

An Assessment of Positive Organizational Behavior in Service Sector of Pakistan: Role of Organization Based Self-Esteem and Global Self-Esteem

¹Wafa Khurram, ²Kamariah Bte Ismail, ¹Syed Khurram Ali Jafri and ²Khairiah Soehod

¹Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia

²Department of Management, Faculty of Management and Human Resource Management, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia

Abstract: This study is an attempt to investigate prevalence of positive organizational behavior in the organizations in the service sector of Pakistan. We tested effects of organization based self-esteem, role stressors (role conflict, role overload and role ambiguity), leader-member exchange and perceived organizational support on positive organizational behavior as well as mediation of organization-based-self-esteem in this regard. Moreover, moderation of global self-esteem was also estimated in relationship between organization based self-esteem and positive organizational behavior. Data from 250 respondents from three service sectors of Pakistan (bank, hotel and education) was collected through mail survey and using stratified random sampling technique. Data analysis on the usable 215 questionnaires was made by using hierarchical multiple regression. Significant direct and indirect results through mediation of organization based self-esteem were found only for leader-member exchange, perceived organizational support and role ambiguity. Nevertheless, global self-esteem was not found to moderate the relationship of organization base self-esteem and positive organizational behavior. Implications and future research recommendations are also given.

Keywords: Global self-esteem, leader-member exchange, organization-based-self-esteem, perceived organizational support, positive organizational behavior

INTRODUCTION

Since its evolution, positive psychology has been emphasizing on the need to focus on the strengths of individuals for better performance results than pondering over weaknesses and ways to fix them (Seligman, 1999; Luthans, 2002a, b). Significance of incorporating positive psychology in organizational behavior studies to improve employees' performance through management and measurement of their strengths has been recognized lately (Luthans, 2002a, b; Luthans, 2003). Luthans and Youssef (2007) explained Self-efficacy, Hope, Optimism and Resiliency as four key psychological resource capacities that make the best fit for the inclusion criteria for Positive Organizational Behavior resulting in enhancement of the managing effectiveness and organizational performance. However, among these four constructs, self-efficacy is proven to have the most intense effect on incorporating Positive Organizational Behavior (Bandura, 1997) and performance (Stajkovic and Luthans, 1998) and meeting the Positive Organizational Behavior criteria essentially (Luthans, 2002a, b). Studies suggest that the several forces arising self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982) are similar to arising and affecting self-esteem as well (Franks and Marolla, 1976; Korman, 1970, 1971, 1976; Brockner, 1988).

Studies from Luthans (2002a, b) also demonstrate the positive self-efficacy as a state; unlike the general self-efficacy-a trait that is steady over time; explaining its elasticity in conversion through training and development. In this regard self-efficacy is similar to the organization based self-esteem which is also a state and domain specific. Studies reveal that in the organizational framework, OBSE is considered to be a better tool for measuring organizational performance and behavior (Tharenou, 1979; Epstein, 1979; Pierce *et al.*, 1989). OBSE has also been verified theoretically and empirically to have a positive relationship with the individual's behavior towards the organization. With the impact of role stressors, Perceived Organizational support and Leader member exchange Low OBSE has been found to produce more antagonistic behavior in the employees, thus aggravating their performances and hindering them to postulate a more positive organizational behavior (Ferris *et al.*, 2009). Though, this deviant behavior is an expected response, but some individuals are also seen to behave positively towards organization even in the presence of low OBSE (Ferris *et al.*, 2009). So the relationship of OBSE and POB does not seem to be that simple. There may be many other factors affecting this relationship.

The moderation approach to self-esteem explains it as an attitude of an individual to draw upon all the existing socio-emotional resources (Global self-esteem)

to deal with low support that leads to low OBSE. Moreover, the plasticity hypothesis by Brockner (1983) explains that people with high self-esteem are less likely to be influenced by the incidents at workplace. Global self-esteem has been used as moderator to stress-strain relationship (Jex and Elacqua, 1999), stress-performance relationship (Mossholder *et al.*, 1981, 1982), stress- health relationship (Kuiper and Olinger, 1989; Ganster and Schaubroeck, 1991). However, very little research has been done in determining the relationship of both general and domain specific dimensions of self-esteem with the positive organizational studies. Hence, taking the viability of employees' organization based self-esteem and global self-esteem in depicting their behaviors at workplace and dearth of knowledge about the effect of their relationship among employees from Pakistani organizations specifically, this study contends to focus on following objectives:

- Provide the empirical proof of positive relationship between OBSE and Positive Organizational Behavior (POB).
- Assess relationship of leader-member exchange, perceived organizational support and role stressors with Positive organizational behavior.
- Evaluate the mediating effects of organizational based self-esteem in POB's relationship with LMX, POS and Role stressors.
- Test the moderating effect of global self-esteem in relationship between OBSE and POB.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Positive organizational behavior is a more modern, promising and practical approach to focus on people's strengths and psychological capabilities. The concept actually started gaining acceptance after the proactive psychology movement when Seligman (1999), President American Psychological Association realized a dire need of shifting the long-established mindset of researchers to investigating the *wrongs* in the individual and organizational level to rights significantly. Later on work by Luthans (2002a, b; 2003) emphasized more on this aspect of organization behavior. Positive organizational behavior is defined as "the study and application of positively oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed and effectively managed for performance improvement in today's workplace" (Luthans, 2003). Wright (2003) shed light on emphasizing more on seeking for issues of employee happiness, health and betterment than just for their functional-based aspect. According to this concept, all the issues focused to employee betterment (social and Psychological) ultimately ends in to productive organizational behaviors and performances (Brockner, 1988; Pierce *et al.*, 1989; Kuiper and Olinger, 1989; Pierce *et al.*, 1993; Tafarodi and Swann, 1995; Carson

et al., 1997; Jex and Elacqua, 1999; Pierce and Gardner, 2004 ;).

The construct of Positive Organizational behavior is based on four pillars of self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience. Empirical studies from Stajkovic and Luthans meta-analysis (1998) showed 28% increase in workplace performance due to self-efficacy, thus supporting the importance of this particular construct of positive organizational behavior. Studies from Luthans (2002a, b) also demonstrates the positive self-efficacy as a state; unlike the general self-efficacy-a trait, that is steady over time; explaining its elasticity in conversion through training and development. In this regard self-efficacy is similar to the organization based self-esteem which is also a state and domain specific. Positive Self-efficacy describes the perception of an employee for his/her level of competence across a variety of tasks (Bandura, 1982). Rosenberg (1979) also provided the self-esteem scale with self-confidence (self-efficacy) and self-deprecation as two main components.

Self-esteem has been conceptualized to have different levels of specificity that makes it a trait-global self-esteem and a state-Task or Domain specific self-esteem (Simpson and Boyle, 1975). A more versatile construct of self-esteem is given by different scholars focusing on its social, physical, academic, vocational and moral dimensions (Korman, 1966; Korman, 1970; Shavelson *et al.*, 1976, Pierce and Gardner, 2004).

Specifying the concept of self-esteem to its domain specificity Pierce *et al.* (1989) introduced the Organization Based Self Esteem (OBSE). It is defined as the degree to which an individual believes him/herself to be competent, considerable and valuable as an organization member (Pierce and Gardner, 2004). From literature it has been proven that OBSE is positively related to performance and behavior towards an organization. Individuals signifying high OBSE tend to be less passive in their behavior, more healthful and positive contributor to the organization than their low OBSE counterparts (Hall, 1972; Brockner, 1988; Campbell, 1990; Kinicki and Latack, 1990; Pierce *et al.*, 1993; Jex and Elacqua, 1999). Having ample support from the literature for its powerful impact on behavior and performance it is proposed that:

H1: OBSE has a positive relation with positive organizational behavior

Baumierster (1999) and Brookover *et al.* (1964) found roots of self-esteem from interpersonal relationships and organizational culture in terms of supportiveness, trusting relationships and leader-member relationship. The most effective determinants of Individual's self-esteem at workplace i.e., OBSE, are found to be role stressors (role conflict, role ambiguity and role overload), Leader-Member exchange (LMX) and positive organizational Support (POS) (Hall, 1972; Mossholder *et al.*, 1981, 1982; Kuiper and Olinger, 1989; Ganster and Schaubroeck, 1991; Pierce *et al.*,

1993; Jex and Elacqua, 1999; Crocker and Park, 2004; Williams, 2007).

Job related role stressors are proven to have immensely related to job performance and organizational behavior. The three most known and effective job stressors are Role conflict, Role Ambiguity and Role Overload (Hall, 1972; Jackson and Schuler, 1985; Bacharach *et al.*, 1990; King and King, 1990; Jex and Beehr, 1991; Hecht, 2001; Koustelios *et al.*, 2004; Pearson, 2008).

According to Baron (1986), Role Conflict (RC) occurs when task given/expected to be done to an individual by his family or organizational members is in incongruity to his/her abilities. The organizational stress literature demonstrates the significant effect of role conflict on performance and behavior (Hall, 1972; Jackson and Schuler, 1985; Jex and Beehr, 1991; King and King, 1990; Koustelios *et al.*, 2004). It is defined as the employees' improbability about his job to be performed and its behavioral expectations (Baron, 1986). Along with role conflict, Role Ambiguity (RA) has also been noticed to influence the employee behavior (Ram *et al.*, 2011) and OBSE strongly (Mossholder *et al.*, 1981, 1982; Jex and Beehr, 1991; Koustelios *et al.*, 2004; Shahbaz and Shakeel, 2013).

Role Overload (RO) is defined as the stress on an individual when he/she has to perform tons of tasks in accordance to meet the anticipated criteria in inadequate time period (Coverman, 1989; Pearlman, 1989; Hecht, 2001). This job stressor is also noticed to have considerable influence on the employee's conduct towards an organization (Bacharach *et al.*, 1990; Hecht, 2001; Pearson, 2008)

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) is a dyadic relationship referring to the quality of the interpersonal relationship of a leader and his/her followers (Gerstner and Day, 1997). LMX theory is different from theory of leadership in terms of focusing more on the interpersonal relationship of leader and member than just concentrating on the personality of the leader (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995; Ferris *et al.*, 2009). LMX has been proven to have a considerable effect on individual's "in-group" performance and behavior towards organization as a whole (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995; Davis and Gardner, 2004; Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). Support is considered to be an important issue to perform better within the organization. Perceived Organizational Support (POS) is defined as the employee's conviction regarding the degree to which an organization and its members rate the employee's well-being (Eisenberger *et al.*, 1986; Ferris *et al.*, 2009). POS is strongly linked with the respect for organization (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002; Davis and Gardner, 2004). Lack of support results in lowering individuals' moral in terms of his/identity, integrity and competency (Aquino and Douglas, 2003; Ferris *et al.*, 2009).

H2: Role stressors (RC, RO and RA) are negatively related to Positive Organizational Behavior (POB)

H3: LMX and POS are positively related to Positive Organizational Behavior (POB)

Organizational based self-esteem has numerously been taken for building up relation between employees' performance and factors affecting it. Most of the times it is taken as a moderator to relationships between stress-strain (Jex and Elacqua, 1999), Stress-performance (Mossholder *et al.*, 1981, 1982), Stress-health (Kuiper and Olinger, 1989; Ganster and Schaubroeck, 1991) and as mediator to the relationship between Organization support and Organization Deviance (Ferris *et al.*, 2009).

Ferris *et al.* (2009) in their studies on determining the effects of organizational based self-esteem on organizational deviance found that the factors of LMX and POS had a negative relation with passive organizational behavior mediated by OBSE (Ferris *et al.*, 2009). As LMX and POS are significantly related to positive organizational outcomes generally and in support of the studies by Ferris *et al.* (2009) we hereby propose:

H4a: OBSE mediates the relationship of Role Stressors (RC, RO and RA) with POB

H4b: OBSE mediates the relationship of LMX and POS with POB

From the literature, various perspectives of Global self-esteem and OBSE are found to be affecting the prevalence of positive organizational behavior (Ferris *et al.*, 2009). Though most of the research is done on identifying the weaknesses of the individuals in organizational context and fixing them up, the concept of focusing more on their strengths to improve and enhance their effectiveness, efficiency and healthiness is up-and-coming profoundly (Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Luthans, 2002a, b, 2003; Luthans and Youssef, 2007). Both constructs of self-esteem are measured to view their shared and individual effect on the performance behavior and outcomes (Brockner, 1988; Pierce *et al.*, 1989; Kuiper and Olinger, 1989; Pierce *et al.*, 1993; Tafarodi and Swann, 1995; Carson *et al.*, 1997; Jex and Elacqua, 1999; Pierce and Gardner, 2004). Organizational Based Self-Esteem and global self-esteem have also been proven by Jex and Elacqua (1999) to mediate each other's effects on the performance.

Though both OBSE and Global self-esteem are found to have an impact on behavioral outcomes of individuals, yet, we see that both cannot serve as replacement for one another (Marsh, 1986) and controlling the effects of global self esteem wipes out the effects of OBSE (Jex and Elacqua, 1999).




Fig. 1: Hypothesized model

Regardless of the fact that global self-esteem is proven to be a strong moderator to performance relationships for its trait and more stable nature, there is hardly any theoretical or empirical evidence of its moderating relationship to Positive organizational behavior and OBSE. Global self-esteem is referred to as individual's positive or negative attitude towards his/herself (Rosenberg *et al.*, 1995) and the extent and nature of one's self-views regarding degree of importance and certainty (Pelham and Swann, 1989). Though, after the emergence of OBSE concept most of the organizational behavior and performance based research is focused on OBSE, yet the importance of global self-esteem as a moderator to this relationship cannot be ignored (Jex and Elacqua, 1999). Literature supports global self-esteem as a strong moderator to stress-performance relationships (Hall, 1972; Kinicki and Latack, 1990; Rosenberg *et al.*, 1995; Jex and Elacqua, 1999). We also see from research by Jex and Elacqua (1999) that both OBSE and Global self esteem mediate each others' effect on organizational behavior and performance. According to self-enhancement theory, both low and high self-esteem individuals have basic need to augment their level of self-esteem (Dipboye, 1977; Sedikides *et al.*, 2003; Pierce and Gardner, 2004; Ferris *et al.*, 2009). This illustrates that though individuals with low OBSE tend to behave passively, some may execute positive behavior towards their organization too (Fig. 1).

H5: Global Self-Esteem (GSE) moderates the relation between OBSE and positive organizational behavior.

METHODOLOGY

Procedure: The Stratified Random Sampling was used to collect data from the organizations in three different service sectors of Lahore city i.e., Banks, Education and Hotel. The target sample for this study was 250 respondents. The questionnaire was developed using

validated scales of the variables involved in the model. The data was collected by using mail survey method and follow-up visits. From 250 respondents (employees) in the organizations under study, 35 questionnaires were discarded due to improper and incomplete answers to the questions, making 86% response rate. Finally the analysis was made by linear regression for the data of 215 respondents using SPSS 17.0.

Participants: Among the 215 respondents, 100 respondents from Banking Sector consisting of 12 respondents from Top management, 42 from Middle management and 46 from lower management. Got 75 respondents from Hotel Industry with 25 respondents each from 3 levels of managerial hierarchy. From Education sector we got 40 respondents where 9 were from Top management, 11 from middle management and 20 from Lower management.

Measures: The survey instrument consisted of two sections. Section A was designed to get information about the demographic profile of the respondents regarding their age, education, experience and gender and management level. Section B comprised of total 59 items related to all variables under study, to obtain descriptive data from the respondents. All ratings were made using validated scales and on 5-Likert's Scale (1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree) except for Leader-Member Exchange where 5-Likert's Scale rated from (1 = Rarely and 5 = Very Often). The reliability of data was checked through Cronbach's Alpha reliability test ($\alpha.831$).

Independent variables: OBSE: 10- item scale by Pierce *et al.* (1989) was used. For role conflict, 5-item scale by Rizzo *et al.* (1970) was used. For role ambiguity, 4-item scale by Rizzo *et al.* (1970) was used. For role overload, 3-item scale by Bacharach *et al.* (1990) was used. For LMX, 5-item scale by Graen

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of demographic variables (n = 215)

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
20-30	105	48.8
31-45	73	34.0
Above 45	37	17.2
Gender		
Male	182	84.7
Female	33	15.3
Education		
Secondary	18	8.4
Intermediate	13	6.0
Bachelors	76	35.3
Masters	101	47.0
Others	7	3.3
Experience (in Yrs.)		
Less than 5	91	42.3
5-10	54	25.1
11-15	30	14.0
16-20	12	5.6
Above 20	28	13.0
Management level		
Top management	46	21.4
Middle management	71	36.3
Lower management	91	42.3
Organization		
Bank	100	46.5
Education	40	18.6
Hotel	75	34.9

RESULTS

Results of descriptive studies regarding demographic variables (Table 1) illustrated that most of the respondents were male (182, 84.7%), of age between 20-30 (105, 48.8%) and with masters as their highest qualification (101, 47%). Regarding experience and management level, most of the managers had less than 5 years of experience (42.3%) and were from lower management (42.3%) followed by second highest as middle managers (36.3%).

Correlation Matrix (Table 2) showed that all the roles stressors were negatively correlated with POB yet only RA (-0.190**) and RO (-0.461**) had significant correlation with POB. RC had insignificant correlation with all variables except RA (0.180**), POS (-0.226**) and GSE (-0.185**). Highest significant correlation was found between OBSE and POB (0.626**). Nevertheless all variables were significantly correlated to GSE.

To test the hypotheses, hierarchical multiple regression was used (Table 3). First of all the direct relationship of OBSE and POB was checked. Results showed significant positive relationship ($\beta = 0.626, p = 0.000$), therefore H-1 was supported. In Model-2, results for direct relationship of RO, RA, RC, LMX and POS with POB showed that predictors contributed to 46.9% variance ($Adj.R^2 = 0.469$) in POB. The F change (36.876) was also significant, however only RA ($\beta = -0.277^*$), LMX ($\beta = 0.325^*$) and POS ($\beta = 0.310^*$) were significantly related to POB. Hence H-2 was partially supported and H-3 was fully supported. In Model-3, OBSE showed significant mediation ($p = 0.000$) for the

et al. (1982) was used. For POS, 5-item scale by Eisenberger *et al.* (1986) was used.

Dependant variable: 18-item PCQ scale by Luthans *et al.* (2007a, b) was used to measure Positive organizational behavior.

Moderating variable: To measure Global self-esteem, Rosenberg's (1965) 9-item scale was used.

Table 2: Correlation matrix

Correlations		RS	RO	RA	POS	IMX	OBSE	GSE	POB
RC	Pearson correlation	1	0.180**	0.003	-0.226**	-0.052	0.018	-0.185**	-0.111
	Sig. (1-tailed)		0.004	0.482	0.000	0.223	0.394	0.003	0.052
	N	215	215	215	215	215	215	215	215
RO	Pearson correlation	0.180**	1	0.0173**	-0.298**	0.180**	-0.095	-0.158*	-0.190**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.004		0.005	0.000	0.004	0.082	0.010	0.003
	N	215	215	215	215	215	215	215	215
RA	Pearson correlation	0.003	0.173**	1	-0.284**	-0.300**	-0.491**	-0.230**	-0.461**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.482	0.005		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	215	215	215	215	215	215	215	215
POS	Pearson correlation	-0.226**	-0.298**	-0.284**	1	0.495**	0.491**	0.459**	0.552**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	215	215	215	215	215	215	215	215
IMX	Pearson correlation	-0.052	-0.180**	-0.300**	0.495**	1	0.467**	0.266**	0.561**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.223	0.004	0.000	0.000		0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	215	215	215	215	215	215	215	215
OBSE	Pearson correlation	0.018	-0.095	-0.491**	0.491**	0.467**	1	0.368**	0.626**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.394	0.082	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000	0.000
	N	215	215	215	215	215	215	215	215
GSE	Pearson correlation	-0.185**	-0.158*	-0.230**	0.459**	0.266**		1	0.420**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.003	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000
	N	215	215	215	215	215	215	215	215
POB	Pearson correlation	-0.111	-0.190**	-0.461**	0.552**	0.561**	0.626**	0.420**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.052	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
	N	215	215	215	215	215	215	215	215

** : Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed); * : Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)

Table 3: Results for hierarchical multiple regression analysis

Dependent variable	Model-1	Model-2	Model-3	Model-4
Predictors	POB	POB	POB	POB
OBSE	0.626*			
RC		-0.026	-0.055	-0.055
RO		0.014	-0.015	-0.015
RA		-0.277*	-0.164*	-0.164*
POS		0.310*	0.202*	0.202*
LMX		0.325*	0.253*	0.253*
OBSE (Mediation)			0.328*	0.329
OBSE*GSE (Interaction)				0.000
R ²	0.392	0.482	0.544	0.544
R ² Change		0.090*	0.062*	0.000
F Change	137.617*	38.876*	28.132*	0.000
P-Value	0.000*	0.000*	0.000*	0.994

relationship of POB with RA ($\beta = -0.164^*$), LMX ($\beta = 0.253^*$) and POS ($\beta = 0.202^*$). So H4a was partially supported and H4b was fully supported. For moderation of GSE, first of all the centering and standardization of OBSE and GSE was done to make interaction term OBSE*GSE. In Model-4, this interaction term was used in the regression analysis of moderation. The F Change (0.994) and R² Change (0.000) was insignificant, hence rejecting H-5.

DISCUSSION

Literature highlights gap of research carried out on the assessing positive psychology at workplace in developing countries like Pakistan (Ismail *et al.*, 2011). Most of the earlier studies in assessing employees' behaviors are made to focus on fixing up the weaknesses and problems related to employees and their behavior towards organization (Seligman, 1999; Luthans, 2002a, 2002b, 2003).

This particular study especially meant for introducing POB in Pakistani organizations, is a step forward in all efforts made to divert the attention of researchers to more positive aspects of employee s' behaviors, traits and their strengths in order to enhance positive organizational behavior (Brockner, 1988; Pierce *et al.*, 1989; Kuiper and Olinger, 1989; Pierce *et al.*, 1993; Tafarodi and Swann, 1995; Carson *et al.*, 1997; Jex and Elacqua, 1999; Pierce and Gardner, 2004). For this purpose we measured the effects of the most powerful predictor for self-esteem in the organizational domain on reflecting positive organizational behavior. Moreover, in the light of distant literature on determinants of organizational based self-esteem, we used Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity, Role Overload, LMX and POS to assess their influence on OBSE and POB. Our hypothesis regarding these variables showed that OBSE, LMX and POS were positively related to Positive organizational behavior hence supporting the earlier studies made on influence of these predictors on employees' organizational behaviors (Ferris *et al.*, 2009; Ismail *et al.*, 2011). However, only one role stressor (role ambiguity) was found to be related to positive organizational behavior of the employees showing that

in Pakistani organizations generally employees' behaviors are significantly affected by unclear job roles role (Ram *et al.*, 2011) which also effects their self-esteem at work place (Shahbaz and Shakeel, 2013).

Employees' depiction of elevated organizational performance and behavior even in the presence of unfavorable conditions like low OBSE , LMX and POS (Ferris *et al.*, 2009) the role of global self-esteem was ensued and evaluated as a moderator. Our results however did not show any significant results for moderating effects of global self-esteem in relationship between OBSE and POB. This was inconsistent to what we predicted, however, showed congruence with argument of previous study that the moderation and buffering effects of self-esteem in relationship of role stressors and organizational performance is not straightforward. It is often affected by *self-esteem contingencies'* like importance that an individual give to performance level when his/her self-esteem is low (Ferris *et al.*, 2010).

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATION

The present study has a number of strengths. First of all this is the novel attempt made to empirically test the relationship between OBSE of employees and their Positive Organizational Behavior. Moreover, we have included the maximum number of the variables (LMX, POS, Role Stressors) that could have strong effect on POB as the variables chosen were the most effective variables for determining OBSE (Jackson and Schuler, 1985; Jex and Beehr, 1991; King and King, 1990; Hall, 1972; Koustelios *et al.*, 2004; Bedeian and Armenakis, 1981; Bacharach *et al.*, 1990; Hecht, 2001; Pearson, 2008; Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995; Ferris *et al.*, 2009; Davis and Gardner, 2004; Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005; Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002; Davis and Gardner, 2004).

We used validated scales for the development of our questionnaire to avoid any discrepancies and false results for our data collected. Moreover, the data was collected from three different service sectors, Banking, Hotel and Education. This gave us a more detailed result for service sectors of Pakistan.

This study has some limitations as well. The organizations selected for the study was from the Lahore city only which limits the generalization of our results to whole population of Pakistan. Moreover, to test the more valid and actual result of effect of OBSE on POB the effect of LMX, POS and Role Stressors should have been controlled as they also had a proven effect on OBSE which can influence the direct effects.

FUTURE RESEARCH SUGGESTIONS

Our study is an attempt to provide a foothold for future research on the most up and coming theory of positive psychology in organizational behavior. Future research can focus on investigating main and interactive

effects of self-esteem contingencies related to traits of employees. In this respect, employees' self-defeating behavior (Renn *et al.*, 2005; Thau *et al.*, 2007) and self-efficacy (Azar and Vasudeva, 2006; Lunenburg, 2011) can prove to be strong potential variables to self-esteem levels of employees at work place. Nevertheless, future studies can see the moderating effects of two distinct dimensions of global self-esteem-self-liking (based on social reflections) and self-competency (based on domain specificity)-as they both have distinct antecedents and effects (Tafarodi and Swann, 1995).

CONCLUSION

The present study provides evidence for positive relation of organization based-self-esteem with positive organizational behavior. It also signifies effects of leader-member exchange, positive organizational support and role ambiguity on OBSE and POB. To nurture positive organizational behavior among employees, organizations in Pakistan are suggested to foster their organization based self-esteem by providing supportive culture and clear job descriptions.

REFERENCES

- Aquino, K. and S. Douglas, 2003. Identity threat and antisocial behavior in organizations: The moderating effects of individual differences, aggressive modeling and hierarchical status. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Dec.*, 90: 195-208.
- Azar, I.A.S. and P. Vasudeva, 2006. Self-efficacy and self-esteem: A comparative study of employed and unemployed married women in Iran. *Ger. J. Psychiat.*, 9: 111-117.
- Bacharach, S., P. Bamberger and S. Conley, 1990. Work processes, role conflict and role overload: The case of nurses and engineers in public sector. *Work Occupations*, 17: 199-288.
- Bandura, A., 1997. *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. Freeman, New York.
- Bandura, A., 1982. The self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *Am. Psychol.*, 37: 122-147.
- Baron, R., 1986. *Behavior in Organizations*. Allyn and Bacon, Newton, MA.
- Baumiester, R.F., 1999. *The Self in Social Psychology*. Psychology Press, Philadelphia.
- Bedeian, A. and A. Armenakis, 1981. A path analytic study of the consequences of role conflict and ambiguity. *Acad. Manage. J.*, 24: 417-424.
- Brockner, J., 1983. Low Self-Esteem and Behavioral Plasticity: Some Implications. In: Wheeler, L. and P.R. Shaver (Eds.), *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*. Ch. 4, Beverly Hills, Sage, CA.
- Brockner, J., 1988. *Self-Esteem at Work: Research, Theory and Practice*. D.C. Health and Co., Lexington, Mass.
- Brookover, W.B., S. Thomas and A. Paterson, 1964. Self-concept of ability of school achievement. *Sociol. Educ.*, 37: 271-278.
- Campbell, J.D., 1990. Self-esteem and clarity of the self-concept. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, 59: 538-549.
- Carson, K.D., P.P. Carson, H. Lanford and C.W. Roe, 1997. The effects of organization-based self-esteem on workplace outcomes: An examination of emergency medical technicians. *Pub. Pers. Manage.*, 26(1): 139-155.
- Coverman, S., 1989. Role overload, role conflict and stress: Addressing the consequences of multiple role demands. *Soc. Forces*, 4: 965-982.
- Crocker, J. and L.E. Park, 2004. The costly pursuit of self-esteem. *Psychol. Bull.*, 130: 392-414.
- Cropanzano, R. and M.S. Mitchell, 2005. Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *J. Manage.*, 31: 874-900.
- Davis, W.D. and W.L. Gardner, 2004. Politics and organizational cynicism: An attribution and leader-member exchange perspective. *Leadership Quart.*, 15: 439-465.
- Dipboye, R.L., 1977. A critical review of Korman's self-consistency theory of work motivation and occupational choice. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Perform.*, 18: 108-126.
- Eisenberger, R., R. Huntington, S. Hutchison and D. Sowa, 1986. Perceived organizational support. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 71: 500-507.
- Epstein, S., 1979. The stability of behavior: On predicting most of the people much on the time. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, 37: 1097-1126.
- Ferris, D.L., D.J. Brown and D. Heller, 2009. Organizational supports and organizational deviance: The mediating role of organization-based self-esteem. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Dec.*, 108: 279-286.
- Ferris, D.L., H. Lian, D.J. Brown, F.X.J. Pang and L.M. Keeping, 2010. Self-esteem and job performance: The moderating role of self-esteem contingencies. *Pers. Psychol.*, 63: 561-593.
- Franks, D.D. and J. Marolla, 1976. Efficacious action and social approval as interacting dimensions of self-esteem: A tentative formulation through construct validation. *Sociometry*, 39: 324-341.
- Ganster, D.C. and J. Schaubroeck, 1991. Work stress and employee health. *J. Manage.*, 17(2): 235-271.
- Gerstner, C.R. and D.V. Day, 1997. Meta-analytical review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 82: 827-844.
- Graen, G.B. and M. Uhl-Bien, 1995. Relationship based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quart.*, 6: 219-247.

- Graen, G.B., M.A. Novak and P. Sommerkamp, 1982. The effects of leader-member exchange and job design on productivity and job satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Perform.*, 30: 109-131.
- Hall, D.T., 1972. A model of coping with role conflict: The role behavior of college educated women. *Admin. Sci. Quart.*, 17: 417-486.
- Hecht, L.M., 2001. Role conflict and role overload: Different concepts, different consequences. *Sociol. Inquiry*, 71(1): 111-121.
- Ismail, K., S.K.A. Jafri and W. Khurram, 2011. An evaluation of positive organizational behavior in banking sector of Pakistan: Role of organization based self-esteem and organizational supports. *Far East J. Psychol. Bus.*, 4(1): 1-16.
- Jackson, S.E. and R.S. Schuler, 1985. A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role ambiguity and role conflict in work settings. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Dec. Process.*, 36: 16-78.
- Jex, S.M. and T.A. Beehr, 1991. Emerging theoretical and methodological issues in the study of work-related stress. *Res. Pers. Hum. Resour. Manage.*, 9: 311-365.
- Jex, S.M. and T.C. Elacqua, 1999. Self-esteem as a moderator: A comparison of global and organization-based measures. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.*, 72: 71-81.
- King, L.A. and D.W. King, 1990. Role conflict and role ambiguity: A critical assessment of construct validity. *Psychol. Bull.*, 107: 48-64.
- Kinicki, A.J. and J.C. Lattack, 1990. Explication of the construct of coping with involuntary job loss. *J. Vocat. Behav.*, 36: 339-390.
- Korman, A.K., 1966. Self-esteem variable in vocational choice. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 50: 479-486.
- Korman, A.K., 1970. Towards an hypothesis of work behavior. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 54: 31-41.
- Korman, A.K., 1971. Organizational achievement, aggression and creativity: Some suggestions toward an integrated theory. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Perform.*, 6(5): 593-613.
- Korman, A.K., 1976. Hypothesis of work behavior revisited and an extension. *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, 1: 50-63.
- Koustelios, A., N. Theodoradis and K. Goulimaris, 2004. Role ambiguity, Role conflict and Job satisfaction among physical education teachers in Greece. *Int. J. Educ. Manage.*, 18: 87.
- Kuiper, N.A. and L.J. Olinger, 1989. Stress and Cognitive Vulnerability for Depression: A Self-Worth Contingency Model. In: Neufeld, R.W. (Ed.), *Advances in the Investigation of Psychological Stress*. Wiley, New York, pp: 367-391.
- Lunenburg, F.C., 2011. Self efficacy in the workplace: Implications for motivation and performance. *Int. J. Manage. Bus. Admin.*, 14(1): 1-6.
- Luthans, F., 2002a. Positive organizational behavior: Developing and maintaining psychological strengths. *Acad. Manage. Exec.*, 16: 57-72.
- Luthans, F., 2002b. The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *J. Organ. Behav.*, 23: 695-706.
- Luthans, F., 2003. Positive Organizational Behavior: Implications for Leadership and HR Development and Motivation. In: Porter, L.W., G.A. Bigley and R.M. Steers (Eds.), *Motivation and work Behavior*. McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York, pp: 178-195.
- Luthans, F. and C.M. Youssef, 2007. Emerging positive organizational behavior. *J. Manage.*, 33(3): 321-349.
- Luthans, F., C.M. Youssef and B.J. Avolio, 2007a. *Psychological Capital*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Luthans, F., B.J. Avolio, J.B. Avey and S.M. Norman, 2007b. Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Pers. Psychol.*, 60: 541-572.
- Marsh, H.W., 1986. Global self-esteem: Its relation to specific facets of self-concept and their importance. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, 51: 1224-1236.
- Mossholder, K.W., A.G. Bedeian and A.A. Armenakis, 1981. Role perceptions, satisfaction and performance: Moderating effects of self-esteem and organizational level. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Perform.*, 28: 224-234.
- Mossholder, K.W., A.G. Bedeian and A.A. Armenakis, 1982. Group process-work outcome relationships: A note on the moderating impact of self-esteem. *Acad. Manage. J.*, 25: 575-585.
- Pearlin, L.I., 1989. The sociological study of stress. *J. Health Soc. Behav.*, 30: 241-256.
- Pearson, Q.M., 2008. Role overload, job satisfaction, leisure satisfaction and psychological health among employed women. *J. Couns. Dev.*, 86(1): 57-64.
- Pelham, B.W. and W.B. Jr. Swann, 1989. From self-conceptions to self-worth: on the sources and structure of Global self-esteem. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, 57: 672-680.
- Pierce, J.L., D.G. Gardner, L.L. Cummings and R.B. Dunham, 1989. Organization-based self-esteem: Construct definition, measurement and validation. *Acad. Manage. J.*, 32: 622-645.
- Pierce, J.L., D.G. Gardner, R.B. Dunham and L.L. Cummings, 1993. The moderating effects of organization-based self-esteem on role condition-employee response relationship. *Acad. Manage. J.*, 36: 271-288.
- Pierce, J.L. and D.G. Gardner, 2004. Self-esteem within the work and organizational context: A review of the organization-based self esteem literature. *J. Manage.*, 30(5): 591-622.
- Ram, N., I. Khoso, A.A. Shah, F.R. Chandio and F.M. Shaikih, 2011. Role conflict and role ambiguity as factors in work stress among managers: A case study of manufacturing sector in Pakistan. *Asian Soc. Sci.*, 7(2): 113-118.

- Renn, R.W., D.G. Allen, D.B. Fedor and W.D. Davis, 2005. The roles of personality and self-defeating behaviors in self-management failure. *J. Manage.*, 31: 659-679.
- Rhoades, L. and R. Eisenberger, 2002. Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 87: 698-714.
- Rizzo, J.R., R.J. House and S.I. Lirtzman, 1970. Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Admin. Sci. Quart.*, 15: 150-63.
- Rosenberg, M., 1965. *Society and Adolescent Self-Image*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Rosenberg, M., 1979. *Conceiving the Self*. Basic Books, New York.
- Rosenberg, M., C. Schooler, C. Schoenbach and F. Rosenberg, 1995. Global self-esteem and specific self-esteem: Different concepts, different outcomes. *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, 60: 141-156.
- Sedikides, C., L. Gaertner and Y. Toguchi, 2003. Pancultural: Self-enhancement. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, 84: 60-97.
- Seligman, M.E.P., 1999. The president's address. *Am. Psychol.*, 54: 559-562.
- Seligman, M.E.P. and M. Csikszentmihalyi, 2000. Positive Psychology: An introduction. *Am. Psychol.*, 55: 5-14.
- Shahbaz, W. and Shakeel, A. 2013. Role ambiguity and employees' organization based self-esteem: Moderating effect of workplace spirituality. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Business Management, University of Management and Technology, Feb. 27-28, pp: 1-21.*
- Shavelson, R.J., J.J. Hunber and G.C. Stanton, 1976. Self-concept: Validation of construct interpretations. *Rev. Educ. Res.*, 46: 407-441.
- Simpson, C.K. and D. Boyle, 1975. Esteem constructs generality and academic performance. *Educ. Psychol. Measur.*, 35: 897-904.
- Stajkovic, A. and F. Luthans, 1998. Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychol. Bull.*, 124: 240-261.
- Tafarodi, R.W. and W.B. Jr. Swann, 1995. Self-liking and self-competence as dimensions of global self-esteem: Initial validation of a measure. *J. Pers. Assess.*, 65(2): 322-342.
- Tharenou, P., 1979. Self-esteem at work: A review of the literature. *J. Vocat. Behav.*, 15: 1-29.
- Thau, S., K. Aquino and P.M. Poortvliet, 2007. Self defeating behaviors in organizations: The relationship between thwarted belonging and interpersonal work behaviors. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 92(3): 840-847.
- Williams, K.D., 2007. Ostracism. *Ann. Rev. Psychol.*, 58: 425-452.
- Wright, T.A., 2003. Positive organizational behavior: An idea whose time has truly come. *J. Organ. Behav.*, 24: 437-422.