the supervisor is likely to be established. Moye and Henkin (2005) assert that trust in one's immediate supervisor is often described as; an interpersonal trust

that stems from day-to-day interaction between the trustier and the trustee. It adds to the creation of a safe environment where employees get involved in OCB (Watt & Shaffer, 2005).

An employee of Nyapea hospital failed to represent the hospital during the women's day celebration of March 08, 2011 at the district Headquarters due to environment of distrust. (Minutes of staff meeting, 2011). This is true as per supervisors' view but employees' views indicate no relationship. Therefore, according to this finding trust's influence on OCB depends on who is rating the other as seen in the above finding, if it is supervisor rating employee, trust will have influence. While on the other hand if employees rating themselves trust will have no influence on OCB. This finding was so unique; future academicians need to carry out more findings on this variable to find out why there was conflicting results, yet most previous findings indicates significant relationship.

5.1.3 Relationship between employee Engagement and OCB.

According to research findings, there exists a significant positive correlation between employee engagement and OCB as per regression result on employees' views. This implies that if employees are well engaged, they exhibit high levels of OCB and vice versa. However regression analysis on supervisors' views indicates insignificant relationship. This implies that employee engagement does not matter as per supervisor's views, this view is to some extent in line with Armstrong (2009) s' view that people can be engaged with their work even when they are not committed to their organization as long as it gives them the opportunity to develop their skills. This may be the case with some knowledge workers. For example, researchers may be mainly interested in the research facilities and opportunity to make a name for themselves. They therefore, join and stay with an organization only if it gives them the opportunity they seek. Engagement among hospitals/ health center staff is limited, which negatively affects OCB. Employees tend to report late on duty, neglect responsibilities, and depart early (Minutes of staff meeting, 2011). This is in line with Beavan et al. (1997). They described an engaged employee as some one; "who is aware of work context, and works closely with colleagues (OCB) to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization.

Engaged people at work are positive, interested in and even excited about their jobs and prepared to go an extra mile to get them done to the best of their ability (Armstrong, 2008).

Engaged employees identifies with the organization, internalizes its values and attitudes and complies with its demands, hence OCB (Robinson et al., 2004). Kiberu (2009) post that, employee engagement is a key driver of organizational effectiveness and work force performance. Smith (2001) describes employee engagement as a combination of commitment to the organization and its values plus a willingness to help out colleagues (OCB). These findings are in line with the employees' view on engagement, to them engagement influences the level of OCB. While to supervisors employee engagement does not. Smith (2001) further argue that employee engagement goes beyond job satisfaction and it is not simply motivation and not about driving employees to work harder, but about providing the conditions under which they will work more effectively or in other words, it's about releasing employees discretionary behavior

This finding indicates that employee engagement's influence on OCB depends on who is rating; if it is employees self rating the result will be significant, while the result be insignificant if it is supervisors rating employees. This unique finding needs further investigation on variable engagement, to find out why the views are conflicting.

5.1.4 Empowerment and Trust.

Bivariate zero order correlation result revealed a strong positive correlation between empowerment and trust. This means that if empowerment climate exist, then employees are more likely to exhibit high level of trusting relationship. The finding was in line with the earlier research findings. Moyer and Henkin (2005) examined the trusting-relationship between employee behavior and empowerment. According to the outcomes of the study, once employees are empowered, they are much happier and ready to do their best; however the opposite is true, the employees who are not let to participate will have no intention of being more productive than they are because they will not trust their managers enough to be satisfied. Nigan (2000) suggested that empowerment leads to increased interpersonal trust between manager and employees, and that trust-building practice such as procedural justice, fulfillment of promises, collaboration, and open communication, in turn results in strengthened organizational commitment.

5.1.5 Empowerment and Engagement.

The zero order correlation result revealed a strong positive correlation between empowerment and engagement. This means that if empowerment climate exist, then employees are more likely to be engaged. The finding was in line with the earlier research findings. There is a close link between high level of engagement and positive discretionary behavior (Armstrong, 2008). As argued by Purcell et al. (2003), Positive discretionary behavior is more likely to happen when people are engaged with their work.

5.2 Conclusions of the finding

Based on findings and relationships between the study variables the following conclusions were made.

5.2.1 Relationship between empowerment and OCB.

From both regression results it can be concluded that empowerment environment strongly impact positively on OCB, it is a constant variable because empowerment is in two ways structural and psychological. Therefore, the environment in which hospitals/health center's employee's work affects their level of exhibition of OCBs. Therefore management needs to create positive environment for empowerment.

5.2.2 Trust and OCB.

In light of the above findings from the supervisors' regression analysis we can therefore conclude that trust significantly correlated with OCB. Good trusting relationship promotes employees' exhibition of OCB. Though, regression result on employees' views indicates insignificant relationship, to them trust is inborn and a silent variable which is not important for them to exhibit OCB. This unique finding needs further investigation to find out why there exist conflicting views between supervisors and employees.

5.2.3 Engagement and OCB.

From employee regression finding it can be concluded that employee engagement have influence on OCB. Engagement environment in which the hospital/health center staff works, have direct link with their exhibition of OCB. Positive environment leads to OCB and the opposite is true.

However the regression analysis on supervisors' views indicates insignificant relationship. This is in line with Armstrong (2009) s' views that people can be engaged with their work even when they are not committed to their organization as long as it gives them the opportunity to use and develop their skills. This may be the case with same knowledge workers. For example, researchers may be mainly interested in the research facilities and the opportunity to make a name for themselves. They therefore, join and stay with an organization only if it gives them the opportunity they seek. However, as per employees' view we can conclude that hospitals/health centers administrators should provide engagement environment for exhibition of OCB by employees. While for supervisors engagement is not important, therefore further investigation need to be carried to find why there is conflicting views.

5.2.4 Empowerment and Trust.

From Bivariate zero order correlation results it can be concluded that empowerment environment strongly impact positively on trusting relationship, empowerment is in two ways structural and psychological. Therefore, the empowerment environment in which hospitals/health center's employee's work affects their level of trust, management needs to create positive environment for empowerment.

5.2.5 Empowerment and Engagement.

Zero order correlation results revealed empowerment environment strongly impact positively on employees engagement, we can therefore, conclude that the empowerment environment in which hospitals/health center's employee's work affects their level of engagement, management needs to create positive environment for empowerment.

REFERENCES

- Ahearna, M., Mathieu, J., & Rapp, A., (2005). To Empower or not to empower your sale force? An Empirical Examination of the influence of Leadership Empowerment behavior on Customer satisfaction and Performance. *Journal of applied Psychology* 90,945-955
- Alderfer, C. (1972). Existence, Relatedness and Growth, *Free Press, New York*.
- Armstrong, M. (2008). Strategic Human Resource Management; *A Guide to Action*, 4th Edition. New Delhi, India.
- Armstrong, M. (2009). Armstrong Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice, 11th Edition. Kogan Page, London and Philadelphia.
- Avolio, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (2002). Developing Potential across a Full Range of Leadership; Cases on Transactional and Transformational leadership, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Mahwah, NJ.
- Bevens, Barber, L., & Robinson, D. (1997). Keeping the best: A practical guide to Retaining key employees, *Institute for employment studies (Brighton, UK)*.
- Bijlsma, K., & Koopman, P. (2003). Introduction, Trust within Organizations. *Personnel review*, 32, 543-555.
- Bullen, P.H., & Onyx, T. (1999). Measuring Social capital, Family support services, and Neighborhood, and Community center in NSW, unpublished.
- Cardona, P., Lawrence, B.S & Bentler, P.M. (2004). The influence of Social and Work exchange relationships on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: *group and organizational Management*, 29, 219-247.
- Chao, G. T. (1990). "Exploration of the Conceptualization and Measurement of Career Plateau: A Comparative Analysis" *Journal of Management* , 16(1), 181-93.
- Conference Board (2006). Employee Engagement: *A review of current research and its implications*, Conference Board, New York.

- Conger, J., & Kanungo, R. (1988). The Empowerment process: Integration theory and Practice. *Academy Management Journal*, 13(3), 471-482.
- Cremer, D., Dijk, M., & Bos, A. (2006). Leaders' procedural justice effecting identification and mediation. *Leadership and organizational development journal*. 27, 533-564.
- Dienesch, R. M., & Linden, R. C. (1986). Leader member exchange Model of Leadership: A Critique and further Development *The academy of management review*, 11, 618-634.
- Erturk, A. (2007). Increasing Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Turkish Academicians: Mediating role of Trust in supervisor on the relationship between Organizational justice and Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of management psychology*, 22, 257-270.
- Ferres, N., Connell, J., & Travoglin, A. (2004). Co-worker Trust as a Social catalyst or Constructive employee attitudes. *Journal of management psychology*, 19, 608-622.
- Fisher, S. R., & White, M. A. (2000). Downsizing in learning Organization: Are there hidden cost? *Academy of management review*, 13, (9), 35-39.
- Forrester, R. (2000). Empowerment: Rejuvenating a Potent Idea. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(3), 67-80.
- Forrester, N. L. (2001). Empowerment at the Peak- The 10th Trait of Effective Leaders *American review of public administration*, 30 (1), 87-109.
- Greasley, K., Brayman, A., Dainty, A., & Price. (2005). Employee Perceptions of Empowerment, 27 (4), 354-368
- Hackman, J., Richard, Nancy, W., and Allan, R. B. (2009). Prediction of long term success in doctoral work in Psychology, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*.
- Hales, C. (2001). Does it Matter what m Managers do?, *Business strategy Review*, 12(2), 50-8.
- Happy, C. (2004). Occupational Stress and Organizational Citizenship Behavior; Among Nurses in Mulago Hospital: Makerere University dissertation. Un published.

[http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTPOVERTY/EMPOWERMENT/O,, ContentMDK.20...](http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTPOVERTY/EMPOWERMENT/O,,ContentMDK.20...)

Holt, G.D., Love, P.E.D., & Nesan, L.J. (2000). Employee Empowerment in Construction: an Implementation Model for Process Improvement, *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 6 (3), 47-51.

Honnger, K., & Applebaum, S. H. (1998). The Impact of Perceived control and Desire to be Empowered: An analysis of Perception and reality. *Managing Service Quality*, 8(6).

Human Resources for Health Bi-Annual Report October 2009-April 2010, issue, 3 May 2010.

Incomes Data Services (IDS) (2007). Building an engaged work force, HR studies update, May 1-3.

Kiberu, R. (2009). *Operant Competences, Professional training and performance of Public sector Accounts*. Makerere University Dissertation; Un published.

Kim, A. (2004). Parent- school Partnership formation through the School Council in Korea, *Educational Research for policy and practice*, 3 (2), 127-39.

Kramer, R. M., & Tyler, R. T. (1996). Trust in Organizations; *Frontiers of Theory and Research*, Sage Publications, Inc., California 91320 USA.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30,607-610.

Lappier, L. (2007). Supervisory Trustworthiness and Subordinate's willingness to provide Extra role efforts. *Journal of applied psychology*, 37, 272-297.

Lawler, E. E. (2003). Treat People Right! How Organizations and Individuals can propel each other into a virtuous spiral of success, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative Approach to Content Validity *Personnel Psychology*, 28, 563-575.

Leadbeater, C. (1999). Living on thin Air: *The new economy*, Harmonsworth, penguin books.

- Lee, M., & Koh, J. (2001). Is empowering really a new concept?, *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12 (4), 684-95.
- Lin, N. (2001). *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*. New York; Cambridge University press.
- Matsiko, C.W. (2005). Assessing Effectiveness of standards for Labor utilization for priority Health interventions in Uganda; *a dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of PhD*; Cambridge Management Institute.
- Minsky, B. D. (2002). LMX Dyad agreement: *Construct definition and the role of supervisor/subordinate similarity and communication in understanding LMX*. PhD dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Louisiana state University and Agriculture and Mechanical College.
- Moye, M., & Henkin, A. (2005). Equity association between employee Empowerment; and Trust in managers. *Journal of management development*, 25, 101-117.
- Munene, J. C., Mumanyire, A., & Rwemigabo, T. (2006). Operational zing results based management: *some hard and soft competences*.
- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshals, S. (1998). Social Capital, Intellectual Capital, and the Organizational Advantage, *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 242-266.
- Nambi, G. (2009). Supervisory and Job-Related Climate, Trust, Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours. A survey among IT selected Companies: *Makerere University dissertation* Un published.
- Nigan, R. (2000). Changing the paradigms: Trust and its roles in public sector organizations. *The American review of public administration*, 30, 87-109.
- Nyapea Hospital. (2005 & 2011). Staff Meeting Minutes.
- Organ, D. W. (1998). Organizational Citizenship Behavior, *The good soldier syndrome*, D.C. health and company, Lexinton and Toronto.

- Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Cognitive versus Affective determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 74 (1), 157-164.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: *The good soldier syndrome*, Lexington, M.A: Lexington books.
- Piwang, P. (2009). Managerial Competencies, Team work, Employee empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors; *A case of Uganda Electoral Commission: Makerere University dissertation*. Un published.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, J., Paine, J.B. & Bachrach, D. G. (2002). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A critical Review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for further research. *Journal of management*, 26, 513-563.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Scott, B., Mackenzie, J., Beith, P., & Daniel, B. (2000). Empirical Literature and Suggestion for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3) 5213-563.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, J., Moorman, R. H. & Fetter, R (1990). Transformational Leader Behaviors and their effects on Trust, Satisfaction, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior, *The leadership Quarterly*, 1 (2), 107-42.
- Poverty Eradication Action Plan. (2004/5-2007/8). *Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development*.
- Psoinos, A., Smithson, S. (2002). Employee Empowerment in Manufacturing, a Study of Organizations in the UK, *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 17 (2), 132-48.
- Purcell, J., Kinnie, K., Hutchinson, S., Rayton, B., & Swart, J. (2003). *Understanding the People and Performance Link: Unlocking the black box*, Chartered Institute of Personal and Development, London.
- Report on Nyapea Hospital staff performance, 2005.
- Robinson, D., et.al. (2004). *The Drivers of employee Engagement*. Institute for Employment Studies. www.employmentstudies.co.uk. Retrieved 2nd june 2010.

- Shah, P. (2000). Network Destruction: The Structural Implications of downsizing. *Academy of management journal*, 44, 219-237.
- Sias, P. M., & Jablin, F. M. (1995). Differential Superior, Subordinate Relations, Perceptions of Fairness and Co-worker Communications. *Human Communication Research*, 22, 5-38.
- Smith, S., Edmonstone, J. (2001). Learning to Lead, *Nursing Management*, 8 (3), 10-13.
- Somech & Bogler. (2002). Influence of Teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in Schools.
- Spreitzer. (1995). Psychological Empowerment Instruments. <http://webuser.umich.edu/spreitze/psychempowerment.pdf>
- Taylor, S. (2003). *Employee Resourcing, Institute of Personnel and Development*, London.
- Tepper, J. B., Zellars, K. L., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive Supervision and Subordinates' Organizational Citizenship Behavior, *Journal of applied Psychology*, 87, 1068-1076.
- Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of benefits: an interpretive model of intrinsic task motivation *Academy of Management Review*, 15(5), 668-81.
- Torington, D, & Hael, L. (1998).” Letting go or holding on-the devolution of operational personnel activities”, *Human Resource management journal*, Vol.8, No.1. page 41-55.
- Towers, Perrin. (2007). *Gloal Workforce Study*, <http://www.towersperrin.com>
- Turnipseed ,D., and Rassuri, G. A. (2005). Performance perceptions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour at work: a bi-level study among Managers and Employees. *British journal of management*, 16, 231-244.
- Vazirani, N. (2005). Employee Engagement, www.siescoms.edu. *College of Management Studies*, 20, 709-34.
- Wagner, S., & Rush, M. (2000). Altruistic Organizational Citizenship Behavior: context, disposition and age, *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140, 379-91.

- Wat, D., & Shaffer, M.A. (2005). Equity and Relationship Quality Influences on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *The Mediating Role of Trust in the Supervisor and Empowerment*, 34 (4), 406-422.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived Organizational Support and Leader member exchange: A Social exchange perspective. *The academy of management journal*, 40, 82-111.
- William, L.J., & Hazer, J.T. (2000). Antecedents of Empowerment and Commitment in Turnover Models; A Reanalysis Using Talent Variable Structural Equation Methods, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2, 219.
- Wollard. (2009). [Blog.vovici.com/blog/bid/...Employee-engagement –definition](http://blog.vovici.com/blog/bid/...Employee-engagement-definition).

Appendix 1. Independent T test

Table 16: T test

	Sex 1	N	Mean	F	Sig	T	Sig
Empowerment	Male	131	4.36	4.337	.038	1.759	.08
	Female	120	4.18			1.775	.08
Trust	Male	130	4.20	3.205	.075	2.187	.03
	Female	120	3.94			2.201	.03
Engagement	Male	131	3.95	1.786	.183	2.179	.03
	Female	120	3.73			2.184	.03
OCB 1	Male	131	3.92	2.346	.127	.331	.74
	Female	120	3.90			.333	.74
OCB 2	Male	131	4.10	.411	.522	1.242	.22
	Female	120	3.98			1.245	.21

Source: Primary data.

The T test results revealed no significant difference ($t = 1.759$, $p = 0.08$). In the mean, empowerment score for male was 4.36 and female 4.18 as regards their perceptions. While there was significant difference among male and female respondent's perceptions as regards trust ($t = 2.187$, $p=0.03$), employee engagement ($t = 2.179$, $p = 0.03$). OCB1 and OCB2 ($T = 0.331$, $P = 0.74$) and ($t = 1.242$, $p =0.22$) respectively registered no significant difference between male and female.

In summary, the model above indicates no significant difference in perception as regards gender on the variables of the study except trust and engagement.

Appendix 2: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

Analysis of variance was carried out to establish the difference in perception of the demographic variables on the independent and dependent variables. The basis for interpretation of results is the level of significance which are equal or below 0.05. The corresponding magnitude of mini scores were used to assess the particular constructs or items that evaluated more positively.

Table 17: Hospital/health centers by variables

		N	Mean	Df	F	Sig
Empowerment	Paidha	25	4.04	3	5.098	.00
	Angal	76	4.42	1	1.138	.29
	Nyapea	59	3.97	1	.697	.41
	Nebbi	92	4.39	2	.7299	.00
	Total	252	4.27	248		
				251		
Trust	Paidha	24	3.91	3	4.077	.01
	Angal	76	4.29	1	.063	.80
	Nyapea	59	3.77	1	.026	.87
	Nebbi	92	4.14	2	6.103	.00
	Total	251	4.08	247		
				250		

Engagement	Paidha	25	3.81	3	4.710	.00
	Angal	76	3.93	1	.060	.81
	Nyapea	59	3.53	1	.482	.49
	Nebbi	92	3.99	2	6.824	.00
	Total	252	3.84	248		
				251		
OCB1	Paidha	25	3.99	3	2.235	.09
	Angal	76	3.90	1	.093	.76
	Nyapea	59	3.76	1	.274	.60
	Nebbi	92	4.00	2	3.216	.04
	Total	252	3.91	248		
				251		
OCB 2	Paidha	25	3.91	3	3.428	.02
	Angal	76	4.10	1	1.071	.30
	Nyapea	59	3.82	1	1.540	.22
	Nebbi	92	4.17	2	4.371	.01
	Total	252	4.04	248		

Source: Primary data

Anova results revealed no significant difference between respondents from Angal and Nyapea. This implies that the perception of the respondent does not differ over the study variable. While respondents from Paidha and Nebbi significantly differed in their perceptions of the study variables except on OCB, Paidha registered no significant difference.

Table 18: Sex by variable

		N	Mean	Df	F	Sig
Empowerment	Male	131	4.36	1	3.095	.08
	Female	120	4.18	1	3.095	.08
	Total	251	4.27	1	3.095	.08
				249		
				250		
Trust	Male	130	4.20	1	4.784	.03
	Female	120	3.94	1	4.784	.03
	Total	250	4.08	1	4.784	.03
				248		
				249		
Engagement	Male	131	3.95	1	4.748	.03
	Female	120	3.73	1	4.748	.03
	Total	251	3.85	1	4.748	.03

				249		
				250		
OCB1	Male	131	3.92	1	.110	.74
	Female	120	3.90	1	.110	.74
	Total	251	3.91	1	.110	.74
				249		
				250		
OCB 2	Male	131	4.10	1	1.542	.22
	Female	120	3.98	1	1.542	.22
	Total	251	4.04	1	1.542	.22
				249		
				250		

Source: Primary data

ANOVA findings revealed no significant difference in the perception between male and females on empowerment, OCB1 and OCB2. However, there was a significant difference between male and females on trust and engagement ($P=.03$). This implies that male and females differed in their perception on trust and engagement.

Table 19: Marital status by variables

		N	Mean	Df	F	Sig
Empowerment	Single	48	4.33	1	.118	.73
	Married	160	4.33	1	.035	.85
	Widow	7	4.35	2	.042	.96
	Widower	2	4.52	213		
	Total	217	4.33	216		
Trust	Single	47	4.18	3	.402	.75
	Married	160	4.14	1	.054	.82
	Widow	7	3.77	1	.433	.51
	Widower	2	4.14	2	.387	.68
	Total	216	4.13	212		
				215		
Engagement	Single	48	3.99	3	.264	.85
	Married	160	3.89	1	.183	.67
	Widow	7	3.98	1	.459	.50
	Widower	2	3.71	2	.167	.85
	Total	217	3.91	213		
				216		

OCB1	Single	48	3.87	3	.373	.77
	Married	160	3.96	1	.000	1.00
	Widow	7	4.03	1	.710	.40
	Widower	2	3.85	2	.204	.82
	Total	217	3.94	213		
				216		
OCB 2	Single	48	4.28	3	1.663	.18
	Married	160	4.04	1	.450	.50
	Widow	7	3.91	1	4.348	.04
	Widower	2	3.98	2	.321	.73
	Total	217	4.09	213		
				216		

Source: Primary data

The table above shows no significant difference between respondents of different marital status. Therefore respondents across the different marital status shared the same views over the study variables except widows had different perception on OCB2 (P=.04).

Table 20: Age by variables

		N	Mean	Df	F	Sig
Empowerment	20-29	40	4.3059	4	1.137	.34
	30-39	111	4.2553	1	2.475	.12

	40-49	64	4.3898	1	2.779	.10
	50-59	12	4.6215	3	.590	.62
	60-69	3	4.8889	225		
	Total	230	4.3289	229		
Trust	20-29	39	4.1363	4	1.182	.32
	30-39	111	4.0426	1	2.730	.10
	40-49	64	4.2175	1	2.452	.12
	50-59	12	4.3992	3	.759	.52
	60-69	3	4.8881	224		
	Total	229	4.1372	228		
Engagement	20-29	40	3.8704	4	1.020	.40
	30-39	111	3.8767	1	2.309	.13
	40-49	64	3.8687	1	1.524	.22
	50-59	12	4.2593	3	.851	.47
	60-69	3	4.4136	225		
	Total	230	3.9003	229		
OCB1	20-29	40	3.8299	4	1.986	.10
	30-39	111	3.8862	1	1.992	.16
	40-49	64	4.0649	1	7.262	.01
	50-59	12	4.1612	3	.227	.88
	60-69	3	4.1884	225		

	Total	230	3.9444	229		
OCB 2	20-29	40	4.1533	4	.342	.85
	30-39	111	4.0917	1	.320	.57
	40-49	64	4.0476	1	.000	.98
	50-59	12	4.2373	3	.456	.71
	60-69	3	4.3261	225		
	Total	230	4.1008	229		

Source: primary data

ANOVA findings revealed no significant difference on the perception between respondents of different age groups. Therefore respondents across the different age groups shared the same views over the study variables except the 40-49 age group that had different perception on OCB1 (P=.01).

Table 21: Educational background by variables

		N	Mean	Df	F	Sig
Empowerment	Certificate	99	4.39	4	1.470	.21
	Ordinary Diploma	113	4.19	1	.053	.82
	Bachelor's degree	28	4.53	1	.001	.98
	Postgraduate Diploma	2	4.50	3	1.959	.12
	Masters Degree	2	4.38	239		
	Total		244	4.31	243	
Trust	Certificate	98	4.21	4	1.794	.13
	Ordinary Diploma	113	3.98	1	.117	.73
	Bachelor's degree	28	4.40	1	.082	.77
	Postgraduate Diploma	2	3.56	3	2.364	.07
	Masters Degree	2	4.18	238		
	Total		243	4.12	242	
Engagement	Certificate	99	3.97	4	2.609	.04
	Ordinary Diploma	113	3.74	1	.279	.60
	Bachelor's degree	28	4.16	1	.059	.81
	Postgraduate Diploma	2	4.31	3	3.459	.02
	Masters Degree	2	3.35	239		
	Total		244	3.88	243	

OCB1	Certificate	99	3.99	4	1.258	.29
	Ordinary Diploma	113	3.86	1	.065	.80
	Bachelor's degree	28	4.08	1	.108	.74
	Postgraduate Diploma	2	3.83	3	1.641	.18
	Masters Degree	2	3.89	239		
	Total	244	3.94		243	
OCB 2	Certificate	99	4.10	4	2.299	.06
	Ordinary Diploma	113	3.98	1	.021	.89
	Bachelor's degree	28	4.41	1	.648	.42
	Postgraduate Diploma	2	4.22	3	2.849	.04
	Masters Degree	2	3.90	239		
	Total	244	4.08	243		

Source: Primary data

Respondents of various educational backgrounds did not significantly differ in their perceptions about the variables except for engagement that showed significant difference of (F2.609, P=.04), (F3.459, P=.02), and OCB2 registered significant difference of (F2.849, P=0.04).

Table 22: Years of service by variables

		N	Mean	Df	F	Sig
Empowerment	Less than 1 yr	20	4.44	4	.677	.64
	1-2 years	56	4.36	1	.098	.75
	2-4 years	81	4.27	1	.197	.66
	4-6 years	66	4.20	4	.797	.53
	6-8 years	17	4.50	238		
	8-10 years	4	4.51	243		
	Total		244	4.31		
Trust	Less than 1 yr	19	4.26	5	.670	.65
	1-2 years	56	4.17	1	.236	.63
	2-4 years	81	4.06	1	.053	.82
	4-6 years	66	4.02	4	.824	.51
	6-8 years	17	4.35	237		
	8-10 years	4	4.42	242		
	Total		243	4.11		
Engagement	Less than 1 yr	20	4.09	5	2.980	.01
	1-2 years	56	4.07	1	.235	.63
	2-4 years	81	3.81	1	2.549	.11
	4-6 years	66	3.64	4	3.088	.02
	6-8 years	17	3.12	238		

	8-10 years	4	4.31	243		
	Total	244	3.87			
OCB1	Less than 1 yr	20	4.04	5	1.100	
			.36			
	1-2 years	56	3.93	1	.287	.59
	2-4 years	81	3.85	1	.267	.61
	4-6 years	66	3.93	4	.1309	.27
	6-8 years	17	4.17	238		
	8-10 years	4	4.05	243		
	Total	244	3.93			
OCB 2	Less than 1 yr	20	4.15	5	2.070	.07
	1-2 years	56	4.25	1	.109	.74
	2-4 years	81	4.05	1	2.226	.14
	4-6 years	66	3.88	4	2.031	.09
	6-8 years	17	4.20	238		
	8-10 years	4	4.34	243		
	Total	244	4.07			

Source: Primary data

ANOVA findings revealed no significant difference between respondents of different years of service groups. Therefore respondents across the different years of service shared the same views over the study variable. However, employees who served less than 1 year, and 4-6 years had significantly different perceptions on engagement ($F_{2.980}, P=.01$), and ($F_{3.088}, P=.02$) respectively.