

Investigating relationship between Authentic Leadership, trust & job engagement (case study: Social Security Organization in Tehran)

GholamReza RashediManesh

Masters student of Executive Management, Payam Noor University, Tehran-Iran
rashedimanesh@gmail.com

Abstract

Job engagement as one of welfare dimension states a positive & active feeling which is recognized by high performance & interest & honor. In the other words, it is related to a promoting psychological & humanistic aim as well as because of its strong impressionability from leadership style & healthy organizational atmosphere in this research relationship between Authentic Leadership, trust & job engagement have been investigated. Therefore, field study has been done through providing questionnaire & its distribution among 263 of experts of Tehran Social Security Organization. Collected data has been analyzed by using SPSS software. Results have indicated there is a strong relationship between Authentic Leadership& trust with job engagement of employees in the organization.

Keywords: *Consciousness, relationship Transparency, moral aspects, Authentic Leadership, job engagement& creativity.*

Introduction

Leadership has been a focal point and debate among many scholars and practitioners (such as Caruso, Mayer & Salovey, 2001; Fineman, 2003; George, 2000; Goleman, 2004). What leaders ought to and should do and what leaders can in practice do, to get the performance and results for which they aim, eludes many experts (AlHashemi, 1987). In general, leadership can be described as the process of directing a group of people or followers in order to attain the goals (Northouse, 2010:12). Leadership, like many other concepts, is affected by the rapid change we experience in our world. It is inevitable for leaders to change and to have different views than before especially when globalization affects nearly every aspect of our lives; when the environmental change is deeply felt at all organizational levels; when innovation stands out and when effective and efficient use of information and human resource has strategic importance. From this aspect, the relationship between leaders and followers is getting more complex since it is important for organizations to benefit from knowledge, skill and talent of its employees. However, because of the reasons described, leadership cannot be limited to just affecting and directing people only. On the other hand the term employee engagement has gained popularity over the past twenty years. Advocated positive outcomes of employee engagement make organizations develop the culture of engagement at work as a priority for organization. Although much is written on the subject of employee engagement, little is known about the engagement of administrative workers at the educational organizations. For educational organizations, it is important to engage administrative workers, as they are the ones who have a significant influence on the tone, manner and style of the entire institution and quality of their day-to-day performance contributes to the quality of the relationships with faculties, students and the public (Scott, 1978 as referenced in Johnsrud and Rosser, 1999). Engagement is most closely associated with the existing construction of job involvement (Brown 1996) and flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Job involvement is defined as ‘the degree to which the job situation is central to the person and his or her identity (Lawler & Hall, 1970). Kanungo (1982) maintained that job involvement is a ‘Cognitive or belief state of Psychological identification. Job involvement is thought to depend on both need saliency and the potential of a job to satisfy these needs. Thus job involvement results from a cognitive judgment about the needs satisfying abilities of the job. Jobs in this view are tied to one’s self image. Engagement differs from job in as it is concerned more with how the

individual employees his/her self during the performance of his / her job. Furthermore engagement entails the active use of emotions. Finally engagement may be thought of as an antecedent to job involvement in that individuals who experience deep engagement in their roles should come to identify with their jobs. Engagement is important for managers to cultivate given that disengagement or alienation is central to the problem of workers' lack of commitment and motivation (Aktouf). Meaningless work is often associated with apathy and detachment from ones works (Thomas and Velthouse). In such conditions, individuals are thought to be estranged from their selves (Seeman, 1972) .Other Research using a different resource of engagement (involvement and enthusiasm) has linked it to such variables as employee turnover, customer satisfaction – loyalty, safety and to a lesser degree, productivity and profitability criteria (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002). The present study investigates the relationship between primal leadership, confidence and enthusiasm for the job pays.

Literature Review

Primal leadership:

Primal leadership realizing the power of emotional the emotional reality and cultural norms realizing the power of emotional intelligence. Primal leadership: realizing the power of emotional intelligence by daniel goleman, annie mckee and richard e. boyatzis (2002, hardcover). Primal Leadership means to “prime good feelings in those we lead”. That means to create resonance, which is a “reservoir of positivity that frees the best in people”. Learning to Lead with Emotional Intelligence describes through stories and anecdotes how a leader can do just that – build up one’s own emotional intelligence to be able to not only gain positive effects for yourself at home, or with friends but also gain positive results at work. So the primal job of leadership as suggested by Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002) is emotional.

Employee engagement:

To date, there is no single and generally accepted definition for the term employee engagement. This is evident if one looks at the definitions forwarded for the term by three well-known research organizations in human resource area, let alone individual researchers. Below are the definitions: Perrin’s Global Workforce Study (2003) uses the definition “employees’ willingness and ability to help their company succeed, largely by providing discretionary effort on a

sustainable basis.” According to the study, engagement is affected by many factors which involve both emotional and rational factors relating to work and the overall work experience. Gallup organization defines employee engagement as the involvement with and enthusiasm for work. Gallup as cited by Dernovsek (2008) likens employee engagement to a positive employees’ emotional attachment and employees’ commitment. Robinson et al. (2004) define employee engagement as “a positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its value. An engaged employee is aware of business context, and works with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization. The organization must work to develop and nurture engagement, which requires a two-way relationship between employer and employee.” This verdict and definition forwarded by Institute of Employment Studies gives a clear insight that employee engagement is the result of two-way relationship between employer and employee pointing out that there are things to be done by both sides. Furthermore, Fernandez (2007) shows the distinction between job satisfaction, the well-known construct in management, and engagement contending that employee satisfaction is not the same as employee engagement and since managers cannot rely on employee satisfaction to help retain the best and the brightest, employee engagement becomes a critical concept. Other researchers take job satisfaction as a part of engagement, but it can merely reflect a superficial, transactional relationship that is only as good as the organization’s last round of perks and bonuses; Engagement is about passion and commitment-the willingness to invest oneself and expand one’s discretionary effort to help the employer succeed, which is beyond simple satisfaction with the employment arrangement or basic loyalty to the employer (BlessingWhite, 2008; Erickson, 2005; Macey and Schnieder, 2008). Therefore, the full engagement equation is obtained by aligning maximum job satisfaction and maximum job contribution. Stephen Young, the executive director of Towers Perrin, also distinguishes between job satisfaction and engagement contending that only engagement (not satisfaction) is the strongest predictor of organizational performance (Human Resources, 2007).

Organizational Trust:

Organizational Trust: “The global evaluation of an organization’s trustworthiness as perceived by the employee. Organizational trust is defined as an employee’s feeling of confidence that the

organization will perform actions that are beneficial, or at least not detrimental, to him or her” (Tan & Tan, 2000, p. 243).

Trust is an essential source of social capital within social systems (Fukuyama, 1996) and, therefore, a pivotal element of societal functioning. Viewing trust through the lens of social capital has produced three main streams of analysis that have important implications for organizations. These three streams examined how trust as a form of social capital was related to reducing transaction costs within organizations, increasing spontaneous sociability among organizational members, and facilitating appropriate forms of deference to organizational authorities.

Trust refers to the belief of workers to the organization leaders that the main actions of organization would benefit workers. Organizational trust will directly affect the amount of their contribution to the organization in terms of performance, intention to persist in the organization, as well as their behavior (Robinson, 1996). Mishra and Morrissey (1990) state that organizational trust requires open communication, sharing of information, greater employee’s involvement in decision-making. Many studies have shown that the decreasing level of confidence is associated with the declined communication and increased conflict. Gilbert & Tang (1998) finds a strong positive relationship between organizational trust and organizational commitment and job satisfaction. There are five dimensions in organizational trust according to Mishra, (1998), they are: competence is the extent to which individuals perceive the capacity and capability possessed by the organization. The organization is effective, able to survive and be competitive. Openness and honesty are the extent to which the suitability and accuracy of information communicated by the organization. Concern for employees is a sense of concern, empathy, member tolerance, sense of security when workers do their activities. Reliability is the extent to which co-workers consistency, working team or organization leaders in acting that can be relied upon. In other words, we can rely on them to do what they say. Identification is the extent to which a similarity of purpose and the workers confidence upon norms, values and confidence associated with organizations.

Methodology

The method of research, applied research is based on objective and based on the method of data collection is descriptive survey. Accordingly, the aspects and issues of the relationship between authentic leadership, confidence and job engagement as well as similar studies conducted on the subject investigated, and then using field studies, attempted to explain the assumptions in accordance with title the aim will be investigated.

Hypothesis

- There is significant positive relationship between Primal leadership and Employee engagement.
- There is significant positive relationship between Primal leadership and Organizational Trust.
- There is significant positive relationship between Organizational Trust and Employee engagement.

Finding

In this section will test hypotheses using Pearson correlation coefficient. The correlation coefficient intensity of the relationship and the type of relationship (direct or inverse) shows. This index is between -1 to 1 and the absence of a relationship between two variables is zero. The test is based on the following assumptions to determine the relationship between two variables deals. Hypothesis (H0): There is a significant correlation between the two variables.

Assume (H1): There is a significant correlation between the two variables.

How to judge the presence or absence of a significant relationship between the levels achieved pays for. Thus, if the test sig is smaller than 05/0 H0 is rejected and there is a significant correlation between the two variables.

Table 1) How to judge the value of the correlation coefficient

the amount of	How to arbitration
25 / -0 0	Direct correlation weak
5 / 0- 25/0	Direct correlation - a relatively strong
75 / 0- 5/0	Direct correlation severe
1. 75/0	Direct correlation is very strong
0	There is no correlation
25 / 0- - 0	Inverse correlation - weak

5 / -0 - 25 / 0-	Inverse correlation -moderately severe
75 / 0- - 5 / -0	Inverse correlation - Extreme
1 - 75 / 0-	Inverse correlation - extreme

The results of hypotheses using Pearson correlation test are shown in the following table:

Table 2) output Pearson correlation coefficient

Primal leadership	Employee engagement	Organizational Trust		
.702(**)	.696(**)	1	Pearson Correlation	Organizational Trust
.000	.000		Sig. (2-tailed)	
263	263	263	N	
.531(**)	1	.696(**)	Pearson Correlation	Employee engagement
.000		.000	Sig. (2-tailed)	
263	263	263	N	
1	.531(**)	.702(**)	Pearson Correlation	Primal leadership
	.000	.000	Sig. (2-tailed)	
263	263	263	N	

According to Table 1, as is seen, sig test all variables equal to (0.00) which is the lower amount (05/0) is. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H0) of no statistical relationship between authentic leadership, confidence and job engagement occurs rejected. So there is a significant correlation between the two variables. So hypothesis accepted in throughput. On the other hand, according to the correlation coefficient equal to (0.617) is the intervals of this amount (0.75 to 0.5) are a direct correlation between these variables strongly with each other.

Discussion & Conclusion

Results in accordance with done researches about Authentic Leadership have confirmed its positive consequences in workplace & have considered it effective on improvement of job engagement level in organizations.

Effects of Authentic Leadership on job engagement have been confirmed through studies of Avolio et al (2004) on Authentic Leadership since he states that Authentic Leadership has important role on improvement of employees' identity & results in development of their positive

capacity such as hope, optimism & having positive attitude to job. Also, Walumbwa et.al (2010) has confirmed that a psychological process links Authentic Leadership to behaviors of followers. This can play the role of mediator for job engagement in improving performance. This can protect from the role of job engagement in improving creative performance. Liz et.al (2005) has indicated that authentic leader will result in favored consequences for employees through creating happiness & welfare. This research has specifically indicated despite positive & significant effect of Authentic Leadership on job engagement but this effect has been more on trust to job engagement. On the other words, it has been observed that employees' trust has important effect on job engagement.

Therefore, Authentic Leadership can be effective in improving job engagement in the organization through confidence-building. Also, results have indicated that Authentic Leadership & creativity in under-study organization is in average & partly good level & job engagement is in good level. Research population as one of the famous firms in the field of providing public services in Iran needs essentially to create a good atmosphere in terms of job engagement & good & trustable place in order to pass away from its competitors, keep its market share & survive in the market. As it has mentioned before behavioral pattern of Authentic Leadership as the root of all new leadership styles & the most comprehensive & most applicable theories can be the key for most of organizational problems & result in positive consequences in workplace. So, leaders must try to enforce features of this behavioral pattern to use its advantages.

References:

- Caruso, D.R., Mayer, J.D., & Salovey, P. (2001) Emotional intelligence and emotional leadership. In: Riggio, R. & Murphy S. (eds) Multiple Intelligences and Leadership, Hillsdale, New Jersey, USA, Erlbaum.
- Fineman, S. (2001) Emotions and Organizational Control, In: Payne R.L. & Cooper C.L. (eds) Emotions at Work, Theory, Research and Applications for Management, Chichester, UK, John Wiley & Sons, pp.219-237.

George, Bill & Sims, Peter (2007). True North: Discover Your Authentic Leadership, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Goleman, D. (1996) Emotional Intelligence: Why it Can Matter More Than IQ, London, UK, Bloomsbury Publishing

AlHashemi, I.S.J. (1987). The application of Western management to the development of a management education programme in Bahrain. Thesis (PhD). Sheffield Hallam University, vol.1, vol 2, vol 3.

Northouse, Peter Guy. Leadership: Theory and Practice, 5th ed. USA: Sage Publications Inc., 2010.

Rosser V.J., 2000. Midlevel Administrators: What We Know. New Directions for Higher Education, 111, pp. 5-13.

Human Resources. (2007). Research: Employee engagement ROI-rules of engagement [Online] Available: <http://global.factiva.com/ha/default.aspx>. (October 28, 2008)

Blessing White. (2006). Employee Engagement Report 2006 BlessingWhite, Inc. Princeton, New Jersey. [Online] Available: www.blessingwhite.com (November 15, 2008)

Macey W.H and Schneider B. (2008). The Meaning of Employee Engagement. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1 (2008), 3-30.