

ANALYZING THE IMPACT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT ON ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR IN PUBLIC BANKING SECTOR

ANSHUL GARG*; SAMTA SURI**

*ASSISTANT PROFESSOR; HR & MARKETING;
TILAK RAJ CHADHA INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT & TECHNOLOGY,
YAMUNA NAGAR

**STUDENT;
TILAK RAJ CHADHA INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT & TECHNOLOGY,
YAMUNA NAGAR;

ABSTRACT

The study intends to find out the impact of Psychological Empowerment on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in Public Banking Sector in India. OCB is thought to be a discretionary behaviour that is not a part of the job description, but is performed by the employee as a result of his /her personal choice. The sample of the study includes 92 employees of public banking sector. Certain parameters are defined for both Psychological Empowerment and OCB to carry out the study. Inter correlations and correlation extends the relationship between the variables of Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Regression analysis quantifies the impact of all the taken parameters of Psychological Empowerment on OCB. Research study discusses various recommendations and implications associated with the study.

KEYWORDS: Altruism, Civic Virtue, Conscientiousness, Job Design, Nature of Supervision, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Psychological Empowerment, Reward Systems, Working Environment.

INTRODUCTION:

PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT: It has been defined in many different ways. The very first definition underlined empowered as a 'multilevel' concept, a mechanism by which people, organizations, and communities gain mastery over their affairs (Rapport, 1981, 1984). Other definitions stressed similar concepts, sometimes limited to the individual level, like Mechanic's (1991) proposal(a process in which people develop a closer correspondence between their goals, efforts and life outcomes), sometimes incorporating person – environment interaction and adding other features like in Perkins and Zimmerman(1995) definition of empowerment, as a process by which people gain greater control over their lives, democratic participation in the life of their community, and a critical understanding of their environment.

Psychological empowerment was defined from the perspective of the individual employee, and a measure was developed using three different samples. The psychologically empowered state was

considered to be a cognitive state characterized by a sense of perceived control, perceptions of competence, and internalization of the goals and objectives of the organization.

According to Grieses (2003:39), *“The strategy of empowerment, which is noteworthy in not only attempting to extend the arguments of Excellence Movement but in seeking to solve the problems of alienation. Strategies of empowerment may include redefining the nature of supervision, reward systems, job design; or even changing the nature of working environment. The critical determinant, however, is the ability to take control of one’s own situation.”* This perceived control over one’s own situation has been termed as Psychological Empowerment.

The above four dimensions viz. Nature of Supervision, Reward Systems, Job Design, Working Environment has been taken as the sub variables of Psychological Empowerment and together forms the construct of Psychological Empowerment. These dimensions together specify a sufficient set of cognitions for understanding Psychological Empowerment.

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) is a unique aspect of individual activity at work, first mentioned in the early 1980s. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB), is defined as *“behaviour that goes beyond the basic requirements of the job, is to a large extent discretionary, and is of benefit to the organization”* (Lambert, S.J., 2006)

“OCBs are employee behaviours that, although not critical to the task or job, serve to facilitate organizational functioning” (Lee and Allen, 2002)

Organ (1988) defines OCB as *“Individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization”*. Organ’s definition of OCB includes three critical aspects that are central to this construct. First, OCBs are thought of as discretionary behaviours, which are not part of the job description, and are performed by the employee as a result of personal choice. Second, OCBs go above and beyond that which is an enforceable requirement of the job description. Finally, OCBs contribute positively to overall organizational effectiveness.

Organ’s (1988) definition of OCB has generated a great deal of criticism. The very nature of the construct makes it difficult to operationally define. Critics started questioning whether or not OCBs, as defined by Organ, were discretionary in nature. Organ (1997), in response to criticisms, notes that since his original definition, jobs have moved away from a clearly defined set of tasks and responsibilities and have evolved into much more ambiguous roles. Without a defined role, it quickly becomes difficult to define what is discretionary.

For example, an individual would be performing OCB if he/she stays late to complete the work even when not asked to finish it on the same day.

Studies reveal that employee’s who are more affectively committed to their organization, also engage more in production of OCB (et al., 1993).

Other study focussed on the employees OCB that leads to managerial evaluations of their subordinates, which are more favourable than those would have been indicated by objective target results (Mc Kensie et al., 1993, 1999)

Bateman and Organ’s (1983) study was one of the first to tackle the measurement of OCB. Their definition of OCB *“Includes any of those gestures (often taken for granted) that lubricate the social machinery of the organization but that do not directly in here in the usual notion of task performance”* (Bateman & Organ, 1983).

Two main facets of OCB are mentioned in previous studies: (1) OCB altruistic, and (2) OCB compliance. Whereas altruism appears to represent the help to specific persons, generalized compliance is a factor defined by a more impersonal sort of conscientiousness. It implies more

of a "good soldier" or "good citizen" syndrome of doing things that are "right and proper", but doing them for the sake of the system rather than for specific persons.

In the view of Smith et al. (1983), the two elements represent distinct classes of citizenship. This study tries to identify the main variables that can explain both dimensions of OCB from the two perspectives mentioned before. It uses studies mentioned in relevant management literature and also by studies dealing with citizenship from a political point of view. The political aspect of citizenship consists of three elements: (1) obedience; (2) loyalty, and; (3) participation. Only the last two will have a significant implication in this study because they represent the informal behaviour of "good citizens."

ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE AND SUCCESS

Multiple studies and meta-analyses have been conducted to look at the relationship between OCBs and organizational performance and success. Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994, as cited in Organ et al., 2006) looked at an insurance agency and found that the OCBs civic virtue and sportsmanship were both significantly related to indices of sales performance. Podsakoff, Ahearne, and MacKenzie (1997, as cited in Organ et al., 2006) examined paper mill workers and found that helping behavior was significantly related to product quality. MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Ahearne (1996, as cited in Organ et al., 2006) found that civic virtue and helping behavior were significantly related to the percent of team quota sales. Walz and Niehoff (2000, as cited in Organ et al., 2006) examined 30 different restaurants and found that helping behavior was significantly related to operating efficiency, customer satisfaction, and quality of performance. Researchers found that helping behavior was also negatively correlated with wasted food. Koys (2001, as cited in Organ et al., 2006) used a combination of OCB dimensions to form a composite measure of OCB. Results from this study indicated that the composite measure of OCB was positively correlated with restaurant profits.

MANAGERIAL EVALUATIONS AND REWARD ALLOCATIONS

With regard to the relationship between OCBs and managerial evaluations, Podsakoff and colleagues (2000) found, in a summary of empirical evidence, that OCBs uniquely accounted for 42.9% of the variance in managerial performance evaluations. Results from this study also indicated that altruism or helping was significantly related to performance evaluations in eight out of the ten studies it was included in; sportsmanship was significantly related to performance evaluations in five out of the eight studies it was included in; conscientiousness was significantly related to performance evaluations in all three of the studies it was included in; and civic virtue was significantly related to performance evaluations in six out of the eight studies it was included in.

More recently, Podsakoff et al. (2009) found that OCBs have a positive relationship with performance ratings and reward allocations. Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, and Mishra (2010) examined the effects of job candidates' tendency to exhibit OCBs on selection decisions made in the context of a job interview. These researchers found that candidates whose interview responses indicated a tendency to engage in helping others, challenge the status quo by voicing their opinions, and support and defend an organization were generally viewed as more competent, received higher overall evaluations, and received higher recommended starting salaries than those who did not.

Research has also looked at the relationship between task-performance, CWB, and OCB with overall managerial evaluations. Interestingly, when compared with task-performance and CWB, OCB is found to contribute least to overall managerial evaluations (Rotundo &

Sackett, 2002). This somewhat inconsistent pattern of results across the OCB literature with regard to antecedents exemplifies the need for more research in this area.

MEASURES

Researchers have developed a variety of measures for OCB. However before being able to measure a construct it must be defined. As discussed earlier, this is not a cut and dry task. Thus, the conceptual definitions of OCB used by researches differ from study to study.

Bateman and Organ's (1983) study was one of the first to tackle the measurement of OCB. Their definition of OCB "includes any of those gestures (often taken for granted) that lubricate the social machinery of the organization but that do not directly in the usual notion of task performance" (Bateman & Organ, 1983). Based on this definition, they constructed a 30-item OCB scale that measured cooperation, altruism, compliance, punctuality, housecleaning, protecting company property, conscientiously following company rules, and dependability. The scale asked each participant to rate their agreement or disagreement with each of the 30 items using a 7-point scale that ranged from negative 3 to positive 3.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour has been studied under four parameters which are Altruism, Conscientiousness, Civic Virtue and Job Satisfaction. Together they form the overall construct of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.

It shall be noted that, higher the sense of Psychological Empowerment in an organization, higher will be Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Individuals are likely to change their OCB if they believe the system to be inherently fair or unfair when they ought to believe a decision outcome is favourable or unfavourable.



RESEARCH METHOD

The objectives of the study were established and research methodology was determined. The questionnaire was prepared and printed and were distributed to employees of public sector bank employees for data collection. After data collection, data was summarised and organised in such a manner that it answers the questions. SPSS16.0 was used to analyse the data to get relevant information from the data collected. Data was thereafter interpreted and inferences were drawn and then transformed into meaningful information to help the management to get a vivid picture and to make accurate decisions therefore. This is a descriptive type of study. The main purpose of the descriptive research is to study the present problems and to suggest some solutions to these problems.

RESEARCH DESIGN

- **Data source:** Data collected was primary, as it was collected by means of questionnaire from employees of Public Banking Sector.
- **Purpose of the study:** Exploratory cum Descriptive
- **Type of Investigation:** Causal
- **Study Setting:** Non contrived
- **Time Horizon:** Cross-Sectional
- **Research Instrument:** A structured questionnaire consisting of close ended questions was used for the purpose of study.
- **Scaling:** Likert Scale (Five point scale) is used in the questionnaire for conducting the survey to analyze the impact of Psychological Empowerment on OCB ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.
- **Scope of Research:** Employees in Public Banking Sector

SAMPLE DESIGN

- Sampling unit: Employees of Public Banking Sector
- Sampling size: 92
- Sampling technique: Non-probability

HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING

As there are four independent variables (Job Design, nature of Supervision, Reward System and Working Environment), so four hypothesis were developed to study the significant impact of these variables on the Dependent Variable i.e. Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

Hypothesis 1 (H1a): There has been a significant impact of Job Design on OCB.

Hypothesis 2 (H2a): There has been a significant impact of Nature of Supervision on OCB.

Hypothesis 3 (H3a): There has been a significant impact of Reward System on OCB.

Hypothesis 4 (H4a): There has been a significant impact of Working Environment on OCB.

ANALYSIS:

Descriptive statistics which use mean and standard deviation were used to present the main characteristics of the sample. Means, standard deviations and correlations were used to present the general results of the study. It was found that the grand mean of all the parameters was 4.24 which shows that most of the response of the employees for all the parameters is between Agree and Strongly agree. As the grand mean of S.D is 0.434 it shows that there is a small variation in response for all the parameters.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The data of 92 Employees in Public Sector Banks has been realized with the help of different statistical tools using the SPSS (17) software.

By applying reliability statistics (Table 1), the value of Cronbach Alpha has found to be 98.3%, which is greater than 50%. It shows that data under study is reliable and truly represents population. The hypothesis has been tested with the help of T-test (Table 2-5), through t-test it has been found that significance level of all the parameters is .000 which is

less than .05 which implies that there is significance impact of all the Independent Variables on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. By applying **Inter Correlations** and Correlation (Table 6-8) between the independent variables and dependent variables respectively, it was found that all parameters are highly and significantly correlated to each other. Further, in Regression Analysis (Table 9-12), the independent variables together explain 59% of the variance (R Square) with **Conscientiousness** in pool of applicants, which is highly significant, as indicated by the P-value which in all cases is less than .05. The independent variables together explain 70.5% of the variance (R Square) with dependent variable **Altruism**, which is highly significant, as indicated by the p-value which in all case is less than .05. The independent variables together explain 64.1% of the variance (R Square) with dependent variable **Job Satisfaction**, which is highly significant, as indicated by the p-value which in all cases is less than .05. The independent variables together explain 14.6% of the variance (R Square) with **Civic Virtue**, which is highly significant, as indicated by p-value which in most cases is less than .05

RECOMMENDATIONS & IMPLICATIONS

The recommendations can be drawn on the different surveys that more participation of employees in the decision making will lead to the more empowerment. Most of the employees do not agree that they are satisfied with the reward system of the organization so, more focus should be done on it. If employees are more psychologically empowered it will lead to more OCB, hence steps should be taken to make them more empowered. Team based reward system must be used so that employees learn how to cooperate and believe in team building. Employees' performance is better judged by the job description and when it is followed work becomes hassle free. More communication should be there in terms of telling their responsibilities so that employees do not fear in communicating to their superiors.

CONCLUSIONS

The survey has been done with the full cooperation of the employees and the management. It has revealed the areas of improvement which the organization needs to cater. From the earlier studies and with the help of different surveys, it can be concluded that the use of selection procedures are predictive of employee citizenship and psychological empowerment so the Organizations should seek out applicant pools comprised of individuals committed to causes other than themselves. Use validated tests to identify individuals with personality traits that predispose them to engage in citizenship behavior and one should keep in mind that the compensation systems linked to group or organizational level outcomes tend to encourage employee citizenship. Moreover, a corporate culture that emphasizes going the extra mile for customers, colleagues, or the organization itself must be developed. An organization should place new employees, whenever possible into work units or groups characterized by high levels of organizational citizenship behavior. More recently, Podsakoff, Blume, Whiting, and Podsakoff (2009) found that OCBs were positively related to unit-level performance and customer satisfaction. Nielsen, Hrivnak, and Shaw (2009), in their meta-analytic review of the existing group literature, examined the relationship between OCBs and performance at the group level. These researchers found a positive and significant relationship between overall OCB and performance at the group level. In addition, Nielsen et al. (2009) found that similar patterns of relationships existed for each dimension of OCB: civic virtue, sportsmanship, altruism, conscientiousness and courtesy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- *Ashwathappa K (5th Edition), "Human Resource Management", New Delhi, Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Companies Limited, pp 103-135.*
- *Anand D (Nov 2008)"Changing role of rewards at workplace" HRM Review.*
- *Beri G.C. (III Edition), "Marketing Research"*
- *Bhatnagar Jyotsna & Sandhu Sheetal (2005), "Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) in 'IT' Managers: A Talent Retention Tool", The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Volume 40(2), pp.478-497.*
- *Biswas Soumendu (2010), "Commitment as mediator between Psychological Climate and Citizenship Behavior", The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Volume 45(3), pp.411-423.*
- *C.S. Venkata Ratnam & B.K. Srivastava, "Human Resource Management" PP- 67-70*
- *Chaitanya S.K. & Tripathi Nachiketa (2001), "Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior", The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Volume 37(2), pp. 217-230*
- *Chandrasekar S. (December 2008) "HRM Review"*
- *Cloninger Peggy A., Ramamoorthy Nagaraja & Flood Patrick C. (2011), "The Influence of Equity, Equality and Gender on Organizational Citizenship Behavior", Advanced Management Journal, Autumn (2011), pp.37-46.*
- *Cooper Donald R., Schindler Pamela S. (Ninth Edition),"Business Research Methods" PP-11-16*
- *Dr Chhabra T.N11, "Psychological Empowerment" PP- 185-186*
- *Francesco Anne Marie, Gold Barry Allen (Second Edition), "International Organization Behaviour" PP-39-42.*
- *Griffin Ricky W. (2008), "Management-Principles & Applications" PP- 115-138*
- *Gupta C.B (4th Edition Revised), "Human Resource Management" PP -1-3 Part b, 131-134*
- *Jain Ajay K. (2010), " Organizational Citizenship Behavior as a potential source of Power", The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Volume 45(3), pp. 396-412*
- *Jiang Jane Y., Sun Li-Yun & Law Kenneth S. (2011), "Job Satisfaction and Organization Structure as moderators of the effects of Empowerment on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Self Consistency and Social Exchange Perspective", International Journal of Management, Volume 28(3), pp. 675-87.*
- *Kothari C.R. (2nd Revised Edition), "Research Methodology Methods and Techniques" PP- 253-265*
- *Kothari C.R. (2nd Revised Edition), "Research Methodology Methods and Techniques", New Delhi, New Age International (P) Limited, pp 1-7, 301-306, 236-243*
- *Kumarraju V V (Nov 2008)"The 7 P's of Citizenship Behaviour" HRM Review*
- *Luthans Fred (3rd Edition), "Organizational Behavior" PP- 73-82.*
- *Mackenzie Scott B., Podsakoff Philip M. & Podsakoff Nathan P. (2011), "Challenge-oriented Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Effectiveness: Do Challenge-oriented Behavior really have an impact on the Organization's bottom line?", Personnel Psychology ,Volume 64, pp. 559-68.*
- *Mallikarjunan K. (July 2009), "Employee Induction & Orientation", HRM Review*
- *Mukhrjee I (July 2009), "Employee Empowerment Strategies", HRM Review*
- *Nag G C (July 2010)"Employee empowerment", HRM Review*

- *Pattanayak Biswajeet, Mishra Rajnish Kumar & Niranjana Phalgu (2003), " Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Conceptual Framework and Scale Development", The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations ,Volume 39(2), pp. 195-210.*
- *Robbins P. Stephen, Judge A. Timaphy, Sanghi Seema (13th Edition), "Organization Behaviour" PP- 418-430*
- *Sekaran Uma (4th Edition), "Research Methods for Business", Wiley India (P) Limited, New Delhi, pp 54-63-130, 263-298.*
- *Sharma D.D, "Marketing Research" PP- 1-15*
- *Shikari A (Nov 2008)"Valuing employee safety" Human capital*
- *Theogaraj Laurainne (Jan 2009), "Training & Development-An Essential Review", HRM Review*
- *Vigoda-Gadot Eran & Beerli Itai (2011), "Change-Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Public Administration: The Power of Leadership and the Cost of Organizational Politics", The Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, Volume 22, pp. 573-584.*
- *Woods David (July 2012) "HR Magazine" pp 24-25*

PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT

JOB DESIGN:

- My job provides a lot of variety
- My job provides allows me the opportunity to complete the work I start
- My job provides me with a variety of work.
- My job is relatively significant in the organization.

NATURE OF SUPERVISION:

- My supervisor sees me sufficiently often.
- At our meetings my supervisor is usually well prepared
- My supervisor attends me.

REWARD SYSTEM:

- All the peers are paid equally regardless of their work contributions.
- My pay is linked with performance in the organization I work for.
- I can accept that peers of mine are paid higher than me, if they make greater contributions to the company than I do.
- I think my pay level should be equal to my peers, as there should not be any gap between peers.
- I welcome pay to be linked to the group performance of our work group.
- Competition for pay among colleagues would harm our friendship.

WORKING ENVIRONMENT:

- My superior encourages and allows me to work to the best of my abilities
- Leaders in my organization give employees the authority to make decisions and take actions to meet the needs and expectations of our customers/clients.

ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

CONSCIENTIOUSNESS:

- I obey company rules and regulations even when no one is watching.
- I believe in giving an honest day's work for an honest day's pay.
- I rarely take long lunches or breaks and involved in my work
- I do not take unnecessary time off work.
- My attendance at work is above the norm.

CIVIC VIRTUE:

- I attend functions that are not required, but help the organization's image.
- I read and keep up with organizational announcements, memos, and so on.
- I attend training/information sessions that I am encouraged to.
- I attend and actively participate in company meetings.
- I am willing to take time out of my busy schedule to help with recruiting or training new employees.

ALTRUISM:

- I help others who have been absent.
- I help others who have heavy workloads.
- I am willing to help others who have work-related problems
- I help orient new people even though it is not required.

JOB SATISFACTION:

- I feel fairly satisfied with my present job.
- Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.
- I find real enjoyment in my work.
- I consider my job pleasant.

**Table 1: Reliability Analysis
Case Processing Summary**

		N	%
Cases	Valid	92	20.0
	Excluded ^a	368	80.0
	Total	460	100.0

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.983	33

**Table 2: Hypothesis Testing (Impact of Job Design on OCB)
One-Sample Test**

	Test Value = 3					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Job_design	27.712	91	.000	1.23913	1.1503	1.3280

**Table 3: Hypothesis Testing (Impact of Nature of Supervision on OCB)
 One-Sample Test**

	Test Value = 3					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Nature_of_supervision	28.432	91	.000	1.20652	1.1222	1.2908

**Table 4: Hypothesis Testing (Impact of Reward System on OCB)
 One-Sample Test**

	Test Value = 3					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Reward_system	24.939	91	.000	1.15217	1.0604	1.2439

**Table 5: Hypothesis Testing (Impact of Working Environment on OCB)
 One-Sample Test**

	Test Value = 3					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Working_environment	27.916	91	.000	1.22826	1.1409	1.3157

Table 6: Inter-correlations between Independent Variables

		Job_Design	Supervision	Reward_system	Working_envt
Job_Design	Pearson Correlation	1	.797**	.540**	.716**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	368	276	368	184
Supervision	Pearson Correlation	.797**	1	.822**	.696**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	276	276	276	184
Reward_system	Pearson Correlation	.540**	.822**	1	.750**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	368	276	552	184
Working_envt	Pearson Correlation	.716**	.696**	.750**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	184	184	184	184

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 7: Inter-correlations between Dependent Variables

		Conscientiousness	Civic_virtue	Altruism	Job_satisfaction
Conscientiousness	Pearson Correlation	1	.554**	.656**	.649**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	460	460	277	368
Civic_virtue	Pearson Correlation	.554**	1	.451**	.457**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	460	460	277	368
Altruism	Pearson Correlation	.656**	.451**	1	.733**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	277	277	277	277
Job_satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.649**	.457**	.733**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	368	368	277	368

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 8: Correlations between Independent Variables & Dependent Variables

		Conscien- tiousness	Civic _virtue	Altruism	Job_ satisfaction	Job_ _Design	Super vision	Reward_ system	Working_ envt
Conscientious- ness	Pearson Correlation	1	.554**	.656**	.649**	.695**	.682**	.348**	.700**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	460	460	277	368	368	276	460	184
Civic_virtue	Pearson Correlation	.554**	1	.451**	.457**	.499**	.405**	.163**	.309**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	460	460	277	368	368	276	460	184
Altruism	Pearson Correlation	.656**	.451**	1	.733**	.778**	.736**	.195**	.712**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.001	.000
	N	277	277	277	277	277	276	277	184
Job_satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.649**	.457**	.733**	1	.775**	.750**	.259**	.613**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	368	368	277	368	368	276	368	184
Job_Design	Pearson Correlation	.695**	.499**	.778**	.775**	1	.797**	.540**	.716**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	368	368	277	368	368	276	368	184
Supervision	Pearson Correlation	.682**	.405**	.736**	.750**	.797**	1	.822**	.696**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	276	276	276	276	276	276	276	184
Reward_system	Pearson Correlation	.348**	.163**	.195**	.259**	.540**	.822**	1	.750**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	460	460	277	368	368	276	552	184
Working_envt	Pearson Correlation	.700**	.309**	.712**	.613**	.716**	.696**	.750**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	184	184	184	184	184	184	184	184

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 9: Regression Analysis: Effect of Independent Variables on Conscientiousness Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.768 ^a	.590	.581	.26355	.590	64.462	4	179	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Working_envt, Supervision, Reward_system, Job_Design
 b. Dependent Variable: Conscientiousness

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.755	0		3.415	.001 ^a
	Residual	.071	0	.074	.896	.371 ^a
	Total	.127	0	.131	1.605	.010 ^a
3		.338	0	.367	4.678	.000 ^a
4		.284	0	.280	3.459	.001 ^a

a. Predictors: (Constant), Working_envt, Supervision, Reward_system, Job_Design

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.755	.221		3.415	.001
	Job_Design	.071	.079	.074	.896	.371
	Supervision	.127	.079	.131	1.605	.010
	Reward_system	.338	.072	.367	4.678	.000
	Working_envt	.284	.082	.280	3.459	.001

a. Dependent Variable: Conscientiousness

Table 10: Regression Analysis: Effect of Independent Variables on Civic Virtue

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.383 ^a	.146	.127	.39314	.146	7.679	4	179	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Working_envt, Supervision, Reward_system, Job_Design

b. Dependent Variable: Civic_virtue

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.383 ^a	.146	.127	.39314	.146	7.679	4	179	.000

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4.747	4	1.187	7.679	.000 ^a
	Residual	27.666	179	.155		
	Total	32.413	183			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Working_envt, Supervision, Reward_system, Job_Design

b. Dependent Variable: Civic_virtue

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
1 (Constant)	2.539	.330		7.698	.000
Job_Design	.307	.118	.310	2.597	.010
Supervision	-.050	.118	-.050	-.424	.672
Reward_system	.095	.108	.099	.876	.382
Working_envt	.049	.122	.047	.404	.687

a. Dependent Variable: Civic_virtue

Table 11: Regression Analysis: Effect of Independent Variables on Job Design Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.840 ^a	.705	.699	.23831	.705	107.127	4	179	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Working_envt, Supervision, Reward_system, Job_Design

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	24.335	4	6.084	107.127	.000 ^a
	Residual	10.165	179	.057		
	Total	34.500	183			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Working_envt, Supervision, Reward_system, Job_Design

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.383 ^a	.146	.127	.39314	.146	7.679	4	179	.000

b. Dependent Variable: Altruism

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.191	.200		.958	.340
	Job_Design	.350	.072	.342	4.876	.000
	Supervision	.285	.071	.276	3.980	.000
	Reward_system	.181	.065	.184	2.761	.006
	Working_envt	.149	.074	.138	2.007	.046

a. Dependent Variable: Altruism

Table 11: Regression Analysis: Effect of Independent Variables on Job Satisfaction
Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.801 ^a	.641	.633	.26254	.641	80.065	4	179	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Working_envt, Supervision, Reward_system, Job_Design

b. Dependent Variable: Job_satisfaction

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	22.075	4	5.519	80.065	.000 ^a
	Residual	12.338	179	.069		
	Total	34.413	183			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Working_envt, Supervision, Reward_system, Job_Design

b. Dependent Variable: Job_satisfaction

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.525	.220		2.382	.018
	Job_Design	.549	.079	.537	6.947	.000
	Supervision	.199	.079	.193	2.526	.012
	Reward_system	.164	.072	.167	2.277	.024
	Working_envt	-.034	.082	-.031	-.412	.681

a. Dependent Variable: Job_satisfaction