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ABSTRACT.

Wendel (1994, p. 91) defined perceived organizational support (POS) as “organization support in terms of all things that relate to assistance and relationships amongst working peers and colleagues, which involve the feeling of need between superiors and subordinates . Rothbard (2001, p. 656) in defining job engagement (JE) listed two components which he thought were critical for its effectiveness on organizational functioning: (i) attention and (ii) absorption, with the former referring to “cognitive ability and the amount of time one spends thinking about the role”, while the latter “means being engrossed in a role and means the intensity of one’s focus on a role”. Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) was first introduced by Organ in the 1980s and he defined the concept of organizational citizenship behavior “as discretionary behaviors by individuals (employees) that do not form part of formal requirements of a job, but are necessary and promote effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988)”.

The objective of study was to explore the relationship between perceived organizational support and job engagement and their effect organizational citizenship behavior. Other relationships that were tested were first, the direct relationship between POS JE. Secondly, the combined effect of POS and JE on OCB. The study was conducted amongst nurses at Victoria hospital, in Alice within the Nkonkobe district municipality. The results showed a significant relationship between JE and OCB, whilst the relationship between POS and OCB was not accepted. The results for the other two hypotheses that were tested; (i) relationship between POS and JE, (ii) combined effect of POS and JE on OCB also showed that they were not accepted. The consistency scores for these variables were of international level (n=106). The Pearson correlation coefficients were used for hypothesis testing.
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1. CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

The modern day employee is very different from the employee from the early 20th century. In today’s work environment, there are many factors that encourage employees to give their best and do more than what is required of them. This has become a major stumbling block for organisation and behavioural practitioners who are concerned with employee motivation, its application and how it affects organisational effectiveness and the achievement of its overall objectives (Organ 1990, P. 57).

The willingness of employees to go beyond the formal specifications of job roles is known as extra role behaviours (Tepper, Lockhart and Hofer, 2001). Greenberg and Barrow (2008, p. 433) define these forms of behaviour as informal, with people who engage in them going beyond what is formally expected of them to contribute to the well-being of their organisational and this is known as organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB). Organ (1988, p. 4) defines OCB as “individual behaviours that are discretionary not directly linked or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in aggregate promote the effective functioning of the organisation”.

Fodchuk (2007) stated that, for OCB, as a variable, to have impact on employee organisational commitment, other contextual factors must be present within the organisational environment. He mentioned organisational culture - job characteristics, job enlargement, levels of job satisfaction amongst employees, perceived organisational support to name a few contextual factors.

For the purpose of this discussion and study, two of these environmental factors will be looked at, at a much more in-depth level and these are job engagement (JE) and perceived organisational support (POS). These two constitute variables that will be studied together with OCB to try and establish a relationship between the three variables. Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison and Sower (1986, p. 213) state that organisational support theory may help explain employee’s emotional commitment to their organisation. The approach emphasises that in order to meet socio-emotional needs and to assess the organisation’s readiness to reward increased efforts, employees form general opinions concerning how much the organisation values their contributions and cares about their well-being and that is what POS is about. POS may be encouraged by employees’ tendency to ascribe humanlike
characteristics to the organisation (Eisenberger et al. 1986). Andrews and Kacmar (2001) are of the opinion that perception or judgements of how much support an employee feels or thinks is being given by the organisation depends on what the organisation put in front of the employee in terms of rewards for the effort they put into their daily functions in trying to achieve the goals of the organisation, therefore POS focuses on the organisation’s commitment to the employee. If an employee feels as if they are being part of the organisation and that they matter, it will affect how they view the relationship between them and the organisation. The level of support by the organisation as perceived by the employee will have a direct relationship with how employees engage in both their job and other work related behaviours such as OCB.

The last part of that discussion brings us to other variable that may affect OCB, namely job engagement (JE). Khan (1990, p. 40) describes engaged employees as being “fully physically, cognately and emotionally connected to their work roles”. More recently, Mally (2009, P. 7) defined employee engagement “as an individual’s sense of purpose and focussed energy, evident to others in the display of personal initiative, adaptability, effort and persistence directed toward organisational goals”.

Schauteli et al. (2002, p. 74) define JE as “a positive, fulfilling, work related state of mind that is characterized by vigour, dedication and absorption”. Therefore for people to be engaging in what they do, they need to love what they are doing not because of the money they get every month end, but only for the love of it. This will lead to job satisfaction by the job-holder and this becomes more relevant within the south African health care system within the care giving context which is characterized by shortage of qualified professionals, unsatisfactory working conditions, low wages (Wildschut & Mqolozana, 2008, p. 43). POS and JE both fall under independent variables and will be studied in terms of what effect or impact they have on OCB (dependent variable). POS is defined as the employees’ emotional commitment to the organisation (Shore and Shore, 1995). Rothbard (2001, p. 656) defines JE in similar terms as when it comes to POS as they are interchangeable terms and both psychological presence but goes further to state that JE involves two critical components, attention and absorption. Attention refers to cognitive availability and amount of time an employee spends thinking about the role, while absorption means being engrossed in a role and refers to the intensity of one’s focus on a role (Rothbard, 2001).
1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

According to Thomas (2000), in a knowledge-based economy, it is generally accepted that skilled employees are key assets and that the loss of such employees would be unacceptable for most organisations. Attracting and retaining such skilled employees is a challenge usually as they have several other job options (Butter & Waldroop, 1999). However, having the requisite skills is not enough to help the organisation achieve its goals (Cho & MacLean, 2009). It is also essential to manage these skilled employees so that they can perform effectively, actively and successfully, and engage in their work and the organisation (D’abate & Eddy, 2007). Within the South African context, the health care system is characterised by a shortage of nurses due migration, unsatisfactory working conditions, and low paying jobs amongst other things, this is a clear indication for a lack of skilled employees (Wildschut & Mqolozana, 2008, P. 43). This is because many nurses have decided to go work abroad for a better wage. There is not enough put in place to develop more people to enter the health care sector.

The International Organisation for Migration (IOM) in partnership with Rural Health initiative and work placement project (RHI) reported that the total number of South African-born healthcare workers practising a medical profession in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States of America combined was 23,407. Considering that only 11,332 doctors and 41,617 nurses were working in the public sector in South Africa in 2001, this is a worrying statistic. Those who work in the profession are expected to work long hours, in very stressful conditions and are not paid very well. This is the current state that our health care system finds itself in, the hardest hit are public hospitals and clinics who serve millions upon millions of the poor. The world health organisation (WHO) (2006) reported that as many as 5000 nurses every year, between 1995 -2005 migrate to North America, Great Britain, or East Asia in search of greener pastures and better working conditions. These numbers constitute 7% of the nursing population in this country.

Rhodes and Eisenberger (2002) stated that employees have been found to develop general beliefs concerning the degree to which the organisation values their contributions and cares about their well-being and that is what POS about. According to the organisational support theory, employees develop POS to meet socio-emotional needs and to determine the organisation’s readiness to reward increased efforts made on its behalf (Eisenberger et al., 1986). The importance of OCB can be realised by the argument based on that of Koys (2001)
who suggested that OCB had an impact on profitability but not on customer satisfaction. Indeed, as organisational citizenship behaviour appears to consist of discretionary behaviours, how the employee perceives the organisation would likely predispose them to either perform or withhold such performance (Grosjean, 2006). Therefore, when it comes to the nursing profession, more especially within the South African context which is characterised by poor working condition, long working hours, being paid low income, POS and its application to and interpretation by members becomes very important. The same principle applies to job engagement, for nurses to continue doing their jobs to the best of their capabilities; they experience job engagement and perform these tasks just for the love of their jobs. If the organisation is able to achieve the right balance for these two variables, it then becomes easier for employees to engage in activities that constitute the third variable which is organisational citizenship behaviour.

From the above discussion, it could be argued that these variables are related and dependent on one another. Therefore, the proposed study will try demonstrate the behaviour of employees who feel that they are important to their organisation, their belief system is valued and they are engaged in their jobs in terms of behaviours they are involved in which will help the functioning of the organisation, yet they don’t get rewarded for those efforts.

Employees who are not interested and engaged may experience low levels of engagement as compared to those who are more involved in their jobs and will affect their motivation to perform more when they are required at times. When looking at rewards and tools to improve performance, an employee feels that the company does put much emphasis on those; hence they do not see the need to do more than what is required. The study will explore the relationship between perceived organisational support and job engagement and the impact they have on organisational citizenship behaviour.

Therefore, the key for any organisation experiencing similar challenges about how to get the right balance between these three variables namely: perceived organisational support (POS), job engagement (JE) and organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) must look strategies on how to get these relationships functioning in correct manner that would be beneficial to both the employer and the employee.
1.3 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Ulrich (2007) states that the success of organisations comes from three essential employee qualities: competence, commitment or engagement and contribution. The employees who possess these qualities and feel good about their organisation, how it values them will in turn experience high levels of POS. Malatesta and Tetric (1996) define POS as the perception that an organisation is supportive and committed to its workers.

Job engagement is described as the opposite or positive antithesis of burnout by (Maslach et al., 2001). Also, organisational citizenship behaviour was defined as “including all behaviours that exceed routine expectations” (Daniels, 2006.). Therefore, the proposed research will attempt to make a modest contribution in this area of work-related behaviour. The rationale for conducting this study is that the South African health-care system is characterised by shortages of skilled professionals, from doctors, nurses and general workers. This results in people working in this kind of occupation having to put in long hours, and working under conditions which are stressful and constantly demanding. The level of pay is not that rewarding owing to the prevailing economic factors. People who work in this industry do not work based on financial gains; rather for the love of what they do (it should be a calling) as mentioned by Wildschut and Mqolozana (2008, p. 47).

The results that would be achieved may demonstrate the link and the interdependency between these variables that is perceived organisational support, job engagement and organisational citizenship behaviour. The researcher hopes that the results will share some light in terms of what organisation need to do (a) to keep their employees feeling that they are of great value to their organisation, (b) have jobs that are structured in manner that maximize job satisfaction, (c) lastly, how the above mentioned issues might impact on employees engaging in behaviours that are outside their job descriptions and daily functions.

1.4 THE OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The overall objective of the study is to establish the relationship between perceived organisational support and job engagement and how they impact on organisational citizenship behaviour and also the study aims to:

- To establish ways in which perceived organisational support affects organisational citizenship behaviour.
To establish ways that can achieve maximum job engagement hence achieve job satisfaction, which can influence organisational citizenship behaviour.

To establish the link between perceived organisational support and job engagement.

To make recommendations about possible plan of action in terms of how best the results can be used to solve the problem within the health profession.

1.5 HYPOTHESES

H1: there is a positive relationship between perceived organisational support and organisational citizenship behaviour.

H0: there is no relationship between perceived organisational support and organisational citizenship behaviour.

H2: there is a relationship between job engagement and organisational citizenship behaviour.

H0: there is no relationship between job engagement and organisational citizenship behaviour.

H3: there is a relationship between perceived organisational support and job engagement.

H0: there is no relationship between perceived organisational support and job engagement.

H4: There is a combined effect of perceived organisational support and job engagement on organisational citizenship behaviour.

H0: There is no combined effect of perceived organisational support and job engagement on organisational citizenship behaviour.

1.6 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1.6.1 ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORT THEORY (OST) by Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002)

Organisational support theory by Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) holds that the formation of perceived organisational support is encouraged by employees’ tendency to assign the organisation humanlike characteristics. Perceived organisational support would be valued by employees for meeting socio-economic needs, providing an indication of the organisations readiness to reward increased work effort, and indicating the organisations inclination to provide aid when needed to carry out ones job effectively (Eisenberger et al., 1986).
A meta-analysis study by Eisenberger and Rhodes (2002) suggested three major work antecedents of POS: organisational rewards and working conditions support received from supervisors, and procedural justice. Researchers have found favourable working conditions and rewards are related to POS, such as developmental skills allowing employees to expand their skills, (Wayne, Shore and Linden, 1997). Perceived supervisor support (PSS) is another antecedent of perceived organisational support. Kotlke and Karafinski (1988) define this “as employee beliefs that that their supervisors care about them and value their contribution; because supervisors act as agents/representatives of the organisation and are frequently charged with employee valuations and communication of organisation’s overall goals to employees”. Another major antecedent of perceived organisational support and organisational support theory is that of procedural justice. Greenberg (1990), states that procedural justice involves the fairness of formal organisational policies and procedures for allocating resources. There should be no favouritism when organisation’s resources are allocated.

1.6.2 PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT THEORY (Rousseau, 1989)

Psychological contract theory, unlike organisational support theory puts much more emphasis on employee’s favourable work experiences as antecedents of POS; psychological contract theory gives primary attention to the relationship between the favourableness of work experiences and favourableness of the treatments the organisation has obligated itself to provide. A psychological contract reflects the expectations that the employee and organisation have concerning the particular resources each owes the other. Rousseau (1989) defines psychological contract theory in terms of “employee’s perceptions of the mutual obligations existing between themselves and the organisation”.

The employee derives the terms of the contract in three main ways. First, individuals may receive persuasive communications from others. Second, employee’s observations about how their co-workers and supervisors behave and are treated by the organisation act as social cues that inform employees of their contractual obligations. Third, the organisation provides structural signals such as formal compensation system and benefits, performance reviews and organisational literature, including handbooks and mission statements that all play a role in creation of employee psychological contract Rousseau (1995). The nature of employee’s psychological contract would be influenced by the organisation’s inclination to create short term, long term relationship (Shore and Tetrick, 1994). Morrison and Robinson (1997) noted that contract breaches might occur due either to deliberate violation by the employee or the
organisation or to a misunderstanding between the employee and organisational representatives concerning the nature of the other mutual obligation (incongruence).

1.6.3 SOCIAL EXCHANGE THEORY (SET) by (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005)
Social exchange theory argues that obligations are generated through a series of interactions between parties who are in a state of reciprocal interdependence. The basis of social exchange theory is that relationship evolves over time into trusting, loyal and mutual commitment as long as the parties abide by the set ‘rules’ of exchange (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). This is consistent with Robinson et al.’s (2004) description of engagement as a two-way relationship between the employer and employee. One of the ways in which an individual can repay their organisation is through their level of engagement, thus employees are more likely to engage and exchange their engagement for resources and benefits provided by the organisation. In summary, social exchange theory provides a theoretical foundation to explain why employees choose to become more and more engaged in their work and with organisations they work for. The conditions of engagement model by Khan (1990) are used to demonstrate this inter-dependency and relationship between the two parties involved and can be considered economic and socio emotional exchange resources model within SET.

1.6.4 A CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF OCB (by Bukari et al., 2007)

![Organisational citizenship behaviour model](image)

**Figure 1.6.4.1 Organisational citizenship behaviour model**
A theoretical framework is a conceptual model of how one theorizes or makes logical sense of the relationships among several factors that have been identified (OCB: altruism, conscientiousness and civil virtue). In other words the theoretical framework is the graphical summary of the whole literature review. Sometimes, it is said that theoretical frameworks
demonstrate the relationship among the variables that are deemed to be integral to the dynamics of the situation being investigated (Bukhari, Ali, Bashir and Shanzad, 2007). Organ (1990), maintained that justice perceptions play a key role in promoting OCB. Predicated upon the social exchange perspective, it was also proposed that whereby employees perform OCB to reciprocate the fair treatment offered by their organisations. A thorough and exhaustive review on literature relating to attitudinal and situational antecedents of OCB, justice or fairness perception were defined as relatively robust correlates of OCB amongst other predictors, (Organ et al., 2006; Organ and Ryan, 1995).

1.7 LITERATURE REVIEW

1.7.1 PERCEIVED ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORT (POS)

POS refers “to the extent to which the organisation values employee’s contribution and cares about their wellbeing (Eisenberger et al, 1986, p. 74). Rhodes and Eisenberger (2002) inferred that POS reflects an employee’s belief about how much organisations support employees work and welfare. POS can be viewed as all things that relate to assistance and relationships amongst workers, which involve the feeling of helping each other and feeling of need, between superiors and subordinates, (Brubaker and Wendel, 1994, p. 91), Strauss and Sayles (1990, p. 26) mention three critical aspects that should be part of perceived organisational support(POS) namely: (a) building a feeling of approval, the overall quality of supervisors behaviour towards the employees, especially trust, can be more important than an action or any combination of actions,(b) developing personal relationships to get to know the subordinates and also to help solve their problems inside and outside work, (c) Providing a fair treatment by letting every employee knows what is expected of them and by putting discipline in place.

There are three key roles given by Mintzberg (1973) in Soto (1999, p. 237) for illustrating the management’s role towards their employees which are as follows; interpersonal role (involving, directing, connecting and being a figure), information role (monitoring, disseminating and being a speaker) and decisional role (resource allocating, negotiating, chaos handling and being an entrepreneur). Perceived organisational support(POS) has been found to be related to, yet distinct from, effective organisational commitment (Eisenberger and Armeli, 2001), effort-reward experiences (Eisenberger et al., 1990), continuance commitment (Shore and Tetrick, 1991), leader-member exchange (Setton et al., 1996), supervisor support (Kottke and Sharafinski, 1998), perceived organisational politics
(Andrews and Kacmar, 2001) and job satisfaction (Acquino and Griffeth, 1999). On the basis of organisational support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986), three general forms of perceived favourable treatment received from the organisation (i.e. fairness, supervisor support, organisational rewards and job conditions) should increase perceived organisational support. Fairness, procedural justice concerns the fairness of the ways used to determine resources among employees (Greenberg, 1990). Shore and Shore (1995) suggested that repeated instances of fairness in decisions concerning resource distribution should have a strong cumulative effect on perceived organisational support by indicating a concern for employee’s welfare.

There is a distinction between structural and social aspects of procedural justice, these involve formal rules and policies concerning decisions that affect employees, including adequate notice before decisions are implemented, receipt of accurate information and voice (employee input in the decision process) for structural determinants (Greenberg and Cropanzano, 1997). Social aspects of procedural justice, sometimes called interactional justice, involve the quality of interpersonal treatment in resource allocation. Social aspect includes treating with dignity and respect and providing employees with information concerning how outcomes are determined (Cropanzano et al., 1997).

In terms of supervisor support (perceived): not only are employees concerned with overall organisation and how it views, values and treats them, but Kottke and Sharafinski (1998) state that employees also develop general views concerning the degree to which supervisors value their contributions and care about their wellbeing (perceived supervisor support). Employees understand that supervisor’s evaluations of subordinates are often conveyed to the upper management, further contributing to employees association of supervisor support with POS, as stated by Levinson (1965).

When looking at organisational rewards and job conditions, Shore and Shore (1995) suggested that human resources practices should show recognition of employee contributions and should be positively related to POS. Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) state that the following can result from employee’s perceptions of how the organisation treats and value them: organisational commitment, job related affect, job involvement, performance, strains, desire to remain, and withdrawal behaviour. POS increases affective commitment to the personified organisation (Foa and Foa, 1980). Shore and Tetrick (1991) suggested that POS
might reduce feelings of entrapment (continuance commitment) that occur when people (employees) are forced to remain with an organisation because of high costs of living. Withdrawal behaviour refers to employees lessening of active participation in the organisation (Guzzo, Noonan & Elron, 1994). Job involvement refers to identification with an interest in the specific work one performs (Cropanzano et al., 1997). POS is expected to reduce excessive psychological reactions (strains) to stressors by indicating the availability of material aid and emotional support when needed to high demands at work (Robble, 1998).

1.7.2 JOB ENGAGEMENT

Employee engagement has become a widely used term; however there has been little academic and empirical research on it as noted by Robinson et al., (2004). Khan (1990, p. 64) Defines personal engagement as the “harnessing of organisation members to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally during role performances”. On the other side, disengagement refers to the uncoupling of selves from work roles. Again Khan (1990, 1992) further states that engagement “means to be psychologically present when occupying and performing an organisational role”. From a viewpoint of Burnout, Burnout researchers define engagement as the opposite or positive anti thesis of burnout (Masih et al., 2010).

Engagement is further characterised by energy, involvement, and efficacy, the direct opposite of the three burnouts dimensions namely exhaustion; cynicism and ineffectivity. Schaufeli et al. (2002, p. 74) looks at engagement as “a positive, fulfilling work related state of mind that is characterised by vigour, dedication and absorption, it is further stated that engagement is not a monetary and a specific state, but rather, a ‘more persistent and pervasive affective cognitive state that is not focussed on any particular object, event, individual or behaviour’”. Saks (2006, p. 613) determined that engagement levels are predicted by perceived support granted to employees by the organisation and that measures of engagement themselves predict levels of job satisfaction, commitment measures, intentions to quit and positive behaviours within the organisation. Harter et al., (2002) state that, while casual influence of engagement on overall firm performance inferred cannot be determined conclusively from an empirical standpoint. This problem is not unique to employee engagement only, but rather endemic to the study of organisations as a whole (Sutton & March, 1997). On the hand, Schaufeli and Salanova (2007) state that “engaged employees are happy to help their colleagues because of their extraversion enthusiasm and success are highly engaged”.
McCashland (1999, p. 168) went on to say that engagement is an “emotional outcome to the employee resulting from critical components of the work place”. JE can also be explained as an intensity involving all employees in high engagement cascades that create understanding, dialogue, feedback and accountability, empower people to creatively align their subunits, teams and individual jobs with major undertakings of the whole enterprise (Miles, 2001).

Khan (1990) states that, as much there is little academic and empirical literature exploring this variable, but it is possible to identify a number of potential antecedents in the engagement model, the following are mostly found; job characteristics; rewards and recognition; perceived organisational and supervisor support; distributive and procedural justice. Khan (1992) stresses the point that psychological meaningfulness involves a sense of return on investments by workers in their jobs through selfless role performances and this constitutes job characteristics. These job characteristics includes provision of challenging work; task variety; allowing for multi-tasking; authority provided for, and an opportunity to make important contributions (Hackman and Oldham, 1980). Khan (1990) reported that people vary in their engagement as a function of their perceptions of the benefits they receive from a role which defines rewards and recognition. The workload and control also suggests that the importance of job characteristics for engagement, in fact, jobs characteristics such as feedback and autonomy have been constantly related to burnout (Maslach et al., 2001). From social exchange theory perspective, it can be concluded that employees who are provided with challenging job will feel obliged to engage in their jobs.

1.7.2.1 CONSEQUENCES OF JOB ENGAGEMENT
The driving force behind the popularity of JE is the positive results that are associated with it. There is a general belief that there is a connection with engagement and organisational results (Harter et al., 2002). May et al (2004) included outcomes in their studies in terms of engagement and proposed that engagement leads to both individual outcomes (quality of people’s work and their own experiences of doing that work), as well as organisational level outcomes (the growth and productivity of organisations).

1.7.3 ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR
Bukhari, Ali, Bashir and Shahzad (2007, p. 1) state that research on OCB is still in its infancy and most of it was conducted around the 1990’s. The reason for conducting research in this area is because of the positive relationship with unit performance. By measuring OCB; the
unit’s performance can be improved. Robinson (2006) argues that OCB is discretionary behaviour that is not part of employee formal job requirements, but that nevertheless promotes the effective functioning of the organisation. Shapiro et al. (2004, p. 77) defined OCB as the “social lubricant of the organisational machinery”. OCB can also be defined as “defending the organisation when it is criticized or urging peers to invest in it” (Turnipseed & Rassuli, 2005).

Daniels et al (2006, p. 79) view OCB “as ‘behaviours that exceed routine expectations’”. Cirka et al. (1999, p. 54) argues that OCB is “an outcome consistent with social exchange relationship”. Begum (2005) lists the following as examples of situations where OCB is shown; willingness to take steps to prevent problems with other employees and obeying organisational rules, regulations and procedures even when no one is watching. Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman and Felter (1990), and also Praine, Mackenzie and Podsakoff (1999) define the following five major categories of OCB:

- **Altruism**: discretionary behaviours on the part of employees that have the effect of helping another person with an organisationally relevant problem (supportive actions).
- **Conscientiousness**: discretionary behaviours on the part of employees that go well beyond the minimum role requirements of the organisation in the areas of attendance, obeying rules and regulations, taking breaks and so forth.
- **Sportsmanship**: willingness of the employees to tolerate less than ideal circumstances without complaining to avoid complaining, petty grievances, rallying against real or imaginary (imagined) slights or put differently, the never die attitude (Organ, 1988).
- **Courtesy**: discretionary behaviour on the parts of an individual aimed at preventing work-related problems with others from occurring.
- **Civic virtue**: behaviour on the part of an individual that indicates that s/he responsibly participates in or is concerned about the life of the company (Podsakoff et al., 1990). Greenberg and Baron (2008, p. 433) came up with two different forms of OCB: OCB that is directed to the individual (OCBI) and OCB directed to the organisation (OCBO). OCBI includes: favours, assisting co-workers, sharing with others. OCBO includes: loyalty, offering ideas, speaking favourable about the organisation to the outside.
1.8 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
Methodology can be defined as the path to finding answers to research questions (Ranjit, 2005, p. 115). Research methods refer to the ways in which information can be gathered from different sources (Welman, Kruger & Mitchell, 2005, p. 2). In this section the proposed research method will be discussed in terms of what design method, population and sampling methods, research instruments and all other question relating to research method.

1.8.1 DESIGN
Research design refers to the steps that researchers follow to complete their study from the beginning to the end (until the objectives of the study or overall goals are accomplished). It includes asking research questions based on the theoretical orientation, selection of respondents, data collection and reporting of results (Marvasti, 2004). This research design relies on quantitative methods, that is research involving, collecting data from subjects in the form of numbers and using statistical analysis techniques to perform data analysis (Terreblanche, Durheim & Painter, 2006).

1.8.2 POPULATION
According to McClendon (2004), the population within the study refers to the entire units of target participants. It is the aggregate of all units that have a chance of being selected to the study sample. For the purpose of this study, the population will include all nurses working in health-care organisations (different hospitals and clinics) in and around the area of Nkonkobe municipality.

1.8.3 SAMPLING AND SAMPLING METHOD
A sample can be described as “a small group of subjects that represent the larger population” (Brynard & Hanekom, 1997, p. 43). Gray (2004) defines sampling as a set of objects, occurrence or individuals selected from a parent population for a research study. Hanekom et al. (2005, p. 56) states that there are two types of sampling, that is probability sampling and non-probability sampling. Within probability sampling, each unit of population has an equal chance of being selected to the sample. Stapford (2007) states that the following reasons as to why is good for a research: It is impossible economically, to cover every unit object and it is also time consuming. It is much easier to conduct research on smaller scale (studying a portion of the population, rather than the entire population), when dealing with smaller numbers, it saves costs and time. Another key element is representivity (Hanekom et al., 2005). For the purpose of this study random sampling will be used. Welman et al. (2005, p.
23) state that random sampling can be defined as method of sampling that allows equal chance to every subject within the population to be selected into the sample.

1.8.4 RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS
The three variables: perceived organisational support, job engagement and organisational citizenship behaviour will be measured using the following measuring instruments described in the sections that follow:

1.8.4.1 PERCEIVED ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORT
To measure the extent to which employees perceive themselves as being valued and important to the organisation will be measured using a short-form Survey for Perceived Organisational Support (SPOS) by Eisenberger et al. (1986). This instrument consists of a 17-item questionnaire, with statements which consist of organisational evaluation of employees and what actions to adopt for employees to feel valued. Respondents’ answers will be measured on a 7-point Likert scale (where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree). Items include valuing of contributions, consideration of goals and values of an individual. The instrument has been used with success in previous studies. The reliability co-efficient for organisational citizenship behaviour, in studies that were conducted previous research projects was at 0.97.

1.8.4.2 JOB ENGAGEMENT
Khan (1990) conceptualised three ways in which a person can be involved in his or her job; they are physical (job intensive), cognitively (psychological factors) and emotionally (feeling positive, pleasantness). To measure job engagement, Schaufeli and Baker (2003) came up with Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES). The instrument consists of an initially 18-item JE Scale (JES). The items for each dimension were averaged and formed reliable measuring scales (with internal consistency and reliability ranging between 0.89 and 0.94). Participants’ responses will be rated on a five-point Likert scale that ranges from “strongly disagree” = 1 and “strongly agree” = 5.

1.8.4.3 ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR
Organisational citizenship behaviour is about those informal activities (work-related) that employees get involved in and are not rewarded for (Khan, 1990). To measure organisational citizenship behaviour, Koys’ (2001) 5-item Likert measuring scale will be used. The instrument consists of all the five major dimensions of organisational citizenship behaviour
(courtesy, sportsmanship, civic virtue, conscientiousness and altruism). The five items in the scale represent the five dimensions, with altruism being defined as managing to help other workers when they need help. Conscientiousness is working to exceed the role requirements; sportsmanship is viewed as a can-do attitude. Both courtesy and civic duty was defined as “working with a sense of responsibility for the success of the organisation and treat co-workers with respect, respectively”. The alpha reliability coefficient for measuring organisational citizenship behaviour is 0.73.

1.9 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES
Data for this research will be collected through questionnaires. The questionnaires will be handed to individual employees in person and collected the same way. The use of questionnaires has the advantage of precision and comparability of responses, and allows for more detailed analysis.

1.10 DATA ANALYSIS
The data will be analysed using statistical techniques. Statistical package for the Social Science will be used to analyse the data (SPSS). The multiple regression analysis technique will be used to analyse the data and establish results among the variables. There are other statistical tools that will be used to the relationship between variables, for example the statistical medians, modes, means, standard deviations and variances. All these techniques represent measures of central tendency.

1.11 LIMITATIONS
The most obvious limitations of any study are the issue of financial resources, time constraints and the scope of the study. As with all studies, financial backing is always very important in terms of to what extent the sponsors of the study are willing to invest, the issue of time. When a researcher conducts a study, it is then expected that the study should be conducted and finished within reasonable amount of time. Sometimes this might be difficult to achieve because of the complex nature of the study, hence more time would be needed. Also with research, there are guidelines and procedures that researchers need to follow and these may sometimes limit them in terms of what they want to cover when conducting research. As for this study, it would have been ideal to include more subjects within both the population and the sample in that more hospitals within the province could have been covered. Also, it would have been much better to have looked at trends regionally,
provincially and also nationally. But because of reasons mentioned above, it is not possible to conduct research at that level.

1.12 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY
In terms of this study, the delimitation would be that looking at the three variables, there other aspects that can affect them that might have been also investigated which might have a direct or indirect impact on the results of the study. Therefore, if these other variables would also been looked more accurate predictions and results in terms of the study could have been achieved. That part of the study and direction it’s going to take will limit the scope of the research, it will affect the end results that the researcher had undertaken to achieve.

1.13 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS
In the spirit of humanity, research and the pursuit of knowledge should never take precedence over participants' personal, social and cultural values (www.hrsc.. Research should also avoid posing a threat to people's physical, mental and emotional health. Therefore, in the research situation of the study, the researcher will take due considerations with regard to ethics. This will involve following a number of ethical practices that include:

- non-deception of research participants (Gregory, 2003, p. 42);
- Debriefing of participants regarding the study (i.e. its purpose, duration, sites, etc.);
- Contribution of the research to the general good of society (http://www.ahc.umn.edu/img/assets/26104/Research_Ethics.pdf) (accessed 18/03/2011 at 11:03; published by the Centre for Bioethics at the University of Minnesota).
- (beneficence);
- Obtaining participants’ consent that is fully informed (by debriefing and the covering letter) and voluntary (by their verbal agreement) (Gregory, 2003, p. 41);
- Due acknowledgement of information sources, thus avoiding plagiarism, respecting intellectual property rights and maintaining integrity in research (Macfarlane, 2008, p. 59);
- Acknowledgement of participants to the best of the researcher's ability;
Preservation of results’ accuracy (http://www.abc.umn.edu/img/assets/26104/Research_Ethics.pdf) (accessed 18/03/2011 at 11:03; published by the Centre for Bioethics at the University of Minnesota).

- Recognition of research sites from where the study was conducted;
- Individual rights to privacy will be observed, through confidentiality of research results (Gregory, 2003, p. 41);
- Avoidance of harm to participants’ physical, mental and emotional health; and
- Transparency of research methods to allow for reliability.

1.14 CONCLUSION

As it has been already mentioned in the background of the study, the South African health care system is faced with multiple challenges currently, ranging from nurses choosing to leave and go work in other countries for better pay, hence losing a lot of skilled employees. Skills and resources shortages lead to work conditions that are demanding for those decide to remain behind. The rationale for conducting this study was to try to find ways that would encourage employees in this sector to engage in their jobs feel sense of being valued and be prepared to do more than what is required of them.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2. PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT, JOB ENGAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

2.1 PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT

2.1.1 INTRODUCTION

Dessler (1997, p. 2) stated that the success of a service organization in achieving its goals cannot be separated from it providing high quality services to its customers. For that aim to be achieved, service organizations are required to continuously upgrade and updated its service capacities to fit its customer demands. To provide high quality services, organization’s needs professional and qualified human resources. The organization can acquire and maintain human resources that have motivation and commitment of employees to them, the same way employees are also concerned with the commitment of the organization to them. Employees need to be highly valued and this could be done through improved medical benefits, increased salary, and other social benefits like admiration and caring shown by the organization (Shumalia, Aslam, Sadagat, Magood & Nazir, 2006, p. 2).

Perceived organizational support (POS), job engagement (JE) are amongst many factors that influence employee performance. Perceived organizational support is directly linked with three categories of favorable treatment such as, (a) organizational rewards, (b) favorable job conditions and (c) fairness and supervisor support. In return favorable outcomes are achieved, that is job satisfaction and job engagement, reduced absenteeism and increased involvement and commitment on the part of the employee (Shumalia et al., 2006, p. 33). Looking at organizational support (perceived) and job engagement and their respective meanings, they are applicable and relevant to the nursing profession, more especially within the South African context. Within the South African nursing sector at the macro level, political and economic changes in South African history have impacted on the demand for health services, large sections of the population who never had access to health care before, are now entitled to free health services and this has put pressure on the system, to such an extent that it is at the breaking point. This new demand for health care services had to be addressed by shrinking numbers in the nursing population, who work in unsatisfactory conditions, in public sector facilities and jobs with relatively low pay (Wildschut & Mqolozana, 2008, p. 32). The following are some of the factors that affect supply and demand of nurses, and are as follows:
working conditions, the broader professional environment, remuneration and migration. The above mentioned factors together with how employees view their relationship with their employers can impact on how they engage in their jobs and also in activities that are not formally defined as part of their daily jobs yet can help the organization function better, known as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) argues (Shokron & Naami, 2009).

The overall purpose of the study is to look at the attitudes of the employees about the organization (perceived organizational support) and the effect their participation in their job activities (job engagement) and activities that are not part of their work scope (formal job requirements) hence cannot be rewarded but can help the organization function more effectively (organizational citizenship behavior). The following discussion will be based on what constitutes perceived organizational support, how is it applicable to the nursing sector in South Africa. What perceived organizational support entails: the definition, its antecedents, and how organizations should apply it? The study will also look at positive results if there are any, the relevance of perceived organizational support to the nursing sector in South Africa.

2.1.2 PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL DEFINED SUPPORT

According to Eisenberger et al., (1986) as cited by Lamastro (2000) Perceived organizational support is “behaviors or leaders attitudes, which always give support and facilitate positive climate in organizations. Perceived organizational support also reflects employee’s beliefs on how the organizations support employees work and welfare”. Wendel (1994, p. 91) defined perceived organizational support as “organization support in terms of all things that relate to assistance and relationships amongst working peers and colleagues, which involve the feeling of need between superiors and subordinates. People get more than just money, or achievement from their jobs”. Perceived organizational support also fulfils the need for social interaction (Robbins, 1996, p. 150).

The South African health care system is characterized by shortage of qualified and professional nurses (Mail and Guardian, 16 August 2006; News 24, 24 May 2007), therefore it has then become more important than ever, that organizations get the right balance on perceived organizational support, job engagement and how it affects performances of employees when doing their jobs more especially with regards to organizational citizenship behavior and other work related activities. From the three definitions of perceived organizational support, one very common factor is that there is perceived attitude of employees about their employers, employees have been found to develop global beliefs or
perceptions concerning the extent to which the organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

2.1.3 KEY COMPONENTS OF PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT

Dolvo (1999, p. 67) and many other researchers in years that followed have identified that, within the South African nursing context, the following factors that might cause negative attitudes towards the employer and result in nurses migrating to other countries, they listed the following factors which they termed ‘push and pull factors’. Pull factors because it compels professional nurses to work in those countries, push factors because it exist in both source and recipient countries, what they described as stay factors in recipient countries and in source countries stick factors Pararath et al., (2003). (a) Income gradient, or difference in remuneration and living conditions between home and recipient countries for example, Vugiric et al. (2004) income differences, for nurses in South Africa and Ghana respectively range from two times in South Africa to twenty-two times in Ghana (Dolvo, 2004),(b) Job satisfaction Gradient, perception of good working environment and professional and technical proficiency that allows for international peer recognition is important for tertiary trained professionals (Dolvo, 2004),(c) Organization’s environment/career opportunity gradient, this factor expresses how fair and accessible are for career advancement and for professional specialization. It also relates to governance, politics and ethrucity as factors that is demotivating nursing professionals.

Another important aspect of perceived organizational support is the relatedness with organizational structure and how it is designed. This looks at how formal rules, policies and decisions and their implementation regarding its application to employees where the social aspects contain employees, are being treated with respect and decorum and providing them with information on how to determine final results (Croppanzano & Greenberg in Shumalia et al., 1996). Dolvo (2004, p. 10) states that the governance gradient within the nursing industry involved differences in the efficiency with which health services are managed, including the amount of administrative bureaucracy and other factors like nepotism and corruption.

The organizational support theory (OST) which perceived organizational support is based, stipulates that three forms of encouraging treatment must be present with the organizational environment for it to be effective and have positive effect on employees and the relationship they will have with their employers (Eisenberger et al., 1986). it also proposes that the following factors should be incorporated to the organizational environment for it to have positive effect on employee attitude and they are as follows; (a) organizational job conditions
and rewards,(b) supervisor support,(c) fairness. Malatesta (1995) and Rhoades et al. (2001) argued that the word supervisor carried weight in terms of management and the power that is associated with the term (supervisor) made employees very aware of the role that supervisors play (being the link between the top management and lower level employees). Employees are well aware of the supervisor’s assessment of their performance and the message supervisors convey to upper management about employees. This supervisor’s support, non-support would further add to employee attitude and associations of the supervisor support which will or will not increase positive organizational support by employees.

Within the South African nursing context, according to Wildschut & Mqolozan (2008, p. 41), the following factors are additional reasons why the health sector is experiencing shortages of professional qualified nurses and they are as follows; working conditions, the broader professional environment, remuneration, and migration.

In terms of working conditions and broader professional environment (The Citizen newspaper, 23 July, 2006) stated that “South African nurses are unhappy and this applies to both public and private sectors”. Within the public sector, professionals are not properly remunerated and there is no strategy in place to maintain both facilities and industry expects. Nurses have to function in an environment characterized by shortages of other health and necessary equipment (The Citizen, 23 July, 2006). Dibetle (2006) states that in certain hospitals the casualties and dispensary areas are overflowing with scores of patients and there are only two nurses and a doctor on duty to attend to all of those patient’s needs. Sometimes the unbearable pressures within working conditions have led to nurses being accused of abusing patient and this behavior was condemned by the then minister of health Manto Tshabalala Msimang (Hlatshwayo, 2007, in Wildschut & Mqolozana, 2008)

2.1.4 CRITICAL FACTORS THAT SHOULD BE WITHIN PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT

Straus and Sayles (1990, p. 126) also emphasize the three critical factors that need to be within perceived organizational support for it to have a positive effect on employees, they refer to them as (a) feeling of approval, meaning overall quality of supervisor behaviors towards the employees, especially trust that can be more important that an action or any combination of actions, (b) developing personal relationship to get the subordinates and solve their problems, (c) providing fair treatment by letting every employee know what is expected of them and by putting discipline in place.
Kottke and Sharafinski (1998) introduced another facet of perceived organizational support. They termed it perceived supervisor support (PSS) and this refers to the general views, perceptions of employees in terms of how their perceived managers support them in terms of their contributions to the organizations and how much s/he cares about their well-being (Kottke et al in Eisenberg & Rhoades, 2002, p. 565). They were of the opinion that, because supervisors act as agents between employees and employers, they are also responsible for evaluating their performances, their view towards them or against them were indicative of organizational support (Eisenberger, 1986).

Based on organizational support theory (OST) by Eisenberger (1986), a positive relation between perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support exist and has been interpreted in the sense that perceived organizational support leads to perceived supervisor support (Rhoades et al, 2001). Yoon & Thye (2000) also suggested that the causality might occur in reverse direction with perceived supervisor support leading to perceived organizational support. Another theory that explains perceived organizational support and its existence is social exchange theory (SET), Masterson in Eisenberger & Rhoades (2006, p. 690), stated that employee’s reciprocation of favorable treatment would be the basis for which subordinates’ positive treatment and customer’s perceptions of favorable treatment. They argued that in a case of service employees, their receipt of favorable treatment would have a trickle-down effect on the effect on the treatment of customers they serve (Tepper & Taylor, 2003).

According to organizational support theory (OST), employees develop perceived organizational support to meet socio-economic needs and determine the organization’s readiness to reward increased efforts made on its behalf (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Sofo in Ekowati & Andini (2008, p. 96) mentioned three key roles that illustrate management’s role towards their employees and they are as follows; interpersonal (involving directing, connecting and being a leading figure), informational system (monitoring, disseminating and being a speaker), also decisional role (resources allocation, negotiating, chaos handling and being an entrepreneur). Therefore support from superiors, if given in correct way, it can change employee perceptions about the organization (Ekowati & Andini, 2008, p. 98).

Brief and Motowildo in Eisenberger et al (1990, p. 51) argued that when employees feel valued and cared for, this encourages incorporation of organizational membership and role status in employee self-identity and this leads to increase of work related behaviors which help the organization. Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002, p. 699) assert that there are positive
consequences and antecedents involved in perceived organizational support when it is being handled in the correct way by the organization (meaning that given the right treatment, the employees should reciprocate with equally good behavior) and they are as follows; fairness, supervisor support and rewards and job conditions, Shore and Shore(2000) in Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002, p. 699) state that continuous instances of fairness in decisions concerning resources should have a strong cumulative effect on perceived organizational support by indicating a concern for employee welfare. Therefore fairness can be defined as procedural justice in terms of general perceptions formulated by employees in terms of organizational processes, as long as they perceive every means of getting to the final decision as fair and impartial that will lead to positive perceived organizational support effect on their behavior (Greenberg, 1990). Cropanzano et al (1997) introduced another concept related to procedural justice, Organizational politics and defined them as attempts to influence others in ways that promote self-interest, often at the expense of rewards for individual merit or betterment of the organization.

Another key factor is that of supervisor support (PSS), Kottke and Sharafinski (1988) are of the opinion that as much as general perceptions by employees about how much the organization values their contributions and cares about their general wellbeing were important for perceived organizational support, employees also develop views concerning the degree to which the supervisor value their contributions and cares about their wellbeing. They view and look at the managers as being the link between them (employees) and the employers (organization), another key factor about managers in the eyes of the employees is that, they are responsible for performance reviews, therefore putting them in a position where they make decisions that can determine the nature of their relationship with an attitude towards the organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002, p.700). Therefore there is a relationship between fairness and organizational justice; they can be grouped in a similar category of relatedness, yet have very different meanings (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001). Other key components of perceived organizational support are that of organizational rewards and work conditions.

Wildschut and Mqoloazana (2008, p. 43) suggest that amongst many factors contributing to qualified and skilled nurses migrating to other countries is unsatisfactory working conditions. Shore and Shore (2000) in Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002, p. 701) came on with the following rewards and job conditions that would have an influence on perceived organizational support; recognition, pay, promotions, job security, autonomy, role stressors
and training. Based on organizational support theory (OST) favorable opportunities for employees on rewards serve to communicate a positive valuation of employee’s contribution and thus contributes to perceived organizational support. As long as employees feel well-rewarded for the effort they put in, they feel obliged to give a similar contribution to the organization to help it achieve its objectives. This is based on the concept of reciprocity, which is taken from the organizational support theory (OST). Reciprocity refers “to the obligation both parties have towards each other as long as they still abide to rules of social exchange” (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). With job security, as long as the organization gives assurances in terms of future employment for all its employees, that contributes to positive perceived organizational support (Allen, Shore & Griffeth, in Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002, p.701). Guaranteed existence and continued employment by the employer motivates employees because it gives them certainty in terms of what the future holds regarding employment.

Autonomy refers to “employees that given discretion to make decisions concerning their work in terms of how to do the job, task variety, scheduling of work activities and work procedures contribute positively to perceived organizational support” (Rhoades et al., 1999). Job stressors refer “to the ‘environmental demand that make employees unable to cope with job requirements at times, for example, a big workload is a reason for stress. As long as the employers reduce stress factors within the job and environment, it will increase perceived organizational support (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002, p.701). Work overload can be defined as “demands that will increase what an employee can reasonable accomplish in a given time” (Rhoades et al., 2002).

Training; training is a very important key to perceived organizational support by the organization, Wayne (2001) in Rhoades & Eisenberger (2002, p.701). He defines training as discretionary practice communication, an investment in employee and this will lead to improved employee attitude about the organization. For employees, continuous improving of skills does not only make them get better at what they do, but help to increase production output. It also provides them with an opportunity on career progression with the hierarchical structure of the organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Dolvo (2004, p. 74) states that one area to look when improving nursing in South Africa is the retention of the existing members in areas of care giving. This can be achieved through correct application of perceived organizational support, achieving high levels of job engagement by employees and therefore resulting in employees who are willing to go an extra mile for their employer.
The last component of perceived organizational support is the size of the organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). In bigger organization, characterized by impersonality of employees owing the large numbers, employees feel less connected to the organization and sometimes struggle to identify with the organization’s image (Dekker & Bailing in Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). This can have a negative effect on perceived organizational support. Of these three major determinants of perceived organizational support, fairness and supervisor support have a major effect on perceived organizational support and job conditions would have a lesser impact (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). The next section will look at the consequences/results that are achieved (positive or negative) when perceived organizational support is or is not present within the organization.

2.1.5 CONSEQUENCES OF PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT

According to Rhoades and Eisenbeger (2002, p. 701), the following are the results of perceived organizational support for the organization; organizational commitment, job related effects, job involvement, performance, strains, desire to remain and withdrawal behavior. Based on reciprocity norm, perceived organizational support includes an obligation on the side of the employee to also care about the organization (Eisenberger et al., 2001). Perceived organizational support has been known to induce affective reactions in employees when it comes to their jobs when applied in correct way (Witt, in Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). Cropanzano et al., (2002, p. 199) stated that ‘perceived competence has been found to relate to task interest as result of perceived organizational support. When perceived organizational support is applied in a positive way, it reduces aversive psychological and psychosomatic reaction to stressor by indicating availability of material and emotional support (Robble, 1998). Perceived organizational support has been found to increase performance standard for job activities favorable to organization and go beyond assigned responsibilities (Gonge, 1997 in Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Perceived organizational support also has a positive effect on the relationship between employment and reasons why employees would opt to remain in their jobs. A negative result of perceived organizational support when it’s absent within the organization is withdrawal behavior defined as “employee lessoning their involvement in their job” (Aquino & Grieffeth, 1999).

Therefore, from the above discussion, it is clear that there is a relationship between perceived organization support (POS) and employee relationships with the organization. If the organization applies perceived organizational support in the correct manner, the end product
of that will be employees who will be mostly likely engage in their jobs. The end results being improved performance, less desire to quit, and less negative behavior.

Employees who perceive their employers in a good light, who are engaged in their jobs, tend to do more than what is expected of them (OCB). The previous discussion looked at definitions of perceived organization support, looked at key components of perceived organizational support, its antecedents and consequences of perceived organizational support, positive or negative. From perceived organizational support, the next section will look at how an organization can get employees engaged in their jobs and that how will affect their performance. Another key component of engaging employees is that they turn to perform more than what is expected of them in their jobs (formal job requirements) which can lead to organizational citizenship behavior which will be discussed at a later stage.

The following section of this discussion will look at the relationship job engagement and organizational citizenship behavior, to investigate the nature of that relationship and how it can affect behavior within the work environment. The context within which this the behavior will be looked will be based South African nursing sector.

2.2 EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

2.2.1 INTRODUCTION

People occupy roles at work, these are and have become well understand and therefore resulting in only “role sending and receiving” being focused on by researchers (Khatz, in Khan, 1990, p.692). Khan (1990, p. 692) states that the concern was the moments in which people bring themselves into or remove themselves from particular task behaviors, the reason being that people are constantly bringing in and leaving out various depths of themselves during the course of their work days. People can use varying degrees of themselves, physically, cognitively and emotionally, in their roles they perform, even as they maintain integrity of the boundaries between who they are and the roles they occupy.

In recent years there has been a great deal of interest in employee or job engagement, with many consulting firms conducting research in their own area claiming job engagement predicts employee outcomes, organizational success and financial performance (Bates, 2004). Employee engagement is a strategic approach for driving improvement and encouraging organizational change, argues Ram (2011, p. 41) and who goes on to say engaged employees require a year-round focus on changing behavior, processes and systems to anticipate and respond to any organization’s needs. “High levels of employee engagement occur when employees are committed to, enthusiastic and passionate about their work (Ram, 2011, p.42).
The following discussion will look at job engagement in terms of: first, the definition, what it entails, its antecedents, and other factors of it that are important in terms of the job outcomes. Secondly, the relationship between the job holder and how engaged he/she is, and how this impacts on the overall achieving of the organizational goals. Lastly, the consequences/results of job engagement will be also looked at.

2.2.2 ENGAGEMENT DEFINED

Khan (1990, p. 694) defines personal engagement as “the harnessing of organizational members’ selves to their working role and this can either be by physical engagement, emotional engagement and cognitive engagement.” He went on to add that “engagement means being psychologically present when occupying and performing an organizational role” (Khan, 1992). Rothbard (2001, p. 656) in defining job engagement listed two components which he thought were critical for its effectiveness on organizational functioning: (i) attention and (ii) absorption, with the former referring to “cognitive ability and the amount of time one spends thinking about the role”, while the latter “means being engrossed in a role and means the intensity of one’s focus on a role”. Schaufeli et al, 2002 in Isaks (200, p. 601) defines job engagement as a “positive fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption”.

From Khan’s (1990) definition at the beginning of the ‘90s to the present day definitions by other researchers, one thing that is common and that is always mentioned about job engagement is that for it to exist, there must be a positive relationship between the job-holder and the job that he/she does on a daily basis. Khan (1990) mentions that harnessing of employees into their work roles can be done in three ways: physical, cognitive and emotional engagement. On the other hand, Rothbard, (2001) talks of two critical components that a designer or analyst needs to take into account when designing or analyzing a job: attention and absorption. Schaufeli (2002) mentioned a positive state of mind related to work and went on to list the following as important for job engagement: (a) vigor, (b) dedication, and (c) absorption. All of these factors demonstrate a positive attitude of the job-holder’s side to his/her job. Therefore, within the South African health care system, characterized by shortages of qualified and professional staff, unsatisfactory working conditions and low paying jobs as mentioned by Wildschut and Mqolozana (2008, p.53), job engagement and getting it right by employers, becomes even that more important. Sakhiwo Belt, the new Premier of Health in the Free State also concurred that the health care sector, under the
Department of Health experienced employee shortages (nurses). He stated that “we are still battling with the issue of sufficient personnel in our institutions”. This heavy burden, which falls on the shoulders of those who must do this work, requires them at least to double their effort to try and ensure that the work is done (2004, Nursing Summit on 29 November). Hassina Subeder, former registrar of the South African Nursing Council (SANC), stated that “possible nursing shortages exist within the nursing sector, and that overall production of nurses in South Africa over the year has not kept in the same speed or pace with population over the same period” (News 24, 2004).

Khan (1990) also states that with personal engagement there is also equal chance of personal disengagement. He formed personal engagement and disengagement as self-in role behaviour and defined them as behaviours by which people bring in or leave their personal selves during work role performance. By this Khan meant that these were two opposing streams of job engagement, on one side there were employees who were very much engaged in their daily activities and yet on the other side, equally, there were workers who have displayed behaviour of withdrawal from their jobs. Khan (1990, p. 694) defined personal disengagement as uncoupling of selves from work in that people withdraw and defend themselves physically, cognitively or emotionally during role performances.

Many studies have in the past focused on how people’s experiences of themselves and their work contexts influence moments of both personal engagement and disengagement (Khan, 1990, p.702). The key to this premise is that people express or withdraw and defend their preferred selves on the basis of their psychological experiences of self-in role. Other scholars with the similar view are Hackman and Oldham (Hackman & Oldham, 1980), whose notion of critical psychological states emphasized that the state of mind the employee is in does influence internal motivation. Their focus was on psychological conditions, which they defined as “rather momentary than static circumstances that shape people’s behaviors generally and at through own experiences” Hackman and Oldham (1980) in Khan (1990, p.703). Bringing this into the context of the nursing profession within the South African context, it then becomes clear that employees (nurses), how they relate to their job, and how they perform within it, would also be influenced by their upbringing and background.

### 2.2.3 KEY COMPONENTS OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

Hackman and Oldham (1980) who devised the concept of psychological conditions, led employers, when trying to motivate their employees to focus a great deal on the psychological factors that affect employees. Psychological factors led and influenced people
to be personally engaged or disengaged from their work. This means being present or absent from the work environment. The three components of psychological conditions were as follows: meaningfulness of work, safety within the working environment and availability within your work when doing it. Put together, these conditions led to people inhabiting their work roles (Khan 1990). The key factors that needed to be addressed when trying to get people involved, engaged and satisfied with their jobs were as follows:

(i) The meaningfulness of the job for the employee.
(ii) Within the working environment (internal) of the organization, safety of the employee.
(iii) Thirdly and lastly, but not least, the availability of the employee for the performance of the role (Khan, 1990).

These are the basis for the employment relationship between the employer and the employee. Hoo (2006, p.345), in illustrating dangerous working conditions within the South African health care sector states that “nurses have to function in an environment characterized by shortages of other health personnel and necessary equipment.” He went on to say that another challenge facing nurses was exposure to infections and contamination due to inadequate facilities. Due to the sometimes unbearable pressures within the working environment, there have also been various reports by patients about nurses’ bad behavior, which was quickly condemned by authorities (Parker, 2006).

Psychological meaningfulness can be defined as a feeling that one is receiving a return on investments in oneself in the currency of physical, cognitive and emotional energy (Khan, 1990, p.703). The link between psychological meaningfulness and personal engagement can be explored using descriptive statistical techniques. Khan (1990) also mentioned three factors that influence psychological meaningfulness: task characteristics, role characteristics and work interaction. Hackman and Oldham in Khan (1990, p. 704) define task characteristics as a situation where employees have work that is clearly challenging, clearly delineated, varied, creative and somewhat autonomous.

Dolvo (2004, p. 10) when providing solutions about the problems of the immigrating skilled nurses “states that perception of a good working environment, professionalism and technical proficiency that allows for international peer recognition is important for tertiary trained professionals and organizations in trying to achieve engagement among employees, and employers should look at that”. For role characteristics, two components were identified for employees to experience psychological meaningfulness: first, roles carried identities that organizations’ members were implicitly required to assume and, secondly, roles also carried
influence or status (Khan, 1990, p.706). Therefore, within the nursing community, there are certain standards associated with the nursing profession that must always be upheld by nurses in their daily functioning. The following are examples of standards; hygiene, wearing of uniforms at all times, extra care given to patients, confidentiality and all other requirements that come with job and role of a nursing (Dolvo 2004, p. 13).

The task component for psychological conditions influences employees and how they do their job generally through work interactions. Khan, (1990, p. 70) defines task component as “people who experience feel-good moments when their task performances include rewarding inter-personal inter-actions with co-workers and clients”. This assertion could not be far from the truth when it comes to the nursing sector, for nurses, work interaction with other nurses becomes requirement; even more important is the relationship between the nurse and the sick patient which might be the difference between life and death (Dolvo 2004, p. 13).

Another key element of the psychological conditions as mentioned by Khan (1990) is psychological safety. It is defined as “the experience of an employee being able to show other employees, one’s self without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status of career” (Khan, 1990,p.708). Factors that play a role in psychological safety include interpersonal relationships, groups and inter-group dynamics, management style and processes, and organizational norms. Khan (1990) was of the opinion that inter-organization relationships promote psychological safety when they were supportive and trusting. Within the work environment, people allowed to be fearless or err without fear of being punished (Gibb, 1961).

Group and inter-group dynamics is a method used by a group of people to mimic or imitate real-life situations unconsciously, to bring about conscious issues affecting the group Slater,1966, in Khan(1990,p. 709). Another key element of psychological safety management style by the leaders and the process put in place to go about the leading others. Khan (1990) looks at many different managing styles and how they impact on employees and their jobs, and the final result is that supportive, resilient, and clarifying management style will result in an increased sense of safety among employees working in a particular organization.

Finally, psychological safety was compounded to role performances that were clearly within the boundaries of organizational norms. And organizational norms were defined as “shared expectations about the general behaviors of system members” (Khan 1990, p.712). All of the above factors contribute to psychological safety, which constitutes many aspects of psychological conditions. The final part of the organisation’s norms, as the definitions say, is
shared and guiding principles of employee behavior within the organisation. Norms gives
general guideline in terms of what behavior amongst employees that is considered
“acceptable or non-acceptable”. One of the most important organizations in the nursing
sector in South Africa is the South African Nursing Council (SANC), which was established
to operate autonomously, to be financially independent, and among its many objectives, the
following are at the centre of its existence: (i) to set and maintain standards of nursing
education and practice in the Republic of South Africa, (iii) give general guidelines in terms
of their policy in keeping discipline and how to discharge your duties which will also entail
norms (SANC, 2007). The last component on how employee engagement can be achieved
using psychological conditions is that of psychological availability.
Psychological availability refers to “a sense of having physical, emotional or psychological
recourse to personally engage at a particular moment, it is a measure of how engaged people
are, given the distractions they experience as member in a social system” (Khan 1990, p.714).
Khan goes on to say that psychological availability involves the following factors: physical
energy, emotional energy, individual insecurity and outside lives. When a person is to be
engaged in performance of their roles, new levels of physical energy, strength and readiness
are required (Khan 1990). Another important factor of psychological availability according to
Khan(1990, p. 697) is that of emotional energy, which means the ability to employ and
express feelings when performing tasks requiring emotional labor Hochschild 1983 in
Khan(1990, p. 715). Emotional energy and engagement go hand in hand when performing a
task that requires emotional intelligence and maturity like nursing.
Wildschut and Mqolozana (2008, p. 48) states that “the lack of resources and support
structures needed for HIV prevention and treatment is negatively impacting not only nurses’
physical ability to care for patients but also their mental ability to provide care.” Another
important element of psychological availability is that of insecurities. This refers to how
secure people are about their work and their status” (Khan 1990, p715). Employees who
come to work and are not fully focused on the job at hand can never be fully engaged in their
jobs Gustavo and Cooper (1985) in (Khan, 1990). The last component of psychological
availability is outside life, events like family crises that happen outside the work environment
can cause employees to disengage from their work (Hall & Richter, 1989). The focus of the
employee on his work could drastically affected by events that outside the organizational
environment yet would have a profound effect on him doing his job at his place of
employment. Therefore it is crucial that organizations establish programs that assist
employees I dealing with such problems before they become too big to handle hence affect quality of work done (Hall & Richter, 1989).

The above discussed factors for psychological meaningfulness of the job, safety and availability constitute psychological conditions within which employees use to either engage or disengage from or in their work. It is very important for organizations when designing jobs, not only to look at job-person fit model but also the environment in which this performance would be discharged (Khan, 1990). Therefore, it clear that there is a link between prevailing psychological conditions and the environment within which the job is to be conducted, therefore to achieve job engagement, organizations must look at the existing environment within the organization. Key to organizations achieving engagement within work is to create an environment that is conducive to employee engagement, employees feeling that they are part of the organization that they part of decision making and are given enough discretion for decision making about their jobs. All of the above factors were borne out of Khan’s (1990) model of engagement.

Another model used in defining job engagement was Maslach’s (2001) engagement model. He defined engagement “as the opposite of burnout, which involved overloading, control and reduced recognition”, yet engagement was based on perceived fairness, values, community and social support. The following section will look at the antecedents of employee engagement.

2.2.4 PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS AFFECTING EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

Khan (1990) and Maslach (2001) models of engagement are a great starting point in terms of defining job engagement, factors that influence job engagement, and the following factors which influence job engagement will be looked at and they are: Job characteristics, perceived organizational support, perceived supervisor support, reward and recognition, procedural justice and distributive justice. The first indicator that a person is or can be involved in their job is the job characteristics of the job itself (Khan, 1990). This premise is based on Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) Job Characteristics Model; they listed five core job characteristics which were very important for the job itself and job-holder. They were skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback. On the other hand, Khan (1992) re-emphasized that psychological meaningfulness can be achieved from task characteristics that provide variety, challenging work, allowing for multi-tasking and personal direction, and this tends to agree with the Job Characteristics Model in that, for the organizations to achieve engagement in terms of the job itself, the above factors would need to be present in a job-
holder position. Jobs that are high on the core job characteristics provide individuals with the room and incentive to bring more of themselves into their work or to be more engaged Khan(1992) in Isaks (2006, p. 604).

Another key factor in employee engagement according to Khan (1990, p. 695) is that of rewards and recognition which he defines as general perceptions by employees in terms of benefits they receive from the role. Dewar(2001) in Hall and Erasmus (2003, p. 133), when discussing reasons contributing to shortages of nurses (professional and qualified) and possibly the reason why they have emigrated to other countries states that there seems to be no incentive for nurses to specialize because it does not improve their financial situation nor their career progression path within the nursing field. Maslach et al. (2001) points out that lack of reward or recognition can have negative impact on employee attitude while appropriate recognition and reward can lead to more engaged employees.

Khan (1992, p. 47) mentioned psychological conditions being very important for job engagement more especially looking at psychological safety which is about the amount of care demonstrated by employers concerning employee well-being. Maslach’s (2001) Model of Engagement mentioned “social” as one of the cornerstones of engagement. Schaufeli and Baker identify in their study jobs that involve supporting colleagues as improving engagement by employees. Eisenburger and Rhoades (2002) postulate that this variable will emerge from social support, namely perceived organizational support (POS) and perceived supervisor support (PSS). In other words, people experience high levels of perceived organizational support and have a positive feeling about their supervisor and role they play between employers and employees will be more engaged in their jobs (Eisenberger & Rhoades, 2002).

The Department of Health in some solutions they came up with in solving the challenges surrounding the health care sector, introduced what they termed Occupations-specific dispensation (OSD) for nurses. This was to attract more nurses to the rural areas by providing them with higher remuneration for working in often remote areas and communities (Wildschut & Mqolozana, 2008, p. 56). Perceived supervisor support might also lead to more engaged employees because of the perception they may have about what role supervisor’s play. Therefore, it is clear that perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support play an important role in employees being engaged in their jobs.

Another important indicator of employee engagement, according to Isaks (2006, p. 606) is distributive and procedural justice. This refers to the organization’s policy on how rewards
are administered to deserving employees; two key components must be present in this process. The first is procedural fairness and the second is distributive justice. The latter refers to rewards awarded to deserving people and the former being the processes being followed (Isaks, 2006, p. 606). Therefore, the general perception of employees on how legitimate the process is might lead to them being more engaged in their work. Isaacs (2006) stated that “distributive justice process refers to the perceptions of fairness in end results or outcomes, whilst procedural justice refers to the fairness of means and process used to reach outcomes”. Therefore, it is important for organizations who want to get people engaged in their work to look at these indicators to help with engagement. The Department of Health, in trying to resolve the problem shortages in nurses and preventing those who want to leave, decided, on the 14th of September 2007, to introduce the occupations-specific dispensation for nurses (OSD). The generality of this agreement was that it ought to improve the governments’ ability to attract and retain skilled nurses (Wildschut et al, 2008, p. 50). Three key things were included in this document:

(i) to introduce a remuneration and career progression for all nurse categories, (ii) to differentiate salary scales for nurses according to the new system of remuneration and (iii) to incorporate the existing scarce skills allowance for identified categories on the new remuneration structure (Wilschut & Mqolozana, 2008, p.47).

Therefore, in closing, job engagement as it is known, is a concept within the employment environment that has become very important, that no employer would want to look past. But because of its relatively new nature, there is not much literature on the subject and researchers are not sure about how best to define it, but what is clear is that it is related to organizational processes relating to work roles and how they are executed. There is confusion among scholars as to whether it falls within the same bounds of involvement, commitment or satisfaction. The above discussion looked at its definition, factors that influence it; its antecedents that need to be within it and lastly it will look at the consequences.

2.2.5 CONSEQUENCES OF JOB ENGAGEMENT

According to Isaks (2006, p. 604), job engagement can lead to a number of things or can have the following consequences: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, reduced need for employees to feel the need to quit the organization and organizational citizenship behavior. From the above discussion, it is clear that there is a relationship between engaged employees and job satisfaction, which will lead to them being involved in their jobs. Reduced reasoning for intending to quit will be discussion for another study. For the purpose of this study, the
relationship between job engagement and organizational citizenship behavior is examined. The next sections will look at organization citizenship behavior.

2.3 ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR (OCB)

2.3.1 INTRODUCTION

A growing problem facing most public institutions in modern times is the quest for creativity, innovation and change oriented behaviors among employees (Vigoda-Gadot & Beeri, 2011, p. 1). Terry in Vigoda-Gadot and Beeri (2011, p. 3) argues that it has become clear that global governmental reforms can only be successful only within a dynamic workplace and proactive public sector. Vigoda-Gadot (2007b, p. 7) further state that “such an atmosphere within the organization encourages public servants to go the extra mile in daily job routines which compensate for bureaucratic red tape, slow and unbendable procedures and insensitivity and inflexibility in the provision of services.”

The health care sector is a dynamic environment that must constantly respond to changing knowledge and government policy (Gilbert, Laschinger & Lieter, 2010). A study conducted by Spreitzer (2007) suggests that giving help to others had a more positive impact on nurses’ perception of trust and reciprocity on hospital units than receiving help from others. Many studies have put more focus on how these helping behaviors, referred to as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), can be a means for both employees and the organization to flourish (Wat & Shatter, 2003).

Dolvo (2004, p. 69) states that “Africa faces a health crisis occasioned by a number of important factors that have risen over the past couple of decades, more emphasis on rapid spread of HIV/AIDS in Sub-Saharan Africa”. Within the South African context Paul Joubert (2009) concurs with the lack or shortage of nurses within the health care sector by stating that South Africa’s health care system is not functioning optimally and this is owing to a serious shortage of manpower. Organ (1988, p. 197) defined organizational citizenship behavior “as those individual behaviors that are discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization”. Taking this definition and applying it to the context of existing conditions within South Africa’s health care sector, which is characterized by serious nurse manpower and conditions of work that are stressful, it then becomes clear how important the concept of organizational citizenship behavior is.
The relevance of organizational citizenship behavior to this study, the nursing sector in South Africa, and what solutions it can bring to employee and organizational related challenges in the work place becomes very important. The premise is that employees, who perceived to be well cared for by their employer, turn to be very involved in their jobs and this will result in them engaging in activities that are not part of formal requirements of jobs, yet necessary for effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1980, p. 201). The purpose of this study is to look at organizational citizenship behavior and how it can help public hospitals function better. The next definition will look at the definition of organizational citizenship behavior, its antecedents, and factors influencing it, the consequences of being involved in such behaviors.

2.3.2 ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR DEFINED
Organizational citizenship behavior was first introduced by Organ in the 1980s and he defined the concept of organizational citizenship behavior “as discretionary behaviors by individuals (employees) that do not form part of formal requirements of a job, but are necessary and promote effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988, p. 199)”. Dyne in Chien (2010, p. 2) proposed a broader construct of “extra-role behavior” (ERB), which he defined as “behaviors which benefits the organization and/or is intended to benefit the organization, which is discretionary and which goes beyond existing role expectations.” Organizational citizenship behavior can also be defined “as volitional extra-role behaviors not directly related to a specific task or job description, lead to improve customer and peer relationships, enhanced teamwork, operational flexibility and competitiveness”(Borman in Peelle, 2001, p. 1).

From the above definitions of organizational citizenship behavior by the different authors, one thing is clear when it comes to organizational citizenship behavior and what it is about, two key elements are mentioned. The first is the individual behaviors are “discretionary”, meaning not enforceable, that is, these behaviors are totally depended on whether the employee does or does not want to do them, and secondly, these behaviors are not part of the job requirements (formal). Ryan (2003) asked the question “why?” he then argued that the answer as to why employee engage in such activities lies in personality characteristics (traits) such as work ethic, conscientiousness or empathy explained organizational citizenship behavior. Kinder and Parker (2003) in Peelle (2007, p. 1) contended that employee-defined roles and work identity influenced organizational citizenship behavior. Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) concur that organizational citizenship behavior was a form of social
exchange for positive treatment received from the organization by employees and which in return employees will use the reciprocity principle which will compel them to try and repay good treatment given by the employer by engaging in activities that are outside their scope of their work, yet necessary for the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1980).

2.3.3 FORMS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Williams and Anderson in Gilbert et al. (2010, p. 341) come up with a two dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior consisting of organizational citizenship behavior individual (OCBI) and organizational citizenship behavior organization (OCBO). They defined OCBI as behaviors by employees that immediately benefits specific peers and co-workers contributes indirectly to the organization. OCBO was defined as behaviors by employees that benefit the organizational in general. These are factors like punctuality, positive attitude, and making suggestions about how the organization can be improved in terms of its general function.

Organ (1997, p. 86), in his work termed “construct clean up” tries to explain the concepts (of organizational citizenship behavior) that he came up with when he was defining the term organizational citizenship behavior, because some researchers had concerns in terms of terminology used in the definition of the construct, organizational citizenship behavior. The first was “discretionary”. Researchers such as Morrison (1994) asserts that in their investigation of the instrument used to measure organizational citizenship behavior, they found that 80% of the items within the measuring instrument were deemed respondents in their studies as “in-role” behaviors, which was contradicting discretionary behaviors which organizational citizenship behavior is based on. Therefore, Morrison concluded that organizational citizenship behavior was ill-defined and varied from one employee to the other.

But Organ (1997, p. 87) argued that “the point is that rewards that accrue to organizational citizenship behavior are at best indirect and uncertain, as compared to more formal contributions such as high productivity, technical excellence or innovative solutions.” Other researchers and scholars in their area contributed problems with defining to things like (i) “fuzziness” of concepts like “role and job”, (ii) the meaning of terms like “non-contractual rewards”, the context in which organizational citizenship behavior was looked at. But key to the definition and what behaviors were considered organizational citizenship behavior like Organ (1997) stated that these behaviors were not part of formal requirements, therefore, they were not enforceable. Wildschut and Mqolozana (2008, p. 44) stated that nurses get more
engaged in their jobs and will go the extra mile in assisting others in terms of their work. This is as long as the request is coming from one of their colleagues or peers as compared to a supervisor or somebody in a position of power. The last part of this paragraph brings us to a very important part of organizational citizenship behavior, the dimensions. Therefore, the following section will look at the core dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior.

2.3.4 CORE DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Organ in Gilbert et al. (2010, p. 341) listed five core dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior and they were as follows: altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue. Altruism involved voluntarily helping of other employees with work-related problems, for example if a worker was behind in his schedule, the person assists within nursing sometimes, your patients say within the casualty ward coming in big numbers owing to accidents, yet within the maternity wards, nurses there are not as busy so people from that section would come and give a helping hand, not because they are required to, but because they feel it is a right to do (Dolvo, 2004, p.69).

Another core dimension of organizational citizenship behavior is courtesy. Organ et al. (2006) defines it as “gestures that help others prevent a problem, such as providing advance routine for an upcoming meeting.” The previous example is relevant in this situation. Thirdly, conscientiousness is referred to as exceeding the required level of attendance, punctuality or preserving organizational resources by not abusing the system in place and upholding or obeying company when under no supervision from your superior (Organ, 1988). Another core dimension of organizational citizenship behavior according to Organ et al. (2006) is that of sportsmanship. They define sportsmanship as “involving sacrificing one’s personal interests and maintaining a positive attitude, even when convinced by others that or when one’s ideas are rejected.” The last dimension of OCB is civic virtue. It refers to “constructive participation in the political processes of the organization such as making suggestions of improvement when conducting organizational meetings of members” (Organ, 1997). Cabrey (2005) stated that the positive social behaviors among co-workers may serve to facilitate effective functioning of hospital units by contributing to a work environment that supports task performance.

2.3.5 CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Gilbert et al. (2010, p. 341) mentioned the following as the positive consequences of employees who engage in organizational citizenship behavior to the organization and these are as follows; efficiency, customer satisfaction, financial performance and renewed growth
within the organization. Conscientiousness, according to Organ (2006) referred to exceeding organizational requirements. One way of achieving this is to use fewer resources in trying to achieve organizational goals and this would lead to better financial performance by the organization, which is one of the results of organizational citizenship behavior. A different direction in terms of how to make use the organization’s resources (financial), positive use will result in growth within the organizational reserves. Again, Organ (1988) mentions altruism as one of the fundamentals of OCB and defines it as being able to lend a helping hand to others who have bigger workloads; the results would be organizational efficiency.

Therefore, it has been demonstrated by the above discussion that organizations in this ever-changing and turbulent economic conditions and competitive environment need to find ways of maximizing human capital and gain competitive advantage on other organization and three variables that have been discussed show through employee behavior how important they can be (Markus, 2007). Laschinger and Finnegan (2000) laments that it is not an organization’s products that will make the organization succeed; rather its human capital will make the difference.

The above discussion on organizational citizenship behavior, looked at, among other things, what is entailed in organizational citizenship behavior, factors that contribute to organizational citizenship behavior, its antecedents, it also looked at its dimensions, (altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue) and how these can be applied in the work context. Organizational citizenship behavior together with the other two variables can be applied within the nursing profession and the environment that exists there. It is even more applicable in the South African nursing context because of the existing conditions which were discussed earlier as postulated by Wildschut and Mqolozana(2008, p. 49) in their research about the current state the nursing profession is in. Wildschut and Mqolozana (2008, p. 51) stated that the South African health care sector is characterized by lack of professional and qualified nurses.

The reasons that they listed as being key to this situation are: (i) unsatisfactory working conditions, (ii) low paying jobs, and (iii) a general need for a better life. The result of this was that the emigration of nurses in the last 20 years grew substantially in terms of numbers. These are professional and qualified nurses who decided to go work elsewhere where they saw better opportunities within the environment which will enable them to achieve their
personal goals. The department of health in their review conducted in year (1997) put the number of professional nurses who had decided to immigrate to other countries in the mid-eighties and nineties at 50000 nurses; this was between the years 1985 to 1995. Therefore, perceived organizational support (POS) and job engagement (JE) when organizations get right, the end results will be that employees get involved first, in their jobs, also get involved in activities that go beyond the call of duty (Organizational citizenship behavior). Looking at the current state of the health care system in South Africa, how relevant are these terms in the sense that they give an employer’s another tool that they can use in solving work related problems.

2.3.6 CONCLUSION
Organizational citizenship behaviors defined by Organ (1986) is about behavior that discretionary, which that they are totally an option on the employee side on whether to be involved in them or not. Yet very critical about such behaviors and why the organization would do well in encouraging its employees to be involved in them is that they are necessary for the functioning of the organization. Therefore what can be drawn from the definition is that the organizational behavior activities should be made part and parcel of the organizational culture. Organization should foster an environment that encourages their employees to do more is required by the positions they hold in the organization (Laschinger & Finnegan, 2002). Wildschut and Mqolozana (2008, p. 47) also concur with the importance of organizational citizenship behavior and the fact that organization need to encourage such attitude among its staffers. They make mention of how straining the working conditions within the local nursing sector more especially within the public health institutions. The department of Health, the employer of many nurses, the union representing all nurses’ interests and many former employees all agree on the desperate shortages of nurses within the health care system, making organizational citizenship behavior for all organizations experiencing similar challenges.

The definition of organizational citizenship behavior, factors that influence employees to get involve in organizational citizenship, the nature (forms) of organizational citizenship, also very critical when it comes to organizational citizenship behavior that was looked at is the core dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior. The results of having employees going beyond the call of duty and how that impacts on the functioning of the organization and lastly the relationship that organizational citizenship has with the other two variables, perceived organizational support and job engagement was also discussed. Therefore it
becomes that organizations need to strike a right balance between how their employees perceived and feel about them. Another key aspect of that relationship is achieving job engagement by employees which will result in job satisfaction (Organ, 1986). A combination of an engage employees who thinks positively about their employer will result in such employees going above and beyond the call of duty,” the reciprocity principle.”

The last chapter looked at the literature review that was available in terms of the three variables; this is to look at what other researchers have found in this area of research. The next step is to look at the chapter three of this study; this chapter is about the research methodology of the study. Perri G and Bellamy (2012, p. 1) defined research methodology as means to understand how to proceed from the empirical research to make inferences about the truth at least the agency of theories.” Durocombe (2003, p. 74) defined research methodology “as a systematic way of answering a research question”. The following discussion will look at that.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter of this study dealt with the literature review, which looks at contributions that are made by other researchers’ concerning the area of study Welman... et al., (2005, p. 34). This means that literature looks at relationship between the variables that are being studied by the researcher so that answers can be provided on the questions asked. For this study, perceived organisation support (POS) and job engagement (JE) are the independent variables in the study. They are being studied in terms of their effect on organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) among nurses within the nursing profession. Once the literature has been looked at, the next step for the researcher is to choose a method that will be used to conduct the study (research methodology). This chapter will focus on the steps that are involved within the research methodology process.

3.2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY DEFINED

The purpose of this chapter explains the scientific way that a researcher will follow in conducting his/her study (Research methodology). Bellamy and Perri G (2012, p. 1) stated that “by methodology, it means the understanding of how to proceed from the empirical research to make inferences about the truth at least the agency of theories”. Research methodology is not only important because of its scientific approach to the research process, but also because it gives researchers the following: a detail overview of the process or the sequence of steps to be followed, it also gives an indication as to what key steps within the process that must be followed. Research methodology is also important to the research community because it allows them an opportunity to distinguish between research methodology and research methods, with the former being defined as inclusive of all the steps involved in the research process, whilst the later refers to one of the steps involved within the research process (Babbie, Halley & Zaino, 2007, p. 37).

The following discussion will focus on the processes involved within research methodology; it will attempt to explain amongst other things: The area in which the study will be conducted (research topic), the method that will be used to conduct the study (methodology), the study units (participants in the study), with study units, the focus on the population and sample which must be drawn from the entire population (the total number of units to be studied versus the portion of the units that will be selected to represent the entire population).
Another key element about the population and samples is the sampling and the sampling methods to be used. This refers to the selection (Durocombe, 2001, p. 133). Another aspect about sampling that is important is how representative the sample is, this will also be covered in the following discussion. Also to be covered in how data will collect is gathered from the participants (data collection methods). From data gathering, the next step within the research methodology is data analysis. Data analysis is about transforming raw data to meaningful information which can be viewed to provide opinions and solutions to many different facets of life (Durocombe, 2001, p.159).

Cooper and Schindler (2008, p. 197) stated that when research is being conducted, the following process should be followed, steps within the research process: exploration of study to clarify the problem, the next step is to propose your area off study, from these, the researcher must device a research strategy, the next phase is data collection design and sampling designing, from that the researcher must put to a instrument pilot testing and if these are any short comings for the instrument used. The researcher must do an instrument revision; the key element with the measuring instrument is validity and reliability co-efficiencies. The next is that actual data/ collection process and proportion of it for analysis; from data collection to data analysis (making sense out of raw data that can be meaningless to the naked eye). After all these stages the last part of the process required the research into report his findings/ results and from these, recommendations can be made. For this study, the following research methodology will also be followed.

3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN

The researcher will attempt to distinguish between the research process and design, Welman, Kruger and Mitchell (2005, p. 79) Defined the research process “as a series of steps in obtaining scientific knowledge by means of various objective research methods”. Terre’ blanche, Durheim and Painter, (2006) look at the research process and researchers as creators of new social realities, not just about studying the old ones from the definitions of research process, a picture of what research design can be drawn. Research design can therefore be defined “as a strategic framework for action that serves as a bridge between research questions and implementation of research questions” (Terre’ blanche et al., 2006, p.34). Research design is more concerned with the structure of the research than the actual research process.
The two most popular research designs that are used when conducting a study are quantitative and qualitative research methods. Bellamy and Perri G (2012, P. 81) argued that surprisingly enough there is little weight in terms of how you distinguish between qualitative and quantitative research designs.

The quantitative research design is used more in data that is based on describing and counting (easily quantifiable data). On the other hand, qualitative design dealt more with data that had to do with tracing of within case causal processes (data analysis and meaning depended on the researcher's meaning of data). Therefore, variable orientated research uses quantitative data hence quantitative research design, whilst case-based research uses qualitative evidence (Bellamy & Perri G 2012, p. 81). This study will use the quantitative research method.

Another key element when it comes to research design is the nature of the study that the researcher is going to conduct (Bellamy & Perri G, 2012). The nature of the study influences the research method that the researcher uses, whether it is quantitative or qualitative method. For example in experimental research where observation would be a better way of collecting data, qualitative method will be used (Ranjit, 2005). The nature can also be classified in terms of method selected for conducting the study. For the purpose of this study the quantitative method will be focused on because it will be used to conduct the study. Under the quantitative method which will be used for this research, there are three types of research methods that can be found and are as follows:

- Non-experimental research process.
- Quasi-experimental process.
- Experimental design can also be used under the quantitative design.

As Bellamy and Perri G (2012, p. 79) stated before, studies that are based on variables where data can be easily quantifiable, quantitative research method is used to conduct such studies. With a quantitative data, it is easier to analyse, because numbers can be easily assigned the data for analysis when it is prepared. This in turn will make it easier to analyse data that was collected and make informed decisions based on the results of the analysis.
3.4 RESEARCH METHODS

Research Methodology refers to scientific ways for gathering information from research participants or any other information source (Bellamy & Perri G 2012, p. 87). For the purpose of this study, the survey questionnaire method will be used to gather data. The questionnaires are to be circulated among research participants. The format of the questionnaire will be that of pre-arranged questions that give the participant a range of answers to choose from. Participants are expected to choose within the available options in terms of their responses to the questions asked. For the answers that the participants must give, they options to choose from and the options are constructed using the Likert rating scale which has a seven point likert scale and five point likert scale for the different variables (Durocombe 2001, p. 127). The questions will cover most of their general thoughts and beliefs, attitudes perceptions and emotions on the subject matter. For the purpose of this study quantitative design will be used.

3.4.1 QUANTITATIVE DATA

Babbie (2010, p. 422) defines quantification of data “as a process of converting data to numerical format, a format that can be used and manipulated by computers and similar machines used in quantitative analysis”. The following are examples of survey questionnaire design based on quantitative research:

3.4.2 DIFFERENT FORMS OF QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH

According to Wellman et al., (2005, p. 167) the following are different forms of research in which quantitative research method can be applicable; the quasi-experimental method of research, the quasi-experimental method of research, and the non-experimental method of research.

3.4.3 REASONS FOR USING QUESTIONNAIRES

After deciding which research method will be used to conduct the study, the next step for the researcher is to look at ways in which data will be collected. The following are most popular ways of gathering data (Babbie, 2010, p. 419). They are as follows; questionnaires, the observation method for research that is based on experiments, and interviews. For this study, the questionnaires were used; they will be concentrated on for further explanations. The following are both reasons and advantages of using questionnaires when gathering data.
Questionnaire on any economical to use with less time and money as compared to other methods, for example the observation method of gathering requires lot of patience, its time consuming and in other instances it can lead to inaccurate data being collected because the subjects would beware of what is happening around them which can lead to modelled behaviour just to suit the outcomes of the research.

Questionnaires are easy to edit and change, if certain sections are not as relevant as the researcher thought when designing the questionnaires, he/she can easily edit those parts, unlike in interviews. If they go wrong, they go wrong.

Questionnaires are standardized hence can be applied without variation. The design and the content of the questionnaire depends largely on what the researcher wants to achieve, which means questions to be asked should extract the necessary information to answer the question at hand.

Questionnaires allow for free coded answers (Durocombe 2003, p. 159). After data has been gathered before the analysis process can be done, a Microsoft excel spread sheet is used to code data so that it becomes easier to analyse. Therefore information that is easily quantified can be coded so that analysis can take place. The use of questionnaires becomes an advantage in such situations.

3.4.4 RATIONALE FOR USING THE SELECTED METHOD

The reasons for using survey questionnaire method have been mentioned and discussed in the above sections. The quantitative method makes use of questionnaires when the researcher is gathering data, and the advantages of using quantitative data have well emphasized earlier. Questionnaires are easy to work with, editable, save time and money. These are some of the advantages that were discussed by Wellman et al (2005, p.34). The objective for using this method is that it allows the researcher to gather data within a reasonable amount of time. Another important factor about questionnaires is that their use allows the researcher to analyse and quantify the information gathered quite easily, which might be have been more complicated when using other methods (interviews) argued Welman et al., (2005, p.57).
### 3.5 POPULATION OF THE STUDY

Welman *et al.*, (2005, p. 2) define the research process as obtaining scientific knowledge by means of various methods and procedures that are objective and scientifically tested. He went on to list the steps that are involved in the research process and are as follows: aims of the research, the research topic or the research problem, reviewing of available literature, research designs to be used in conducting the study and other steps that are part of the research process up until you reach conclusions on the problem and report on your findings. Within the fourth step (research design), which covers the methodology followed when conducting a scientific study. Part of research process requires the researcher to explain where the study is going to be conducted and who is the target population. This section will look at the targeted population, sampling, and sampling methods.

Heldal and Jentoft (2011, p. 19) gave this definition on target population as “a set of all persons from which the study is going to be conducted; they are the targeted population because the research problem also affects them”. Welman *et al.*, (2005, p. 53) defines population “as the study objects and it consists of all individuals, groups, organisations, human products and events or the condition to which they are exposed. The word population means the entire set about which the researcher wishes to generalize on basis of problem at hand (Sapford, 2007, p. 6).

The focus of this research is to study nurses’ perceptions of and how they feel about their employer, in this case, the employer is the Department of Health, from national level to the provincial level. The Victoria hospital is situated in the small town Alice, within the Nkonkobe municipality in the province of the Eastern Cape. Another aspect that will be studied about nurses is how engaged nurses are in their jobs. Khan (1990) defines employee engagement as the simultaneous employment and expression of a person’s “preferred self” in task behaviours that promote connections to and others, personal presence (physical, cognitive, and emotional), and active, full role performances. The concept of engagement being fairly new construct within behavioural sciences and also within the organisational context is similar but not the same as involvement or commitment will also be looked. The last part of this research is to look at the two variables, perceived organisational support and job engagement, their relationship and effect on yet another important aspect of
organisational processes when it comes to employees and performance of the jobs that is organisational citizenship behaviour.

As already mentioned in the above discussion, the population for this research project is all nurses that work at the Victoria hospital, in Alice. For the purpose of this study, by all nurses at Victoria hospital, means the professional nurses. The list also includes staff nurses, senior nurses who are also in the positions of management, auxiliary nurses, and community health care givers, student nurses who occupy the lowest ranks within the nursing community and have little experience in nursing.

The total number for the population of nurses who work at Victoria Hospital during the year 2012 was around 200 nurses, therefore N=200. This included all the different clusters that were explained earlier (Victoria hospital management, November 2012). A sample will be drawn from that number. Among ethical issues that researchers are faced with, the research must be based on issues that affect society at large and the results of such studies should be beneficial to the community at large (Ranjit 2005, p. 57). But when conducting research it is impossible to cover every subject involved in the study, hence sampling is necessary. The next section will look sampling and sampling methods.

3.6 SAMPLING AND SAMPLING METHODS

According to Mendenhall, Beaver and Beaver (2006, p. 13) researchers may find it impossible to cover every unit within the population when conducting their research. The reason for this is that research by its very nature; it involves a large population size of subjects to be studied that would make it impossible to cover each and every unit in that study. A good example is that of conducting a census, counting everybody lives within the borders of a country may possible, but in reality even with the most sophisticated counting techniques, the process will take too long to finish and there will be people who will not be accounted owing to a variety of reasons. The solution is to make a general estimate based on the available numbers in terms entire population (Census South Africa, 2011). The same problem can be seen when conducting research in many areas of life. The answer to this problem is that of sampling.

Mendenhall, Beaver and Beaver (2006, p. 3) defined sampling “as a specified number of measurements or data from much larger body of measurements called population”. Welman
et al.,(200, p. 53) cautiously concur and said that as the definition states from which a sample is taken, but in sampling terms, the term “population” is not only that exist where people live. Brynard and Hanekom (1997, p. 43) also agreed with Mendinhall et al., (2006) in defining the sample. He stated that a sample represents the larger population.

Welman et al., (2005, P. 56) distinguished between two most popular methods of sampling namely probability samples and non- probability samples. The two are most used methods in sampling. Probability sampling was defined as a situation where, in terms of sampling it can be determined that any element or member of the population will be included in the sample (Welman et al., 2005, p.57). They listed the following as sampling techniques that can be used under probability sampling: The simple random sampling, the most used and the easy to understand. This means that every unit within the population have equal chance of being selected into the sample. Stratified sampling, it refers to situation whose sampling is based on clearly recognisable and non- overlapping subpopulation (gender sampling). Systematic sampling, suppose the researcher is looking for a number of units, therefore with systematic sampling, the framework is used to the number and lastly the cluster sampling technique, in large scale surveys it is almost impossible to obtain a list of all members of the population, therefore with cluster sampling, first a stratified sample is drawn then grouped into homogenous called “clusters”

Another method of sampling is the non-probability sampling. Welman et al., (2005, p.56) defined non-probability sampling method as the situation whereby a probability that a unit within the population and the chance of it being selected into a sample cannot be specified. The following are examples of this method of sampling quota sampling, purposive sampling, snowballling, self-selection sampling, convenience sampling and accidental sampling. All these techniques are used in population surveys where the probability of being to a sample is equal to zero (Ranjit, 2005 p.54). For the purpose of this study, more attention is given to probability sampling method because it is the one that applies to this study. Therefore the sampling techniques under the non-probability sampling method will only be mentioned not discussed as they do not apply to this study.

3.6.1 SAMPLE SIZE

The sample size refers to the number of people that can be in a sample (Welman et al., 2005, p. 34). The size of the sample is key factor and will also increase reliability and validity of the
sample. Another important reason for having a correct sample size drawn is that of representatively. Representatively refers to “how will all dynamics of the population are presented in the sample in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, educational levels, and all other factors that define the characteristics the population (Welman et al., 2005, p. 63).

The formula that was used for determining an appropriate sample size was that of percentage method. It requires that a certain percentage of the entire population units must obtain for the number constitute an acceptable sample that is representative of all population dynamics. , it requires that the minimum percentage (30%) must be reached for the units to constitute a sample. (Durocombe 2006, p. 57)

3.6.2 SAMPLING PROCEDURE

The sampling procedure refers to methods that are used to draw a sample (Bellamy & Perri G 2012, p. 81). For the purpose of this study, probability sampling method will be used. Welman et al. (2005, p.45) Defined probability sampling method “as situation where units within the population had predetermined chance of being selected to the sample”. The sampling technique that will use is the simple random sampling technique used to select units into the sample.

3.6.3. THE FOLLOWING ARE REASONS WHY PROBABILITY SAMPLING WILL BE USED:

According to Lousser (1999, p. 192) the following reasons are why it is preferable to use a probability and they are as follows:

- Probability sampling is a method used sampling has been used in most empirical studies conducted, therefore in process evidence of its effectiveness.
- With probability sampling, the advantage is that it is based simple random sampling techniques, which means there is always a probability that a unity will selected to a sample.

3.6.4. A SAMPLING TECHNIQUES

A sampling technique refers to a method to be used by the researcher in selection of units to the sample (Duracombe, 2003:69). For the purpose of this study, the sampling technique that will be used is the simple random sampling. Cooper and Schendler (2003) define simple
random sampling as probability sampling technique in which each population unit has a equal chance of being chosen to the sample

3.5.5 A SAMPLING FRAME

Wellman et al., (2005, p. 57) defines a sampling frame as a complete list in which each unit of analysis is mentioned only once. For this study a sampling frame was the register of all nurses in Victoria Hospital. All nurses at the start of every shift are required to sign in and also sign out at the end of the shift. This is largely done to keep track of who did or did not come to work on that particular shift, and also helps management to keep records in terms of employee’s absenteeism records. This might also be used for the purpose of this study to indicate number of nurses at the Victoria hospital and also as a sampling frame.

3.7 DATA COLLECTION

3.7.1 DATA COLLECTION DEFINED

Wellman et al., (2005, p. 135) stated that data collection procedures are based on systematic observation, this means that the data collection methods should be replicable in the sense that other observers are able to observe and report on what you have observe. They defined data collection method “as a process of gathering data from research participants.” Quantitative data are collected to classify and describe attributes, behaviours and relations within any social setting, activities of populations according to Parahoo (2006).

Data collection should be objective, systematic and repeatable (Lacey, 2010). Robson (2007) maintains that a researcher should use the simplest manner of collecting the data to get answers to the research question and should not collect any more data than necessary. Mindful of these conditions the data collection instrument selected for this study is a questionnaire. The questionnaire is structured into four different sections with the first part covering biographical information of the research participant. The next section will cover all statement about perceived organisational support. The last two sections of the questionnaire will cover information about the other two variables namely job engagement and organisational citizenship behaviour.


3.7.2 METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

Data can be classified according to the way in which it was collected or in terms of intrinsic properties, when researchers collect their own data for the purpose of the study that data is called primary data (Bless Hogson-Smith & Kagee 2006, p.11). They went on to list the following as methods that can be used in collecting data: Observation as process of watching employees going about doing their jobs and involves simple observation and modified participant observation (Bless et al., 2006, p.114). Another method for data collection is that of interviews and questionnaires. They define interviews as a direct contact with participant who is asked to answer some questions relating to the problems. Interviews can either be non-scheduled or non-scheduled structured interviews. On the other hand, questionnaires do not require direct personal contact with respondents and they can be either self-administered questionnaires or mail questionnaires (Bless et al., 2006, p.115). For the purpose of this study questionnaires will be used as the instrument to collect data.

3.7.3 THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

As mentioned earlier, the data collection instrument that will is used to gather data from participants for this study is questionnaires. Bless et al.,(2006, p. 115) stated that an advantage with using questionnaires, is that there is no need for direct contact by the researcher with the respondent as it would be required with other methods of data collection. Lueng (2001, p. 234) defines a questionnaire “as a document with a standardized procedure, pre-coded, containing both closed-ended and open-ended questions, and it can be regarded as a data collection instrument that sets out questions to be asked in a formal way in order to get the required information”.

The self-administered questionnaire is defined “as involving a direct and face to face meeting between the researcher and the respondent” (Cooper & Choniler, 2003). One of many reasons why self-administered questionnaires are popular with researchers is that they guarantee anonymity and privacy of the participants, therefore encouraging honest responses. They allow for sensitive data such as age and level of position to be disclosed by participants because of the anonymity and confidentiality principle that must be given as guarantee by the researcher. Lastly, self-administered questions are easy to work with since they do not require a lot of time to complete and less costs and money to use (Ranjit, 2005).
3.6.4 Definition of This Research Instruments

In designing the questionnaire for this research the following research related issues had to be taken into consideration:

- The objectives of the study, whether items in research instrument would get information which achieve the required results and achieve the overall objectives of the study.

- Look at the theoretical basis of the study that was discussed during the literature review, and also very important are the hypothesis that were to be tested during the research process. The research instrument should be designed in manner that will either support for the alternative hypothesis or against the hypothesis. For this study, the items on the research questionnaire are closed-ended questions covering the three variables being studied. The responses that were given by the respondents were measured analysed using a seven point likert scale and 5 point likert scale for the other responses.

The questionnaire consists of four sections, the first section being about the biographical information about the participant for an example age and gender and other related information. The second section was related to items investigating the first variable (POS). Perceived organisational support looked at issues like attitudes, perceptions and general beliefs of the employee about the employer. The third section was about the second independent variable job engagement the researcher wanted to establish the level of engagement of nurses in their job, it looks at how well they enjoyed doing what they were doing, try to establish reasons if any than just the financial rewards of the job.

The last section looked at the dependant variable and the relationship it had with these other two. It looked at what activities nurses do get involved hat were outside the formal job requirements in position that they occupy in their jobs. The researcher wanted to determine what reasons would cause them to engage in organisational citizenship behaviour and how it made them feel about their job and their employer. It is also important for researcher when developing an instrument, to look at questions and to determine whether they are not of the offensive and discriminative nature. According to Durocombe (2003, p.74) the following check-list should always be in place:

- Whether a question should be asked or not.
- If the question was valid and was within the scope of the research.
- If the respondent will be able to answer the question, clear and straight to the point.
- Look for ambiguity in the way questions are structured.
- Whether the respondent would be willing to answer the questions.
- To check whether the question does not have a double meaning, the researcher intending to ask this, the question itself intending to ask something else. This type of thing could confuse respondent who would end up giving in accurate responses rendering the information useless and misleading because it would lead to false results.

3.6.5 QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTRATION AND RESPONSE RATE

When it came to the distribution of questionnaires (the research instrument) for the gathering of data, a total of 130 questionnaires were personally delivered to the Victoria hospitals for the nurses to fill in the necessary information. The questionnaires were given to the matrons within the hospital who made sure that at the beginning of every shift, questionnaires will be circulated to the nurses in the incoming shift. The nurses were asking to fill in the necessary details as to provide the information the researcher was looking for. The response that was achieved was that out of the hundred and thirty questionnaires that were circulated amongst staff, one hundred and six (106) were returned to the researcher. This amounted to an 82% response rate which in research terms is more than acceptable. A percentage of 0.05% also contributed to spoiled questionnaires, this was in part to questionnaires that were not completed or not filled in a correct way.

3.8 DATA ANALYSIS

3.8.1 INTRODUCTION

Once the data that one has collected have been properly processed in terms of data encoding and have it converted to a computer file. The researchers are ready to turn their attention to the process of data analysis. During this Culminating stage of the study, various numerical, statistical and graphical techniques are used to finally answer the questions that resulted from the initial research objectives (Venter, 2006, p. 111).
3.8.2 DATA ANALYSIS DEFINED

According to Welman et al., (2005, p. 213) data analysis can be defined as converting raw, meaningless information into meaningful data that can be analysed and meaningful decisions can be based upon. Therefore from the above definition, it can be concluded that data analysis is about coding and editing of that was gathered by the researcher. The process involves sifting through all questionnaires that were returned to the researcher, look for the spoiled ones, from there the process of coding starts (Venter, 2006, p. 113).

For data analysis to take place, raw field notes have to be converted. “This entails converting the notes into write ups which should be intelligible products that can be read, edited for accuracy, commented on, and analysed” (Wellman et al 2005, p. 211). According to Cooper and Schindler (2003) data analysis involved the reduction of accumulated data to a manageable size, developing summaries, looking for patterns and applying statistical techniques. It also includes the interpretation of research findings in the light of the research questions and determines if the results are consistent with the research hypotheses and theory. As already mentioned the starting for data analysis is the coding of data.

3.8.2 THE DATA ANALYSIS PROCESS

According to Wellman et al., (2005, p. 227) data coding means that we have to identify the variable that we want to analyse statistically and decide on the different code values such as variable level presents. For this study, the data analysis was done using the descriptive analysis. The researcher of the study and statistical expert used the statistical methods and techniques to the analysis (descriptive and inferential statistical methods). The process was as follows; the data was first coded using an excel spread sheet so that it is easy to collate and analyse data. Data that is recorded on a spread sheet can be easily analysed using different statistical software.

For this study, the SPSS software was used to analyse the data. The SPSS software was used to construct frequency tables, also to graphically illustrate many relationships among the variables being studied. The testing of hypothesis and the correlations that exists between the three variables was done using the Pearson and Cronbach correlation coefficients. Other statistical methods of testing these relationships that were used are the T tests and chi square tests.
3.8 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR THIS STUDY

In the spirit of humanity, research and the pursuit of knowledge should never take precedence over participants' personal, social and cultural values. Research should also avoid posing a threat to people’s physical, mental and emotional health. Therefore, in the research situation of the study, the researcher will take due considerations with regard to ethics. This will involve following a number of ethical practices that include:

- non-deception of research participants (Gregory, 2003, p. 42);
- Debriefing of participants regarding the study (i.e. its purpose, duration, sites, etc.);
- Contribution of the research to the general good of society (beneficence);
- Obtaining participants' consent that is fully informed (by debriefing and the covering letter) and voluntary (by their verbal agreement) (Gregory, 2003, p. 41);
- Due acknowledgement of information sources, thus avoiding plagiarism, respecting intellectual property rights and maintaining integrity in research (Macfarlane, 2008, p. 59);
- Acknowledgement of participants to the best of the researcher’s ability;
- Preservation of results’ accuracy (accessed 18/03/2011 at 11:03);
- Recognition of research sites from where the study was conducted;
- Individual rights to privacy will be observed, through confidentiality of research results (Gregory, 2003, p. 41);
- Avoidance of harm to participants' physical, mental and emotional health; and
- Transparency of research methods to allow for reliability.
3.9 CONCLUSION

Chapter three of this study looked at the method that the researcher when conducting his study needed to follow for reliability and validity reasons. Research methodology refers to a scientific way of arriving to a solution of the problem that the researcher was trying to solve (Wellman et al., 2005, p.189). It is a systematic way of solving a problem concurred (Durocombe, 2003, p. 89). According to Ranjit (2005, p. 37), systematic refers to “a series of steps that are in involved within the research process, steps that when being than by someone else, the results are similar to that of the first person involved in the study”. This chapter had focused on those steps, from the research design, population and sampling to data gathering and analysis.

The following chapter which is chapter four of this study will focus on the next within the research process which is the analysing of the collected data. Wellman et al., (2005, p. 213) defining data as conversion of raw, meaningless information into meaningful data that can be analysed and meaningful decisions can be based upon. Different statistical methods will be used to do the analysis.
CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter three (3) of this study was about the research methodology and techniques that a researcher should apply when conducting an empirical research. Ranjit (2005, p. 45) defined research as scientific ways of generating information and convert that information into meaningful data that objective decisions can be made on it. The data analysis is defined as process of converting information to a meaningful data that can be used to make informed decisions (Wellman et al., 2005). The descriptive and inferential statistical methods were used to conduct the analysis. For hypotheses testing, the Pearson correlation coefficients were used.

The four hypotheses that were tested were between three variables; perceived organizational support (POS) defined as employee’s perception of how much does the employer values their contribution and cares about their general well-being (Eisenberger, 1986). Isaks (2001, p. 66) stated that job engagement (JE) is about harnessing employees into their work roles so that they can perform better in their jobs to the benefit of the organization. On the other hand, organizational citizenship behavior is defined as discretionary behaviors by employees that are outside their jobs and job requirements, hence not rewarded and cannot be enforced, yet their necessary for effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1990).

The following discussion will focus on the descriptive and inferential statistical techniques that were used to analyze the gathered data. The first part will look at the descriptive analysis. From the descriptive statistical methods, the next part of the discussion will focus on the inferential statistical methods of analysis. The descriptive analysis includes variables such as age, gender, tenure, level of education distributions.

4.2 THE INTERNAL CONSISTENCY OF MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

The instruments used to collect and measure data are very important in terms of the validity and the reliability of the research results. There are three measuring scales used to measure data for the variables. The instrument used to measure perceived organizational support was survey for perceived organization support by Eisenberger in 1986 which had Cronbach reliability coefficient between 0.77 and. 89 with 0.70 being the acceptable reliability coefficient level in terms of research standards.
For measuring job engagement, the Utrecht work engagement measuring scale (UWES) was used to measure the reliability coefficient which was between 0.71 and 0.88. For organizational citizenship behavior, the Koy’s 2001 organisational citizenship behavior measuring scale was used to measure reliability level and the results showed a 0.93 reliability level for this measuring instrument. Therefore, the reliability issues have been proven beyond doubt for these measuring instruments in previous studies.

### 4.3 SAMPLE SIZE AND RESPONSE RATE

A sample of 120 nurses was selected out of the total population of +200 nurses who are working at the Victoria hospital, Alice. A total of 120 questionnaires were circulated amongst nurses who work different shifts within the hospital system. This was done with help of matrons who are in charge of different working shifts. Out of the 120 circulated questionnaires, 106 respondents gave back the questionnaires, which became the total number for the sample.

### 4.4 STATISTICAL METHODS AND TECHNIQUES

#### 4.4.1 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

The descriptive statistical methods focus on the following distributions; age, gender, marital status, race, position held, level of education, and the tenure. The above mentioned distribution will be illustrated using graphs as shown in the following figures. The first graph, figure 4.1 shows the distribution of respondents based on their age.
Figure 4.1 Age distribution of respondents

The majority of the respondents (28.3%, n = 30) are in the age group 41-50 years, while 25.47% (n=27) are in the age group 31-40 years. Twenty-one respondents (19.81%) fall in the age category 20-30 years, sixteen respondents (15.09%) fall in the category 51-60 years, and a further 11.32% (N = 12) of the respondents are in the age group under 20 years old. This the largest group in terms of all different groups, this signifies people at highest levels of their careers who had spent enough time within the nursing profession. Their career ambitions at this stage are to consolidate their status within the organisation and at the same time planning towards their final working years.

The above 20 years age category is the least represented within the distribution, this signifies people who entering the labour with very limited experience about their work, and they are fresh from the college. Their novices in their profession skilled with only the theoretical knowledge gained at tertiary level. The next distributions will at the gender dynamics of nurses within the hospital, this is important in terms of meeting the legislative requirements. The labour laws require equality and diversity in the work place (DoH, 2007). Figure 4.2 depicts the gender of respondents. The majority of the respondents (78%, n = 83) are females, while male respondents comprised 22% of the respondents (n = 23).
Figure 4.2 Gender distributions of respondents

The age distribution shows a 78% representation of females in a sample of 120 nurses, this is very high number. This is because, traditionally, 30 to 40 years ago nursing was viewed as being gender based, hence females were deemed better at giving care to the sick and that is why they are so dominant in profession (Harrison, 2009; p. 17).

But in the last 15-20 years, there has been a steady shift in societal value and belief system, hence more males are choosing nursing as career choice. With the intense recruitment drive of nurses by the department of health in trying to solve the shortages of nurses within the nursing profession, the numbers reflect a change in attitude with more and more male nurses joining the profession (Harrison, 2009. P. 21)
Figure 4.3 Marital status of respondents

Figure 4.3 illustrates that of the 106 respondents who participated, 51 (48.11%) of the respondents were never married, thirty-nine (36.79%) are married, and eight (7.55%) are divorced and the other eight (7.55%) are widowed. The next graph will demonstrate the racial dynamics of workforce within public hospitals based on the results of this hospital.
Figure 4.4 Race distributions of respondents

As depicted in Figure 4.4, the racial composition of the sample comprises of 89% (n = 93) Black respondents, and 11% (N = 11) Colored respondents. Again with race distribution, a very high percentage (89%) to be precise of females, were apportioned to a single race, the blacks. There can be many reasons to explain this high percentage. First, when one looks the racial demographics in the country, the blacks constitute the biggest number (Census South Africa, 2011).

The reasons for this might be attributed to share volume of black people in this country. The second reason is that the so “called black race” has sub group that constitute the entire population of black people. There are the Zulus, the Xhosas, and the Sotho’s, the southern Sotho’s, the Venda’s, The Tswane’s, the Shanganes and other indigenous tribes (Harrison 2009, p. 27).

Another reason that can explain the 89% spread is the geographical settlement of many different racial groups, for example it is common knowledge that the province is occupied by black Xhosa speaking people, the Kwazulu natal province you will find Zulu speaking people being dominant. The Colored population is more dominant in the Western Cape (Census South Africa, 2011).

The Victoria hospital being situated in the Eastern Cape, in a town called Alice with community being black and Xhosa speaking explains why the black nurses in that hospital are so dominant. Therefore, this signifies you find black people in such areas; hence how the organizational culture is would sometimes be influence by local culture. Employers are therefore advised to always consider such factors when dealing with problem affecting their
organisation, because culture does play role in an organisation’s success (Harrison, 2009, p. 27).

![Figure 4.5 Level of education for respondents](image_url)

Figure 4.5 Level of education for respondents

Figure 4.5 illustrates the education level of the sample. The graph depicts that the majority of the respondents, 33.96% (n =36) has a certificate educational level, whilst 31.13% (n = 33) possess a diploma. Twenty-seven respondents (25.47%) has a high school education level and 9.43% (n =10) possess a degree. The following presentation will look at what positions the different nurses occupy, this very important distribution. It gives insight into the skills based within the hospital and also the nursing community at large.

The 25% that falls under the category of high school education as the level of education refers to those student nurses who had pass their grade 12 and enrolled into the nursing colleges without furthering their education level at other places of higher learning (DoH Health Files, 2009).
Figure 4.6 Position held by respondents

Figure 4.6 below shows the position held by respondents. The position held distribution had a sample of 120 nurses with 106 responding to the questionnaires, it comprises of 29.25% (N = 31) p nurses, 24.53% (n = 26) student nurses, 17.92% (n = 19) nurses, 9.43% (n = 10) enrolled nurses, 9.43% (n = 10) managers or supervisors, 3.77% (n = 4) nurse assistant, 2.83% (N = 3) health care giver and 2.83% (n = 3) are staff nurse.

The position held distribution shows that the student are the second biggest group within the Victoria hospital, this support what has been discussed before, the resolution the department of health has adopted to employee as many people as possible to counter act the shortage of nursing within the health care system in this country. It is the most critical form of intervention that can be employed in solving the problem. Others have also suggested that the department should also look at rehiring the retired professionals as quick fix, short solution to deal with this problem (DoH, 2007).
Figure 4.7 Tenure

Figure 4.7 shows the number of years spent by the respondents serving the organization. It can be viewed that the majority of the respondents (n = 41 or 38.68%) fall in the 0-5 years and 28 respondents (26.42%) fall in 26-30 years. Fifteen respondents (14.15%) fall in the 6-10 years while 8 respondents (7.55%) fall in the 11-15 years. The smallest number of respondents (n = 7 or 6.6%) fall in the 21-25 years’ service group and 6 respondents (5.66%) fall in the 16-20 years of experience. Only one respondent (0.94%) falls in the 31-35 years in service category.

4.4.1 INFERENTIAL STATISTICS

The inferential statistics were used for hypotheses testing. The Pearson correlation coefficients were used to test all the proposed relationships between the variables; perceived organizational support, job engagement and organizational citizenship behavior.
4.4.1.1 Cronbach’s alpha of job engagement

Variables which were measuring job engagement had an acceptable reliability coefficient hence this measure was reliable. The reliability of the variables ranged from 0.77 to 0.81.

4.4.1.2 Cronbach’s alpha for organizational citizenship behaviour

The instrument which was used to measure organizational citizenship behavior is reliable. Variables have an acceptable reliability coefficient which ranges ranged from 0.70 to 0.81.
### 4.4.1.3 Cronbach's alpha for organizational support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deleted Variable</th>
<th>Raw Variables</th>
<th>Standardized Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation with Total</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY_CONTRI</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFORT</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLAIN</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEL_BEIN</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTICE</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATISFAC</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCERN</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOMPLI</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above it shows that all the demographics variables had no significant correlations with organizational support, job engagement and organisational citizenship behaviour. Hence in this study demographics did not have an effect on the study variable.
5. HYPOTHESIS TESTING WITH PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

| Pearson Correlation Coefficients | Prob > |r| under H0: Rho=0 |
|---------------------------------|--------|------------------|
| Number of Observations          |        |                  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENT</th>
<th>CITIZENSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGAGEMENT</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CITIZENSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITIZENSHIP</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENT</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLEASE NOTE**

**H**₁ - alternative hypothesis

**H**₀ - null hypothesis

5.1 HYPOTHESIS 1

**H**₁: there is a positive relationship between perceived organisational support and organisational citizenship behaviour.

**H**₀: there is no relationship between perceived organisational support and organisational citizenship behaviour.

The findings of the study demonstrated that there is no significant correlation between perceived organizational support and organisational citizenship behaviour (r=-0.08; p=0.45).

The correlation shows that there is no relationship between perceived organisational support and organisational citizenship behaviour. Hence the null hypothesis is favored over the alternative hypothesis.
5.2 HYPOTHESIS 2

H₁: there is a relationship between job engagement and organisational citizenship behaviour.

H₀: there is no relationship between job engagement and organisational citizenship behaviour.

The result of the study indicated that job engagement was highly significantly and positively correlated with organizational citizenship behaviour (r=0.39; p=<.01) showing that job engagement significantly affect organisational citizenship behaviour. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis.

5.3 HYPOTHESIS 3

H₁: there is relationship between perceived organisational support and job engagement.

H₀: there is no relationship between perceived organisational support and job engagement.

The findings of the study demonstrated that there is no significant correlation between perceived organisational support and job engagement (r=0.02; p=0.85). The correlation shows that there is no relationship between perceived organisational support and job engagement. Hence the null hypothesis is not rejected.

5.4 HYPOTHESIS 4

H₁: There is a combined effect of perceived organisational support and job engagement on organisational citizenship behaviour.

H₀: There is no combined effect of perceived organisational support and job engagement on organisational citizenship behaviour.

Another reason that might explain results for hypothesis other than what was found in hypotheses one and two which were contrasting results with the one being accepted and the other one being rejected whilst they were both predicting positive relationship between variables is that it is sometimes very difficult to establish a combine effect of more than variable on another variable. The reason is that how the researcher might be able to apportion each variable’s influence when it is a combination of the two variables. Therefore that would pose a serious challenge in terms of how those portions for each variable can be established.

The following table (table 4.1) will give a summary of the descriptive analysis that used to test the proposed hypotheses. As mentioned in the previous sections that both descriptive and inferential statistical methods were used to do the analysis. The following table provides an illustration of that process.
The following table (table 4.1) is the summary statistics for all the variables, these include descriptive statistics; mean, median, mode, and standard deviation. This is for perceived organisational support, job engagement, and organisational citizenship behavior.

In terms of the results observed from the table 4.1, organizational citizenship behavior has the highest mean score followed by perceived organizational support and then job engagement. This agrees with researcher’s assertions that there should be a relationship between the independent variables (POS and JE) and the depended variable, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The fact OCB has the highest mean amongst the three variables might be contributed to the fact that an employee experiencing either one of the two will result in that employee getting involved in OCB activities.

Therefore, the nurses at the Victoria hospital experiences high levels of organizational citizenship behavior. This again is agreement with some of the hypotheses that study had predicted which were either accepted or not accepted. The high levels of OCB experienced by the nurses were in line with jobs that they do. The unsatisfactory working conditions, shortage of qualified and professional nurses requires those that are within the system to do more than what is required of them.

The following table (table 4.2) also gives summary of descriptive statistical analysis for this study. The summary includes the p-values for the three variables, mean squares, and f-values which came from frequencies of the different variables.
TABLE 4.2 A Summary of descriptive statistics for the three variables

The table shows that there is no combined effect of perceived organizational support and job engagement on organizational citizenship behavior ($f=1.63; p=0.17$). Therefore if organizational support and job engagement are combined they do not have an effect on organizational behavior in this study.

6. CONCLUSION OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter dealt with statistical methods and techniques that the researcher must use in the analysis of the gathered data. There were two statistical methods that were used, namely descriptive and inferential statistical methods. The descriptive methods looked the distribution side and presented the results in graphical manner. The inferential methods were used mainly for testing the hypotheses and the predicted relationships between the variables.

Chapter four also looked the internal consistency issues for the measuring instruments and the discussion on some of the graphical information and the results thereof.

The results from the chapter were a mix bag with predicted hypotheses between variables being accepted or not expected. The positive relationship between perceived organizational support (POS) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) was not accepted, whilst the predicted positive relationship between job engagement (JE) and organizational citizenship was accepted. The other two hypotheses, positive relationship between POS and JE, and combined effect of both POS and JE on OCB were also not accepted.
The following chapter (Chapter five) will look at in depth discussion of results and findings from the analysis results in this chapter. The last part of the next chapter will be about the researcher’s recommendations that the researcher will make based on the results from the current chapter. The study recommendations are a detailed list of what plan of action that must be undertaken to try and remedy the situation at hand. These recommendations that the researcher will make will be based on the observed results. As research is about providing answer to questions that were asked, provides solutions to existing problems. It is then appropriate that the last part of the research process should be about providing advice as to what actions that must be taken to fix the problem. The following recommendations will look at leaders within the health care system and what plan of action they need to adopt so that they fix the existing problems.
CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS, RESULTS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter five (5) of this study is about the discussion of the results and the findings of the study. The previous chapter (chapter 4) explained the statistical methods that the researcher needed to use to analyse the data was collected during the process of data gathering. From the discussion of the results and findings, the study will suggest the reasons as to why some the proposed relationships in the hypotheses were either accepted or rejected. Also looked at in this chapter are both the strengths and limitations of the study. The last section will look at the recommendations that will be suggested by the researcher of the study owing to the the results and findings of the study and also the conclusion.

The researcher had proposed that perceived organisational support and job engagement had an effect on organisational citizenship behaviour amongst employees (In this case, nurses within the nursing profession). The two independent variables, perceived organisational support and job engagement were predicted to have a positive effect, hence the proposed relationship that they have with the dependent variable, organisational citizenship behaviour.

The perceived organisational support (POS) was defined as employees’ perception about how much the employer values their contributions and general care about their well-being (Eisenberger, 1986). On the other hand, Isaks(2001, p. 67) defined job engagement(JE) as the honing of employees into the work roles to get them performing better in their jobs to increase organisational effectiveness and efficiency, whilst organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) was defined as behaviors by employees that were totally voluntarily done therefore not enforceable nor rewarded yet were necessary to increase organisational efficiency (Organ, 1990).

Other hypotheses that were tested in terms of relationships that exist between these variables were first, the direct relationship between perceived organisational support and job engagement. The second relationship to be tested was the combined effect of both the perceived organisational support and job engagement on the organisational citizenship behaviour.

The results of testing of all the relationships and hypotheses that were mentioned earlier will be presented in the following of this discussion. From the discussion of results, the next section will look at the recommendations, and then from the recommendations, the researcher
will discuss the strengths and limitations of the study. The last part of the chapter will be about the researcher’s conclusion of the chapter and also the study itself.

5.2 RESULTS AND FINDINGS DISCUSSED

In this section, the results and the findings are discussed from the analysis chapter, chapters three and four had outlined the scientific methods to be followed when these Hypotheses and relationships between variables were tested, hence delineating all other methods available. Four hypotheses were examined. The first hypotheses examined the relationship between perceived organisational support (POS) and organisational citizenship behaviour; it followed that the employees having good perceptions about their employers and views their employers as being generally caring about their well-being will, that type of attitude will influence their organisational citizenship in a positive way.

Therefore, there was a positive relationship between these two variables in that the independent variable (POS) had a positive influence on the dependent variable (OCB). As much as the research done on the two variable is still on the infancy stages, studies conducted on the international level had always shown and agreed with the assertion that perceived organisational support has an positive influence on organisational citizenship behaviour (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2001).

The chief researcher of perceived organisational support, Eisenberger in his literature of the this variable in many of his studies, had always linked this construct with positive results when it to work related behaviour terms like job satisfaction, job commitment, involvement and all other terms associated with the feel good factors that an employee has about the organisation and the job that one does. Job satisfaction has been seen as the end product of employee involvement, engagement and commitment (Rhoades, Eisenberger & Armeli, 2001). Therefore, hypotheses one (1) proposed that employees with the right level of POS will be positively affected by that, hence engage in activities that were outside the scope of their job and job requirements. These OCB activities are neither rewarded nor enforceable, yet they are important for the functioning of the organisation.

This notion was based on the principle of “reciprocity”. This means that if employees perceive that the employer values their contributions and their general well-being is cared for, they feel obliged to replicate the gesture on the part of the employer by rewarding him or her with good performances. This reciprocity principle is based on the “social exchange theory”
by Eisenberger in 1986. It stated that parties in social exchange transaction were obliged to reciprocate each other actions as long as the terms and conditions of social exchange were still in operation. Therefore, this principle guided behaviour of employees in situations like these. That is why it is to be expected that the relationship between perceived organisational support and organisational citizenship behaviour would be a positive one.

H1 had proposed that there is a positive relationship between perceived organisational support and organisational citizenship behaviour, this proposition was rejected. The results of this study, after expansive testing of hypothesis showed clearly that there was no established positive relationship between the variables that is perceived organisational support and organisational citizenship behaviour \((r=-0.08;p=0.45)\). This was in contradiction to what previous studies have found and what the literature was suggesting.

The fact that these were the end results in terms of testing this relationship was not a bad thing in terms of research practices. There been studies conducted before where the proposed relationships between variables were found to not exist. This should be clear indication that scientifically proven processes were followed hence the results. As what could be the reasons for more especially when it comes to this study, that will be discussed in next sections. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected for this hypothesis, which proposed no positive relation between the two variables.

The second hypotheses proposed that there was a positive between job engagement (JE) and organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB). Therefore this meant that an employee who is engaged in their jobs will translate that engagement into getting involved in activities that are outside their job requirements, OCB activities which are necessary for effective functioning of the organisation. These hypotheses proposed therefore, that there was a positive relationship between the two variables, job engagement and organisational citizenship behaviour. The job engagement construct with job satisfaction as one of positive results centred around its three pillars, authority, job design and both job enlargement and job enrichment (Isaks, 2002). It followed that people experiencing job engagement will result in those employees experiencing a significant increase in job satisfaction, leading to them engaging in organisational citizenship behaviour activities. Therefore, the researcher of the study predicted a positive relationship between these two variables.
The results of the study accepted the alternative hypotheses confirming what the researcher had predicted in his/her hypotheses (r=0.39; p=<.01). This was to indicate and confirm that there is significant effect of employee engagement and with the right level of engagement; this can lead to an employee engaging in organisational citizenship behaviour activities to help the organisation function in a better way. The research also done before in this area had supported the researcher’s prediction about the positive relationship between job engagement and organisational citizenship behaviour; this is clearly illustrated in the literature about this variable by one of the principal researchers of this construct, Isaks in one of his studies of employee engagement (Isaks, 2002).

The last two hypotheses that were predicted and tested by the researcher were also rejected. They proposed that, first; there is a positive relationship between the two independent variables; perceived organisational support (POS) and job engagement (JE). According to the studied literature, it had supported the positive relationship between POS and JE (Rhoades, Eisenberger & Armeli, 2001). The results of the study clearly rejected the alternative hypotheses, hence accepting the null hypotheses (r=0.02039; p=0.8454). Therefore, the proposed positive relationship between perceived organisational citizenship and job engagement does not exist.

Secondly, it was hypothesised that the two independent variables; perceived organisational support (POS) and job engagement (JE) have a combined, positive effect on the dependent variable, organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB). This was based on the premise of the third hypotheses that proposed a direct and positive relationship between the two independent variables. This was rejected, hence this hypotheses has been rejected by the data analysis results in this study. The results clearly shows no combined effect of both POS and JE on OCB (f=1.63; p=0.17).

The following is an illustration using a table format in illustrating the hypotheses testing in trying to establish which of the proposed relationships did exist. With the help of table format demonstration, it can determine which of those tested relationships were accepted and which were rejected after the data analysis process. For hypothesis testing, the Pearson correlation coefficients were used. For all the hypothesis that were proposed and the relationships that were tested between the three variables, a sample of 120 nurses was put together from a total
population +200 nurses who work at the Victoria hospital, in Alice within the Nkonkobe municipality.

The sample was representative of all the dynamics of the nurses who worked at the Victoria hospital, from different race groups, both genders, those with little or no experience at all, to those who have work within the nursing profession for more than two decades. There were also nurses who were doubling as care givers and also as administrators owing to the amount of time they have been in the profession and also the experience they have gained while working.
5.3 HYPOTHESIS TESTING WITH PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

| Pearson Correlation Coefficients | Prob > |r| under H0: Rho=0 | Number of Observations |
|----------------------------------|---------|------------------|------------------------|
|                                  | SUPPORT | ENGAGEMENT       | CITIZENSHIP            |
| SUPPORT                          |         |                  |                        |
| 0.01                             | 0.02    | -0.08            | 94                     |
| 1.01                             | 0.85    | 0.45             | 97                     |
| ENGAGEMENT                       |         |                  |                        |
| 0.02                             | 0.01    | 0.39             | <.01                   |
| 0.85                             | 0.98    |                 | 95                     |
| 94                               |         |                  |                        |
| CITIZENSHIP                       |         |                  |                        |
| -0.08                            | 0.39    | 0.01             | 95                     |
| 0.45                             | <.01    |                 |                        |
| 97                               | 1.02    |                 |                        |

The next section of this chapter will discuss possible reasons as to why some of those predicted were either accepted or rejected when data analysis was done. The discussion would be centred on the current studies. This means that the discussion will look at what possible reasons relating to the nursing that might cause some of these relationships to not exist.

5.4 DISCUSSION OF REASONS FOR WHY SUCH FINDINGS, THESE RELATING TO THE CURRENT STUDY

The South African health care system has been characterised by shortages of professional and qualified nurses (Wildschut & Mqolozana, 2008, p. 45). They went on to list the following as other challenges that within the nursing profession; difficult working conditions, low wages, and scarcity of resources and equipment more especially within the public service. This is so within public hospitals because new political situation that prevails within the country.
Prior to 1994 before the new democratic dispensation, not too many people had access to public institution due apartheid laws that were in place at the time. After 1994, a huge number have to be provided for within the health care system. This puts and continues to put pressure on the health care system in this country, at times the pressure is so big on the scarce resources that the system is on the brink of collapse (The Department of Health, 2007).

Against that background, it is then clear that the environment under which the nurses work, more especially those that work within the public hospitals, is not conducive and ideal for positive working conditions. It is against this background that the proposed positive relationship the perceived organisational support (POS) and organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB). The reason might be that the employees have negative perceptions about the employer owing to the prevailing working condition, leading to a negative relationship between POS and OCB. Another reason for this negative relationship between the two variables might be that in South Africa, there is high unemployment and chances of finding employment are very low, hence people will take what is available to them, not because they love doing it (The South African health journal, 2003). Another reason which might also contribute to these hypotheses being rejected was also discussed in the above section. The stressful working conditions, low wages and scarcity of resources are many reason the negative relationship between the two variables.

Dolvo (2004, p. 49) also stated that formidable challenge that South African health care has to tackle is the migration of professionally qualified nurses to other countries in search of greener pastures. The low pay and unsatisfactory working conditions are attributed to this exodus of nurses to places in the world. Therefore this means that when employees are brought in to the organisation, have no intention of staying for long. The chance for positive relationship to develop between perceived organisational support and organisational support is very little.

The second hypotheses which predicted a positive relationship between perceived organisational support (POS) and job engagement (JE) was accepted as being a relationship that exist between these two variables. Within the context of current study, this can be that when people get to the organisation, they take time and eventually will settle down. This can be attributed to many factors. The following factors can lead to people staying within the
organisation for a long time; job enlargement and enrichment, job redesign, favourable working environment, organisational rewards and incentives (Isaks, 2003).

Dolvo (2004, p. 57) stated that department of health in trying to attract and entice doctors and nurses to go work in rural areas where their services were mostly needed. The department of health offered an additional allowance for those who had agreed to work in those conditions. The South African law requires employers to provide to employees who work in dangerous conditions protective gear to protect themselves against dangerous elements within the environment, and on top of that they are provided for with extra incentives to continue doing the dangerous job. For an example there is uniform allowance given to people who required to were protective gear all time when they are doing their job and in the area of work (DoH, 2007).

It is against this background that a positive relationship between the perceived organisational support and job engagement can be predicted. Eisenberger (2001, p. 667) defines perceived organisational support as employee perceptions about how much their contributions are valued by the employer and how well he/she cares about their general well-being. On the other hand, Organ (2002, p. 78) defines organisational citizenship behaviour as those behaviors that are not part of the formal job requirements, done at the discretion of the employee, they are not enforceable and not rewarded, but are important for effective functioning of the organisation. Isaks (2003, p. 67) stated that with right combination of factors that exist within the job environment, the may lead to an employee staying with the organisation, hence the positive relation between POS and OCB.

All the above discussed factors might contribute to the negative relationship between the three variables. The next section of this chapter will look the recommendations at how to best improve the situation within this area of research.

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS

The national government and the department of health at the national level under the then minister of health, Dr S. Bhengu announced twelve (12) years ago that they would expand their bilateral relationship with the island state of Cuba (DoH, 2001). Within the terms of the agreement, it was agreed that between the two countries, there would be an exchange program of nurses and doctors.
This meant some South African aspiring medical students would be sent to Havana for medical training and some the Cuban doctors would be allowed to work in this country and be given incentives (DoH, 2001). This was done to try to curb the desperate shortages of professional qualified medical practitioners in this country. This was one in a many attempts by the national government in trying solving this problem within our health care system. There have been other attempts that had put in place in trying tom solve this pervasive problem within our health care system. The following is the list of recommendations that the department of health needs to look at in trying to solve this problem;

- As much there has been a concentrated effort on employing more student and training them so that can be able to work within the health care sector, the feeling and statistics suggests that the intake is not even near to balancing the numbers in terms of what is the demand for health professionals, this is a national intervention when in it comes issues. Therefore more people should be into the system for the problem of nurse shortages to become something of the past.

- Another intervention at national level is to curb the migration of skilled health professionals going to work in other countries, the department of health needs to look at both its rewards and incentive structures and compare these with what market related. Then they should offer competitive reward packages so that they can be able to retain the skills that they already have at their disposal and also attract people from outside.

- Another intervention at national level would that the department should look at its retention strategy. Identify its weak points and try improving those weak links. If not that, try to overhaul the entire structure and come up with a new one.

- When it comes to problems relating to the current study, problems relating to perceived organisational support, job engagement and organisational citizenship, the following are the suggested recommendations;

- Key for the employer to get these processes working in his favour is the environment in which the employees work in. Therefore, it is of critical importance that the organisation tries to create an atmosphere that is conducive to work under. This can be achieved by creating a relaxed and less hostile environment that is accommodating and empowering to all employees (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2003).
The employer has to been to be carrying about his/her employees. This can done through investing on employees. There are many ways in which an employee can invest in his labour force, from training and retraining to develop their capacity hence giving fair chance on career progression within or outside the organisation.

Another intervention would to redesign employee’s jobs and create new spans of control. Part of the reason why people might be leaving the organisation might come down to how their jobs are structured. Three concepts are critical when it comes to this area, first job structure, secondly task variety and lastly the discretion given to the job holder. This part of the intervention speaks to the three variables.

The reward and incentive structures have already been discussed in the above section but they are also very important to getting employees believing in the employer and sharing the organisation’s overall objectives.

Another solution that is critical in situations like these which has been discussed also is that investment in employees and the issue of retention strategies that the organisation has adopted is very important in terms of its effectiveness.

Another intervention that department that look at whilst it is the process of training people to be able to work within the health care system, would be to rehire the retired professionals who have skills and the know-how on short term basis. These people might be given short time contracts renewable on annual basis. This would provide short term solution till those student nurses ready to provide services to the ill people more especial in public hospitals.

5.6 THE LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

When it comes to limitations of this study, the following were identified by the researcher;

First, the scope of what was covered under the study was concentrated to the three variables that were discussed. As per guidelines of acceptable research practices, a researcher is always advised at the beginning of the process to identify the area of focus (Wellman et al, 2005, p. 65). Therefore sometimes this might work against what other areas of interest that the researcher would have wanted to examine.

Another limitation for this study is geographical dimensions that it covered, the researcher instead of focusing of an individual hospitals, it would have been to look at hospitals in the entire province of the Eastern Cape. They would have provided a bigger population with more varied sample and opinions.
Another limitation of this study, unlike in other areas where literature is available in larger quantities because of many studies that have been conducted before, in this area the research is still at the early stages, hence not much literature is available. This can put the researcher in terms where to generate information as to make informed and objective observations.

Another disadvantage of conducting research is that they are time based; a study must be finished within a certain amount. This is owed to stringent deadlines that the researcher must comply with. Another reason why the time factor is important is that the environment in which the study is being conducted under continuously changes. Therefore time frames were long accepted as part of research for studies not lose their credibility and validity.

Lastly, the issue if resources needed to conduct the study, for example the financial resources. Financial resources the most detrimental factor when it comes to the success or failure of the study. Therefore, the researcher must make that adequate financial resources available and put in place so that it is possible to conduct the study.

5.7 CONCLUSION OF THE CHAPTER

Chapter provided discussion on the results and finding from the data analysis process. These were results in relation to the hypotheses that were tested in terms the relationships that were between the three variables. From the discussion about the findings to the recommendations that were from the results that were provided from the data analysis process. The results from that analysis clearly indicated that there was no relationship between perceived organisational support and organisational citizenship behavior.

The results also showed that there was no combined positive effect of perceived organisational citizenship and job engagement on organisational citizenship behavior. They also confirm no direct relationship between perceived organisational citizenship behavior and job engagement.

The only positive relationship that was confirmed was between job engagement and organisational citizenship behavior. From the recommendations, the strengths and limitations of the study were outlined.
5.8 RESEARCHER’S CONCLUDING REMARKS CONCERNING THE WHOLE STUDY

The main objectives of the study was to examine the effect of perceived organisational support (POS) and job engagement (JE), the two independent variables in the study on organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB), the dependent variable among nurses at the Victoria hospital, in Alice, a small town in the Nkonkobe municipality within the province of the Eastern cape in the republic of South African.

The basis for the hypotheses was that there was a positive relationship between the independent variables (POS & JE) and dependent variable (OCB). This meant that both POS and JE have a positive effect on OCB, a change in both the independent variables would lead to a positive change in the dependent variable.

The results of the tested hypotheses and relationships between the variables were either accepted or rejected. The positive relationship between the perceived organisational and organisational citizenship that was predicted was rejected after the data analysis. On the other hand, the positive relationship between job engagement and organisational citizenship behaviour was accepted after data analysis. The last two hypothesis about the direct relationship between POS and JE was not accepted, whilst the combined effect of perceived organisational and job engagement on organisational citizenship behaviour was also not accepted. There was no significant between the two independent variables, it was also found that there was no combined effect or significant relationship for both perceived organisational support (POS) and job engagement (JE) on organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB).

The end results for some of the variables after data analysis process were either supporting or contradicting the literature of these variables. The chief researcher of perceived organisational support, Eisenberger (1986-2002) in his literature of this construct suggested a positive relationship between perceived organisational support and organisational citizenship. This was rejected by the findings of the study, the positive relationship between job engagement and organisational behaviour was accepted which Isaks (2003) predicted.

In relation to the current study, the reasons as why some the results came out the way they did were given. This was in relation to prevailing conditions and the environment that the nurses work under. In previous discussions, reasons were given that might have those
relationships either being accepted or not accepted. The last part looked at what plan of action the research results suggested to be taken to better improve the health sector in South Africa, more especial the public sector hospitals that deal with large of poor people who depend on public hospital health services.
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APPENDIX A: THE RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

DEAR RESPONDENT,

My name is Dumisani Mathumbu. I am a Masters student in the Department of Industrial Psychology at the University of Fort Hare. Currently, I am conducting a study on nurses within the health care system, more especially within the public sector in terms of organisational support, the job itself and what activities they are involved in that go beyond the call of duty. It would be greatly appreciated if you kindly complete the following questions as honestly as possible. Honest completion will assist in generating information that will help your organisation to improve its overall performance. Please note that the information being asked for is purely for academic purposes and will be kept strictly confidential. Hence, your name and that of your organisation are not required. Thank you in advance.

Yours faithfully,

Dumisani Mathumbu.

Contact details:

E-mail: dmathumbu@yahoo.com
        200704113@ufh.ac.za

Cellphone: 0838939739
Section A: Biographical information

Please fill in your biographical information below.

Age group: (please tick the appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 20</th>
<th>20-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51-60</th>
<th>60 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Gender:  Male [ ]  Female [ ]

Marital status: Married [ ]  Never married [ ]  Divorced [ ]  Widowed [ ]

Race:  Black [ ]  Coloured [ ]  White [ ]  Other (state) [ ]

Education level: Primary school [ ]  High school [ ]  Certificate [ ]

Diploma [ ]  Degree [ ]

What position do you hold in your organisation? .................................................

How long have you worked for your current organisation? ........................................

Section B: Perceived Organisational Support

Indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements by marking with an X in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. The organization values my contribution to its well-being.

2. The organization fails to appreciate any extra effort from me

3. The organization would ignore any complaint from me.

4. The organization really cares about my well-being.

5. Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice.
6. The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work.

7. The organization shows very little concern for me.

8. The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.

---

**Section C: Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Italian Version)**

Indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements by marking with an X in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>At my work, I feel bursting with energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>At my job, I feel strong and vigorous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I am enthusiastic about my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My job inspires me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I feel happy when I am working intensely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I am proud of the work that I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I am immersed in my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I get carried away when I am working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section D: Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Measuring Scale

Indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements by marking with an X in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I manage to help other workers when they are in need’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I work to exceed the role requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I work with a ‘can do’ attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I treat my co-workers with respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I work with a sense of responsibility for our success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX B: THE MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM SAMPLE SCORES FOR BIOGRAPHICAL VARIABLES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tenure</th>
<th>N Obs</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.2562500</td>
<td>0.6392291</td>
<td>3.0000000</td>
<td>6.5000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.1520468</td>
<td>0.4780264</td>
<td>3.2222222</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.6105263</td>
<td>0.4285674</td>
<td>4.0000000</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.2767857</td>
<td>0.5238967</td>
<td>3.8750000</td>
<td>5.6250000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.3888889</td>
<td>0.5627736</td>
<td>3.1111111</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.8428571</td>
<td>0.2953858</td>
<td>4.2000000</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9821429</td>
<td>0.5702182</td>
<td>2.8750000</td>
<td>4.6250000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2777778</td>
<td>0.4323758</td>
<td>3.6666667</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3500000</td>
<td>0.4242641</td>
<td>4.0000000</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2250000</td>
<td>0.2236068</td>
<td>4.0000000</td>
<td>4.5000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2444444</td>
<td>0.6731169</td>
<td>3.5555556</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8000000</td>
<td>0.2828427</td>
<td>4.4000000</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.8750000</td>
<td>0.5153882</td>
<td>3.2500000</td>
<td>4.5000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1481481</td>
<td>0.4851710</td>
<td>3.4444444</td>
<td>4.6666667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.8857143</td>
<td>0.1573592</td>
<td>4.6000000</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.2500000</td>
<td>0.8772293</td>
<td>1.3750000</td>
<td>5.6250000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.2083333</td>
<td>0.3990226</td>
<td>3.1111111</td>
<td>4.8888889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.5629630</td>
<td>0.4836942</td>
<td>3.4000000</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.7500000</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>4.7500000</td>
<td>4.7500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3333333</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2.3333333</td>
<td>2.3333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0000000</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>4.0000000</td>
<td>4.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos_held</td>
<td>N Obs</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.2631579</td>
<td>0.4980774</td>
<td>3.2500000</td>
<td>5.1250000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.9766082</td>
<td>0.6924826</td>
<td>2.3333333</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.6111111</td>
<td>0.4027682</td>
<td>4.0000000</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3000000</td>
<td>0.7245688</td>
<td>3.5000000</td>
<td>5.7500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2716049</td>
<td>0.3932733</td>
<td>3.7777778</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.5600000</td>
<td>0.4402020</td>
<td>4.0000000</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.2413793</td>
<td>0.6689302</td>
<td>2.8750000</td>
<td>6.5000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.2260536</td>
<td>0.5164684</td>
<td>3.1111111</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.6370370</td>
<td>0.4001424</td>
<td>4.0000000</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2500000</td>
<td>1.2788341</td>
<td>1.3750000</td>
<td>4.2500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0555556</td>
<td>0.1111111</td>
<td>4.0000000</td>
<td>4.2222222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4500000</td>
<td>0.5259911</td>
<td>4.0000000</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.3125000</td>
<td>0.6229132</td>
<td>3.5000000</td>
<td>5.6250000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.2645503</td>
<td>0.4352893</td>
<td>3.1111111</td>
<td>4.8888889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.5920000</td>
<td>0.5081994</td>
<td>3.4000000</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9166667</td>
<td>0.3608439</td>
<td>3.5000000</td>
<td>4.1250000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5000000</td>
<td>0.2357023</td>
<td>4.3333333</td>
<td>4.6666667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
<td>0.0000000</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.2500000</td>
<td>0.6588078</td>
<td>3.2500000</td>
<td>5.6250000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2962963</td>
<td>0.4906534</td>
<td>3.5555556</td>
<td>4.7777778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.8000000</td>
<td>0.3265986</td>
<td>4.0000000</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0625000</td>
<td>0.0883883</td>
<td>4.0000000</td>
<td>4.1250000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2962963</td>
<td>0.1697250</td>
<td>4.1111111</td>
<td>4.4444444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6000000</td>
<td>0.5291503</td>
<td>4.0000000</td>
<td>5.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC_LV</td>
<td>N Obs</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.15104</td>
<td>0.50939</td>
<td>3.250000</td>
<td>5.250000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.12121</td>
<td>0.45349</td>
<td>3.111111</td>
<td>4.888888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.66923</td>
<td>0.46283</td>
<td>3.400000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.50939</td>
<td>0.45349</td>
<td>0.46283</td>
<td>0.46283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.37867</td>
<td>0.64438</td>
<td>3.625000</td>
<td>5.750000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.31986</td>
<td>0.48967</td>
<td>3.222222</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.63636</td>
<td>0.42265</td>
<td>3.600000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.64438</td>
<td>0.48967</td>
<td>0.42265</td>
<td>0.42265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.12500</td>
<td>0.82474</td>
<td>1.375000</td>
<td>6.500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.11447</td>
<td>0.54112</td>
<td>2.333333</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.56875</td>
<td>0.43436</td>
<td>4.000000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.82474</td>
<td>0.54112</td>
<td>0.43436</td>
<td>0.43436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.08750</td>
<td>0.45280</td>
<td>3.250000</td>
<td>4.875000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.23611</td>
<td>0.59224</td>
<td>3.555555</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.73333</td>
<td>0.34641</td>
<td>4.000000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.73333</td>
<td>0.34641</td>
<td>4.000000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.45280</td>
<td>0.59224</td>
<td>0.34641</td>
<td>0.34641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>N Obs</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.20646</td>
<td>0.67999</td>
<td>1.375000</td>
<td>6.500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.50827</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.17113</td>
<td>0.43966</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.400000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.61797</td>
<td>0.43966</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.43966</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.28750</td>
<td>0.53699</td>
<td>3.625000</td>
<td>5.625000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.48112</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.666666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.44444</td>
<td>0.31101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.31101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.31101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL</td>
<td>N Obs</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2462</td>
<td>0.63155</td>
<td>2.875000</td>
<td>5.750000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.04204</td>
<td>0.56251</td>
<td>2.333333</td>
<td>4.888888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.64324</td>
<td>0.39478</td>
<td>4.000000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.25520</td>
<td>0.71874</td>
<td>1.375000</td>
<td>6.500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.32575</td>
<td>0.44146</td>
<td>3.555555</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.69387</td>
<td>0.43989</td>
<td>3.400000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.01562</td>
<td>0.64930</td>
<td>3.000000</td>
<td>5.375000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.08333</td>
<td>0.50307</td>
<td>3.111111</td>
<td>4.555555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.28571</td>
<td>0.39761</td>
<td>3.800000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.95833</td>
<td>0.43060</td>
<td>3.250000</td>
<td>4.500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.33333</td>
<td>0.46259</td>
<td>3.555555</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.48571</td>
<td>0.42983</td>
<td>4.000000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDE R</td>
<td>N Obs</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.26190</td>
<td>0.52277</td>
<td>3.250000</td>
<td>5.375000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.26984</td>
<td>0.53928</td>
<td>3.111111</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.58181</td>
<td>0.48563</td>
<td>3.400000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.49566</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.20192</td>
<td>0.70083</td>
<td>1.375000</td>
<td>6.500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.17629</td>
<td>0.50294</td>
<td>2.333333</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.64615</td>
<td>0.41268</td>
<td>3.600000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.49566</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>N Obs</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.22727</td>
<td>0.36579</td>
<td>3.625000</td>
<td>4.750000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35555</td>
<td>0.40504</td>
<td>3.888888</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.66666</td>
<td>0.54160</td>
<td>3.400000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00625</td>
<td>0.76999</td>
<td>1.375000</td>
<td>5.125000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.02923</td>
<td>0.49806</td>
<td>3.111111</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>690000</td>
<td>0.36977</td>
<td>3.800000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.26000</td>
<td>0.71436</td>
<td>3.500000</td>
<td>6.500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.39613</td>
<td>0.42879</td>
<td>3.777777</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.67826</td>
<td>0.43375</td>
<td>3.600000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.25431</td>
<td>0.68910</td>
<td>2.875000</td>
<td>5.750000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.15555</td>
<td>0.47284</td>
<td>3.222222</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.49333</td>
<td>0.42583</td>
<td>4.000000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>N Observations</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.33928</td>
<td>0.55562</td>
<td>3.250000</td>
<td>5.250000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.07142</td>
<td>0.69266</td>
<td>2.333333</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.07142</td>
<td>0.69266</td>
<td>2.333333</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.73333</td>
<td>0.38297</td>
<td>4.000000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.73333</td>
<td>0.38297</td>
<td>4.000000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.73333</td>
<td>0.38297</td>
<td>4.000000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>