How work engagement affects vocal behavior in Iraqi hotels?

Marwah Abdulkareem Zuhaira *
Department of Tourism
University of Kufa, Iraq
marwaa.mahmood@uokufa.edu.iq

Abdalamir Zwin
Department of Tourism
University of Kufa, Iraq
Abdalamir.Zwin@uokufa.edu.iq

Bushra Alasadi
Department of Tourism
University of Kufa, Iraq
Bushra.alasadi@uokufa.edu.iq

Corresponding author*

Abstract

Tourism is without any doubt one of the quickest developing sectors in the world and is seen as an attractive proposed investment choice. Voice behavior for employees maybe have positive outcomes for organizations as the tone set creates an ambience for a working atmosphere. In spite of that encouraging workers to talk out is not secure unless the organization signals that it's safe and effective for workers to try and do this. One of positive states in organizations is work engagement, which is considered to be the opposite of burnout. This study helps to understand the impact of work engagement on vocal behavior and to seek out the relationships between them. In this research we collected data from (253) employees of three top quality hotels in capital in Iraq. As the result of analysis of this study indicates, work engagement was found to have statistically significant correlations to voice behavior and tone when dealing with stakeholders and also in casual relationships.

Keywords: Work engagement, voice behavior, acquiescent voice, defensive voice, pro-social voice, tourism sector, Iraqi hotels.

Introduction

Tourism is a modern phenomenon that stems from the growing needs for recreation, rest, change of atmosphere and a sense of joy. It is without a doubt one of the quickest developing segments all around and is seen as an attractive proposed investment choice (Nicolaides, 2020). Leaders in tourism companies conduct their work through their employees actions. They divide and distribute the resources, direct the exercises of workers, and take the choices to achieve authoritative objectives and at last maintainability of objectives (Kashani, 2020). Numerous investigations have contended that work engagement as a forerunner, evoke positives hierarchical results, for example high performance, psychological well-being, rising loyalty, decreasing turnover, low absenteeism and it also creates a competitive advantage (Kwon & Farndale, 2018 ;Soares & Mosquera, 2019). Work engagement is satisfying and it is a positive state of employees characteristics in relation to job performance that makes them feel completely involved in what they do, whether at a front-desk or in a kitchen of a hotel (Schaufeli et al., 2002), or it is positive emotional state relate with the work, depicted by high levels of dedication, vigor, and absorption(Orgambídez-Ramos & de Almeida, 2017). Engaged employees work more earnestly through raised levels of discretionary effort than individuals who feel detached (Bakker, 2011).Hence the value of engagement as a subject of study. Khan clarifies that engaged employees "express

themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performance"(Kahn, 1990). It is diverse from job satisfaction in that it combines work pleasure with more actions to be undertaken (Bakker, 2011;Perera et al., 2018). Work engagement is a motivational construct monitoring three dimensions namely the cognitive engagement, emotional engagement, and social engagement. Cognitive engagement consists of inner indicators involving value, goals of learning and self-regulation(Chong et al., 2018). Emotional engagement is characterized by positive or negative reactions to work. Studies found a strong connection between emotional engagement and work achievement. Social engagement is the result of various relationships and actions (Arai & Pedlar, 2003). Engagement operates not just at the state level, including sentiments of enthusiasm, focus, and being stimulated, yet in addition as a conduct, including working proactively, job development, stability, working beyond expectation and adaptability (Kwon & Farndale, 2018).

Voice behavior features important distinctly in the (HRM) human resource management space, organizational behavior, and industrial relations, and it is examined among others, as it is considered to have a positive influence on employee morale and their performance (Kwon & Farndale, 2018). Employee voice has been examined as a basic condition to rouse representatives to react as associations require (Farndale et al., 2011, Mellahi et al., 2010). Articles have therefore been written discussing the components behind what pushes people to speak out versus residual silence even when employees have significant inputs or ideas to offer (Mowbray et al., 2015). Voice is behavior or a conduct intended to energize change and challenge this status quo, albeit to get higher levels of performance(Kwon & Farndale, 2018).Voice is also behavior intended to induce change and challenge the status quo, albeit to improve performance(Choi, 2007). Here, we focus on the worker voices at three levels-acquiescent voice, defensive voice, and pro-social voice. Voices coordinated toward superiors (upward dispute) have likewise been found to have a constructive association with work engagement, while voice directed toward co-workers and individuals outside the organization has a positive association with turnover intentions (Kassing et al., 2012). The applied discourse contends that different mediators (such as the value of voice, the degree to which voice is considered, the degree to which voice is expected, and the degree to which voice corresponds to a cultural norm), will influence the connection among voice and engagement. We may along these lines once in a while hope to observe institutionalization to a good practice model of voice to make a commitment, especially transversely over different social settings as we use our voices. A business that provides customer service needs to make a good first impression. For example, once a guest enters a hotel lobby or restaurant or any food service establishment, the guest makes judgments about the business based on the appearance, sound of voice, posture, and courtesy of the employees. The voice In communicates a message to the guests about the hotel or restaurant and its attitude to guests. These first impressions affects guest's discernment of the whole hotel or dining experience. When a perception is formed, even if it is faulty, it is very hard to change this in the eyes of the guest. When employees are engaged they are more happy and they tend to be more focused and polite to guests.

Work engagement has been shown to have an impact on the high job satisfaction (Keyko et al., 2016). Work engagement is linked to job attitudes, and organizational commitment (Orgambídez-Ramos & de Almeida, 2017, Rich et al., 2010; Nicolaides, 2008).Kwon and Farndale, (2018) contend that workers might be induced to speak out firstly when organizational norms indicate that there should be no trepidation of retribution and that their concern or idea will be effectively at least heard. Work engagement affected turnover intention negatively(Shahpouri et al., 2016). Also, the previous surviving exploration shows that voice conduct is beneficial in the working environment and for organizations (Morrison et al., 2011). The voice behavior of

managers encourages a learning domain under which authoritative representatives commit less errors, and routine work and advancement are improved (Hong et al., 2014). It also bodes well for guests when hotel or restaurant staff address their patrons well (Nicolaides, 2008; 2012). The tone of a person is principal for reinforcing the brand of a business. The brand persona or "Who". Who are you showing yourself to be to customers is critical as is your tone or how you are speaking to customers as friends or as outsiders. Treating a customer as a customer is important and vocal range and tone are critical issues to consider.

Confronting nature, the voice may convey the danger of being misunderstood and consequently upset interpersonal relationships (Liang et al., 2012). This can be the case in a hotel lobby where an employee could come across as aggressive and rive clientele away. Employees in this manner compute the potential benefit and risk before speaking out. At the point when people see the risks related with voice conduct, they may at present shout out in light of their promise to defend their ethical standards or qualities that they support (Gentile, 2013). Also employees have two considerations when deciding to speak out: (1) on account of participating ones voice is required to be effective in accomplishing the perfect result, and (2) in the case of speaking out is predicted to be safe (Kwon & Farndale, 2018).

To fill in the knowledge gap of better understanding the relationship between, work engagement, and voice behavior, the goal of the current study was to assess the role of work engagement (from co-workers) as an independent variable on voice behavior in a sample composed of employees of three top hotels in Iraq. Specifically, we questioned whether work engagement affects voice behavior among hotel staff. Based on the past literature, we hypothetical suggested that:

Hypothesis 1: Work engagement has a stronger positive relationship with voice behavior.

Hypothesis 1a: Work engagement has a stronger positive relationship with acquiescent voice behavior.

Hypothesis 1b: Work engagement has a stronger positive relationship with defensive voice behavior.

Hypothesis 1c: Work engagement has a stronger positive relationship with pro-social voice behavior.

Research methodology

Study design

We used a descriptive, correlational, and regression study and employed questionnaires. A total of (281) employees of the three top hotels in Baghdad (Sheraton, Meridian, Melia) were respondents and the focus was on specialized jobs in the (food and beverage, front office, housekeeping, food production). Finally, we got (253) almost participants (90%) response rate, and the 70% (n= 178) of them were male. We used four types of educational level the first one was Intermediate stage(35), Preparatory stage and Diploma in Tourism (62),BSC (153), and others (3).With rating to Location of work 58.8% of the employees adduced that they were working in food services (n = 149) and 41.2% worked at food production (n = 104). It is worth mentioning (163) from our sample were tourist study specialization persons and (90) of them were from non-tourism specializations.

Instruments

Instruments applied in this research were the dimension of voice behavior involved acquiescent voice, defensive voice and pro-social voice and work engagement scale in our questionnaire.

1. Voice behavior

To assess voice behavior, we utilized Van Mieghem's, (2003) questionnaire. This scale had fifteen items divided into three dimensions, acquiescent voice five items, defensive voice five items, and pro-social voice five items. This study used a Likert scale which ranged from 0 (always) to 5 (never). The alpha Cronbach's reliability acquired in this study was 0.86.

2. Work engagement

To estimate work engagement, we utilized Schaufeli et al's., (2002) questionnaire. This scale had eight items. This study used Likert scale which ranged from 0 (always) to 5 (never). The alpha Cronbach's reliability acquired in this variable was 0.95.

3. Data collection

After our request for a directive, the ethics committees of the three hotels approved the research. We were assisted by the hotels requesting the employees who met modulation criteria for our study. Questionnaire were given to employees who agreed to engage with us voluntarily and no incentive was offered to any of them. Questionnaire had a cover letter which clarified the purpose of the research. The employees were requested to complete the survey and return it and we gave them enough time to complete it. We confirmed that the data would used for scientific research purposes.

The Results

Descriptive statistics

Table 1 shows the mean, standard deviation, and correlation relationship that have examined in this paper. Work engagement (WE) has positively associated with acquiescent voice behavior (r=0.87, p<0.01). Work engagement (WE) was positively associated with defensive voice (r=0.90, p<0.01). Furthermore, work engagement (WE) has positively related to pro-social voice behavior (0.83, p<0.01).

Table 1: Correlation matrix

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Gender	0.71	0.50							
2. Educational level	2.92	0.86	0.23**						
3. Location of work	0.35	0.47	0.03	0.23**					
4. Specialization	0.41	0.49	0.29**	0.27**	0.28**				

5.Work engagement	**3.68**	**.88**	**-0.24**	**-0.07**	**0.04**	**-0.06**		
6.Acquiescent voice behavior	**3.83**	**1.08**	**0.06**	**0.03**	**0.02**	**-0.04**	**0.87****	
7.Defensive voice	**3.77**	**1.02**	**0.04**	**0.01**	**0.01**	**-0.06**	**0.90****	**0.95****	
8.Pro-social voice behavior	**3.50**	**0.90**	**0.01**	**-0.01**	**0.02**	**-0.02**	**0.83****	**0.92****	**0.98****

Note: N=253, ** $p<0.01$.

Table 2 shows the results of multiple regression analysis to examine the research hypotheses. Results show the models are significant as a whole (F-value 2.18, 12.29, 8.08, 5.56, 5.8 for models1, 2, 3, 4, and5, respectively, p-value <0.001, and Adju.R² is 19, 18,12,8 and 9 percent for models respectively). First model included control variables only and found insignificant result affected voice behavior. Model (2) examined the main effects of work engagement (WE) on voice behavior; this model indicated that the work engagement has positive and significant impact on voice behavior (b= 0.413, p<0.001). Hypothesis 1 is supported.

Furthermore, the effects of work engagement (WE) on acquiescent voice behavior, defensive voice, and pro-social voice behavior have been examined in models 3, 4, and 5respectively. Work engagement has positive and significant impact on acquiescent voice behavior (b= 0.454, p<0.001), work engagement has positive and significant impact on defensive voice (b= 0.45, p<0.001), work engagement has positive and significant impact on pro-social voice behavior (b= 0.34, p<0.001). All the results support the various sub-hypotheses.

Overall the evidence showed in Table 2 support H1, H1a, H1b, and H1c that the degree of work engagement is more pronounced for firms in different behaviors. Moreover, the voice behavior is carried for work factors.

Table: 2. significant testing results of the multiple regressions for study hypotheses.

Model Dependent variables		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Controlling variable:						
Gender		-0.16	-0.12	-0.08	-0.11	-0.17
educational level		-0.01	0.007	0.00	0.04	0.016
specialization		-0.106	-0.05	-0.1	-0.05	0.01
Location of work		-0.105	-0.14*	-0.14	-0.09	-0.18*
Independent variable:						

Work engagement		-	0.413***	0.454***	0.449***	0.337***
R2		0.34	0.201	0.142	0.102	0.106
Adjusted R2		0.19	0.184	0.124	0.08	0.088
F- value		2.18*	12.29***	8.08***	5.56***	5.8***

Note: N=253, ** p<0.01.

Discussion and Conclusion

The results of the study have diverse contributions, firstly there is so little previous research which has examined the effect of work engagement on voice behavior in Iraqi hotels. This research was the first empirical study to discover that work engagement has a significant positive influence on voice behavior, which is an important contribution for the local tourism and hospitality. Based on that the hotels should get more suggestions for increasing levels of work engagement for employees and job development and success in obtaining enhanced customer satisfaction. Furthermore, this study further found a significant relationship between work engagement and acquiescent voice, defensive voice and pro-social voice. We have discussed that the voice behavior has in general advanced in silos across various disciplines (Mowbray et al., 2015). Organizational benefits acquired from work engagement have been recognized to include the utmost achievement of individual job goals or outputs (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Accordingly, the result of analysis of this research indicated, that the study variables were found to have relations between variables and are statistically significant to work engagement, and voice behavior. This outcome is consistent with Burke et al., (2013) where voice behavior was considered to offer a significant increment in clarified variance on work engagement. Voice behavior is important as employees get the initiative to goal-constructive proposals instead of just complaining about the cases they face (Van Dyne & Le Pine, 1998). Building on this conceptual framework, we further propose that silence and voice have differential consequences to employees in work organizations. Based on fundamental differences in the overt behavioural cues provided by silence and voice, we present a series of propositions predicting that silence is more ambiguous than voice, observers are more likely to misattribute employee motives for silence than for voice, and misattributions for motives behind silence will lead to more incongruent consequences (both positive and negative) for employees (than for voice). A limitation was that study sample focused on some employees working in three hotels in Baghdad (Sheraton, Meridian, Melia) and there are of course many more types of hotels in the Iraqi tourism and hospitality industry. Therefore it is difficult to generalize the results to hotels from other grades of hotels in the same industry. For future projects we need to also increase the number of respondents. Also, the spread of samples should also consider cross-cultural perspectives. It is also important to continuously seek variables to strengthen the relationship between work engagement and voice behavior. Finally, we can say this research highlights the positive association between work engagement of Iraqi hotels. Findings suggest action is taken to increase needed work engagement.

References

Arai, S. & Pedlar, A. (2003). Moving beyond individualism in leisure theory: A critical analysis of concepts of community and social engagement, *Leisure Studies*, 22(3),185-202.

Bakker, A. B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current directions in psychological science*, 20, 265-269.

Burke, R.J., Christensen Hughes, J., Burke, R., Koyuncu, Fiksenbaum, L. &Tekin, Y. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of work engagement among frontline employees in Turkish hotels, *Journal of Transnational Management*, 18, 191-203.

Choi, J. N. (2007). Change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: effects of work environment characteristics and intervening psychological processes, *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 28, 467-484.

Chong, W. H., Liem, G. A. D., Huan, V. S., Kit, P. L. & Ang, R. P. (2018). Student perceptions of self-efficacy and teacher support for learning in fostering youth competencies: Roles of affective and cognitive engagement, *Journal of Adolescence*, 68, 1-11.

Farndale, E., van Ruiten, J., Kelliher, C. & Hope-Hailey, V (2011). The influence of perceived employee voice on organizational commitment: An exchange perspective, *Human Resource Management*, 50, 113-129.

Gentile, M. (2013). The Giving Voice to Values curriculum. from http://www.babson.edu/ faculty/teaching-learning/gvv/Pages/home.aspx

Hong, J. C., Chien-Hou, L., Hwang, M-Y., Hu, R-P. & Chen, Y. L. (2014). Positive affect predicting worker psychological response to cyber-bullying in the high-tech industry in Northern Taiwan, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 30, 307-314.

Kahn, W. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work, Academy of Management Journal, 33, 692-724.

Kashani, P.E. (2020). The effects of managers on organizational behaviours and functions. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 9(1).

Kassing, J., Piemonte, N. M., Goman, C. C. & Mitchell, C. A. (2012). Dissent expression as an indicator of work engagement and intention to leave, *The Journal of Business Communication*, 49, 237-253.

Keyko, K., Cummings, G.G., Yonge, O. & Wong, C.A. (2016). Work engagement in professional nursing practice: A systematic review, *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 61, 142-164.

Kwon, B. & Farndale, E.(2018). Employee voice viewed through a cross-cultural lens. *Human Resource Management Review*, 26(4), 327–337.

Liang, J., Farh, C. I. C. & Farh, J.-L. (2012). Psychological antecedents of promotive and prohibitive voice: A two-wave examination, *Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 71-92.

Mellahi, K., Budhwar, P. S & Baibing Li. (2010). A study of the relationship between exit, voice, loyalty and neglect and commitment in India. *Human Relations*, 63, 349-369.

Morrison, E. W., Wheeler-Smith, S. L. & Kamdar, D. (2011). Speaking up in groups: a cross-level study of group voice climate and voice, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 183.

Mowbray, P.K., Wikinson, A. & Tse, H.H.M (2015). An integrative review of employee voice: Identifying a common conceptualization and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 17, 382-400.

Nicolaides, A. (2020). Sustainable Ethical Tourism (SET) and Rural Community Involvement. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 9(1).

Nicolaides, A. (2012). Service quality provision in upmarket restaurants: a survey of diners in three restaurants in a Gauteng casino complex. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 2(2).

Nicolaides, A. (2008). Service Quality, Empowerment and Ethics in The South African Hospitality and Tourism Industry and The Road Ahead Using ISO9000/1. PhD theses, University of Zululand, KwaZulu-Natal.

Orgamidez Ramos, A. & De Almeida, H. (2017). Work engagement, social support, and job satisfaction in Portuguese nursing staff: A winning combination. *Applied Nursing Research*, 36, 37-41.

Perera, H. N., Granziera, H. & McIlveen, P. (2018). Profiles of teacher personality and relations with teacher self-efficacy, work engagement, and job satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*,120, 171-178.

Rich, B. L., LePine, J. A. & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 617-635.

Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., Gonzales, V. & Bakker, A.B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach, *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92.

Shahpouri, S., Namdari, K. & Abedi, A. (2016). Mediating role of work engagement in the relationship between job resources and personal resources with turnover intention among female nurses, *Applied Nursing Research*, 30, 216-221.

Van Dyne, L. & Lepine, J.A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity, *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 108-119.

Van Mieghem, J.A. (2003). Commissioned paper: Capacity management, investment, and hedging: Review and recent developments, *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 5, 269-302.