Impact of Job Overload on On-the-job Behavior and the mediating role of Person-organization-fit
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Abstract
This study was conducted to evaluate the relationship of job overload and On-the-job behavior and to find out if person-organization-fit can mediate the relationship between job overload and on-the-job behavior. To test hypothesis, teaching profession was selected and private sector higher education institutes in Peshawar were selected. Responses were collected via questionnaires from 232 respondents. Regression was used as a statistical tool and found positive relation between JO and OJB whereas POF had played significant but negative mediating role between JO and OJB.
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1. Introduction

During last two decades, increase in research in the field of Human Resource Management (HRM) and its functional areas has shown the worth and importance of HR in any organization. It is not surprising that HR is now treated as a major asset as well as a key to success in
developed world. More importantly, this wave has reached the less developed part of the world as well.

Management, HR professionals and academicians are trying to cover all aspects of this area and are coming up with unique ideas and solutions to the issues related to workforce and workplace however; with every passing day there is a new issue and thus the complexity of context is increasing. As man is not machine, therefore; it is understandable that workforce is not perfect nor can be the workplace an ideal workplace. The more the nature of job is becoming complex, the expectations are also increasing.

Hundreds and thousands of researches are published every year on the topics related to job and workplace. For example, job characteristics are changing often. New tasks are added on need basis (job enlargement) and it leads to more work in given time period (Job overload/task overload). This overload results in burnout, stress, fatigue, conflicts and imbalance in work-life. On the other hand, same results has been produced by person-organization fit where it is stated that when an employee is not having adequate skills or lack information to job (role ambiguity) may result in the same fashion as overload. Thus, lack of ability leads to job misfit and similarly the difference in person-organization values can cause a person-organization misfit.

Most of the cases of such nature are often caused by issues related to job (job overload) or lack of person-organization fit. As a result, employee as well as organization suffers. One important result discussed by the researchers in the field of psychology is that due to job related issues, employee’s behavior will be affected and there will be negativity in both behavior and attitude (Maslach, 2003). Furthermore, it can be redirected to the point that change in behavior is a result of difference in level of expectations. Therefore, excess of workload and too many demands will lead to fatigue, exhaustion and finally to change in on-the-job behavior. One study found a negative relationship between job overload and on-the-job-behavior(Lee & Ashforth, 1996)

Although, On-the-job behavior (work place behavior), job characteristics, and person-organization fit has been a part of research and theory for decades (Jamal, 2011). But they are considered separately and are evaluated with other variables and not with each other. Therefore, a question remains unanswered that what is the contribution of job overload and Person-organization fit in identifying on-the-job behavior? Therefore, this study will focus try to find the relationship and also an answer to the following questions;

1. Does job overload (JO) contribute in identification of on-the-job behavior (OJB)?
2. To what extent person-organization fit (POF) impacts on-the-job behavior (OJB)?
3. Is person-organization fit (POF) mediates the relationship of job overload and on-the-job behavior (OJB)?
4. Is there any relationship between Job overload and Person-organization fit?
1.1. Background of study

Number of studies has been conducted on the job overload, person-organization fit, and on the job behavior. However, these studies took the variables under study separately.

1.1.1. Job Overload (JO)

Job overload has been researched and found in relation with work-family conflict (Bolino & Turnley, 2005; Coverman, 1989; Razak, Yunus, & Nasurdin, 2011). Similarly, job overload also results in role conflict (Coverman, 1989; Home, 1998). Most of the research on JO has been conducted by psychologists and social scientists has linked JO with job stress. According to published studies JO increases level of stress in an employee and results in turnover (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004; Coverman, 1989; Madu, Okoro, & Onuibe, 2014; Maslach, 2003). Furthermore, some studies also associated JO with justice (Andrews, Wilmington, & Kacmar, 2014; Lambert, Hogan, & Griffin, 2007). Moreover, it has also been negatively associated with employees’ performance and ultimately with organization performance (Choi, Cheong, & Feinberg, 2012; Jamal, 2011; Karatepe., 2013).

Job overload has been positively related with working hours, absenteeism and competitiveness, size of the firm, turnover etc. and has been negatively associated with satisfaction and commitment (Dwyer & Ganster, 1991). It has negative effect on employees attitude and satisfaction (Sargent & Terry, 1998).

1.1.2. Person-Organization Fit

Person-Organization Fit (POF) is another aspect of HR that has been widely researched. It has been said that it is very important for both employee and organization that they suite each other and if not, then it will be hard for both in the long run as well as short run. Person-Organization and Person-Job fit has been strongly associated with HR practices. Perceived HR practices can influence person and organization fit (Boon, Den Hartog, Boselie, & Paauwe, 2011). Liu, Liu, and Hu (2010) found a relationship with satisfaction and turnover intention. Another prominent variable found in research is commitment (Meyer, Hecht, Gill, & Toplonytsky, 2010). If POF is not appropriate then the researchers indicated that its effects will be on the attitudes and behavior of employees (Tepeci, 2011; Yen & Ok, 2011). In addition, some studies linked POF with job characteristics and employee engagement (Hamid & Yahya, 2011). Similarly, it has been linked with outcome (performance) of an employee as well as having a positive effect on organization performance (Silva, Hutcheson, & Wahl, 2010). These relationships have been shown in direct
relation as well as having mediating effect on the relationships with other variables. POF has been found having positive relation with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, willingness to job and person-job fit, job demand, and negatively correlated with stress and fatigue (Cable & Judge, 1996).

1.1.3. On the Job Behaviors

On the Job Behavior (OJB) is expected to be positive. When employee shows positive work behavior, they will volunteer for additional tasks, overtime, will try to learn new things and will be welcoming to help others. And in this extent, an employee will waste time allocated for doing jobs. On the other side, negative job behavior will be indicated by wasting job time, being absent for no reason, spending most of the time chatting, doing personal tasks during office hours, leaving early, not showing respect to supervisor or co-workers. Previous researches shows that OJB has positive association with satisfaction, commitment, involvement, tension, fatigue, and is negatively associated with burnout, organizational politics, justice, and burnout (Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, & Toth, 1997a). Job behavior has been found having positive relation with motivation (Bigley & Steers, 2003), positive with job satisfaction (Li, Liang, & Crant, 2010), performance (Hamid & Yahya, 2011; Nielsen, Bachrach, Sundstrom, & Halfhill, 2012), Organizational Justice (Andrews et al., 2014).

All variables (JO, POF, OJB) are tested with almost similar variables from time to time but these variables are not studied with each other exclusively. Therefore, this study aims to fill this gap by identifying the relationship of these variables exclusively.

1.2. Theoretical Framework and Hypothesis

On the basis of available literature, the following hypothesis has been devised;

H1: JO leads to bring change in OJB. (Perrewe & Ganster, 1989).

H2: JO has significant relationship with the Person Organization Fit (POF).

H2a: JO has significant relationship with Perceived ability-Job fit.

H2b: JO has a significant relationship with Perceived Person-Organization fit.

H3: There is a positive relation between POF and OJB.

H4: POF will have a mediating role between OJ and OJB.
2. Methodology

This research was conducting with positivistic approach and therefore relay upon quantitative methods (Mertens, 2005).

2.1. Population

In pursuit of suitable population to test the hypothesis of framework it was found that teaching sector is having highest level of exhaustion as compared to law enforcement agencies, medicine field, social service sector, and mental healthcare sectors therefore, it was decided to have academicians as most suitable population for this study (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). Teaching staff at university level are having number of tasks including teaching, research activities (writing and supervising), administrative work, and students counseling therefore, they are considered to be most appropriate population.

2.2. Sample and Sampling techniques

Private sector higher educational institutes of Peshawar were selected as a sample for this study. There was more than 1400 teaching staff in this sector. Sampling technique adopted for this research was probability sampling and within probability sampling, a Simple random sampling was used to collect data from teaching staff at university level. 350 questionnaires were
distributed (25% of population) and among them 245 were returned. Out of 245 returned questionnaires, 232 (16.57% of population) were completely filled and that was used for analysis purpose.

2.3. Data Collection Tool/ Instrument

Data collection tool was adopted from the studies conducted by several studies. For example; job overload instrument was adopted from Dwyer and Ganster (1991) having 11 items, perceived ability-job fit instrument was adopted from Xie (1996) having five items, Perceived person-organization fit was having 3 items and was adopted from Cable and Judge (1996) and on-the-job behaviors questionnaire was adopted from Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, and Toth (1997b) having 22 items. These instruments were adopted due to its high reliability and tested validity. All variables were having reliability of more than 0.68 coefficient alpha and thus considered as reliable tool. Responses for items were obtained on 5 point Likert scale where 1 was strongly disagree and 5 was for strongly agree.

2.4. Statistical techniques

Regression and correlation were used to identify the relationship among these variables. Each hypothesis was tested using separate linear regression equations and it was assumed that no assumption were violated of regression.

3. Finding and Analysis

In model-01 OJB is dependent variable and JO is independent variable. The JO has positive relationship with OJB, the value of JO is 0.202, indicates that one unit increase or decrease in JO will increase or decrease 0.202 units in OJB. Also the p-value of JO is 0.008 is less than 0.05, indicate that JO has a significant relationship with OJB. Now the value of R-sq. 0.030 means that only 3% of variation in dependent variable (OJB) is explained by independent variable (JO) and the other 97% variations are explained by other factors which are not include in the model. The value of Adj R-sq. value increase only when important variable or variables are include in the model, in this model Adj R-sq. value is 2.5%, indicate that the contribution of JO is very minimum in this model. F(prob) value indicates the significance of overall model in this model F(prob) value is 0.008 shows the significance of overall model
In model-02 OJB again is a dependent variable but now the explanatory is POF. POF has negative relationship with OJB which can be observed from POF coefficient sign, the coefficient value of POF is \((-0.650)\) indicating that one unit increase or decrease in POF results in 0.650 unit decrease or increase in OJB. The p-value of POF is 0.000 which is highly significant at level 0.05, indicating that POF has highly significant effect on OJB. The R\(^2\) value is 0.240 meaning that 24% of variation is explained in dependent variable (OJB) due to independent variable (POF) and Adj R\(^2\) is 23.6% which is also high for a single variable. If one can compared the results of this model with model-01 clearly observed that the dependent variable is same but explanatory variables are change, in model -01 R-sq. value is minimum with model-02 R-sq. also F-statistic of model-01 is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.495</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
<td>POF</td>
<td>-0.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-sq.</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R-sq.</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R-sq.</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adj R-sq.</td>
<td>0.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(prob)</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F(prob)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-statistic</td>
<td>7.063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F-statistic</td>
<td>73.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model -03

PAJ = \(\beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{JO})\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.496</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-sq.</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R-sq.</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R-sq.</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adj R-sq.</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(prob)</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F(prob)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model -04

PPO = \(\beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{JO})\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.025</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>POF</td>
<td>-0.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-sq.</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R-sq.</td>
<td>0.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R-sq.</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adj R-sq.</td>
<td>0.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(prob)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F(prob)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

relationship with OJB which can be observed from POF coefficient sign, the coefficient value of POF is (-0.650) indicate that one unit increase or decrease in POF 0.650 unit decrease or increase in OJB. The p-value of POF is 0.000 which is highly significant at level 0.05, indicates that POF has highly significant effect on OJB. The R-sq. value is 0.240 mean that 24% of variation is explained in dependent variable (OJB) due to independent variable (POF) and Adj R-sq. is 23.6% which is also high for a single variable. If one can compared the results of this model with model-01 clearly observed that the dependent variable is same but explanatory variables are change, in model -01 R-sq. value is minimum with model-02 R-sq. also F-statistic of model-01 is
7.063 and F-statistic of model-02 is 73.074, clearly model-01 F-statistic is less than model-02 F-statistic, POF is more important variable than JO. The F(prob)is less than 0.05, shows that overall model-02 is highly significant.

In model-03 PAJ is a dependent variable and OJ is an independent variable. OJ has a positive relationship with PAJ, the coefficient of OJ is 0.067 indicates that one unit increase or decrease in JO will 0.067 increase or decrease in PAJ. The p-value of OJ is 0.421 is greater than 0.05, indicates that JO has insignificant effect on PAJ. The values of R-sq. and Adj R-sq. are 0.03% and -0.02% respectively, which indicates that JO has null contribution in the model. The overall model is also insignificant.

In model-04 PPO is a dependent variable and OJ is an independent variable. OJ has a positive relationship with PPO, the coefficient of OJ is 0.338 indicates that one unit increase or decrease in JO will 0.338 increase or decrease in PPO. The p-value of OJ is 0.000 is less than 0.05, indicates that JO has significant effect on PPO. The values of R-sq. and Adj R-sq. are 9% and 8% respectively, which indicates that 9% of variation explained in PPO due to JO. Now if one can observe that in model-01 the value of R-sq. is 3% where JO used as independent variable, in model-04 R-sq. value is 9% in this model also Jo used as independent variable. Clearly for the comparison of these two models can be observed that JO has strong relationship with PPO. The F(prob) is 0.000 which is less than 0.05, indicate that overall model is highly significant.

In model-05 POF is a dependent variable and OJ is an independent variable. OJ has a positive relationship with PPO, the coefficient of OJ is 0.202 indicates that one unit increase or decrease in JO will 0.202 increase or decrease in POF. The p-value of OJ is 0.000 is less than 0.05, indicates that JO has significant effect on POF. The values of R-sq. and Adj R-sq. are 5% and 4% respectively, which indicates that 5% of variation explained in POF due to JO. Now if one can observe that in model-01 the value of R-sq. is 3% where JO used as independent variable, in model-05 R-sq. value is 5% in this model also Jo used as independent variable. Clearly for the comparison of these two models can be observed that JO has strong relationship with POF. The F(prob) is 0.000 which is less than 0.05, indicate that overall model is highly significant.

In model-06 OJB is a dependent variable POF and OJ are independent variables. POF has a negative relationship with OJB and OJ has a positive relationship with OJB, the coefficient of POF is -0.741 indicates that one unit increase or decrease in POF will 0.741 decreases or increase OJB. Similarly the coefficient of OJ is 0.352, shows that one unit increase or decrease in Jo will 0.352 unit increase or decrease in OJB. The p-value of POF and JO is 0.000 is less than 0.05, indicates that the both independent variable have significant effect on OJB. The values of R-sq. and Adj R-sq. are 32.5% and 31.9% respectively, which indicates that 33% of variation explained in OJB due to POF and JO. As from model-01 and model-02 the dependent variable OJB is same but independent variables are different POF has more contribution in OJB as respect to OJ. The F(prob) value is 0.000 less than 0.05, shows that overall model is significant.
In H1, the relationship of Joboverload was tested with On-the-job behavior and result indicated positive and significant relation but with very weak R². Thus indicating that relation exists but there are other variables as well upon which on-the-job behavior is dependent.

In H2, on-the-job behavior was regressed by person-organization fit and found a negative relationship with R² of 0.23 indicating that with the increase in Person-Organization fit, there will be negative change in on-the-job behavior. This result was surprising from the research point of view because it was assumed to have positive relation as the more POF the more will be OJB. The reason for this inverse relationship is not yet clear and it needs to be clarified with extensive research exclusively on the relation of these variables.

While testing the perceived ability-jobfit (H3) with Job overload the result was insignificant whereas perceived person-organization fit has been found significant with Joboverload in H4 and this relationship has less importance due to very weak R² value.

In H5, we tried to find if there is any mediating role of POF between OJB and JO and the results indicates increase in R² and the model is significant as well. However, the POF is negatively mediating the relation of JO and OJB.

4. Conclusion

Study on sample from university teaching staff indicates that there is relationship between the OJB, JO and POF. Whereas these association are not strong and thus indicating that there will be other variables as well that were not included in this study. Teaching staff showed a positive relation among JO and OJB which highlights that they can manage and accommodate job overload and it will affect there on-the-job behavior positively. This is an indication that job overload does not decrease their passion and commitment for their profession. However, another surprising result was the negative relationship between OJB and POF. It shows that the more person and organization fits, OJB will decrease. It is still unclear that if this is due to difference in any demographics or any other reasons.

4.1 Future Research Directions

This study opened a new area for study and is having some interesting results however, the explained variation between dependent and independent variable is weak. This shows that this research area can be expanded in future and further variables can be added to complete this framework.
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