

**FACTORS INFLUENCING ORGANISATIONAL
CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR OF INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY PROFESSIONALS IN
CHENNAI, INDIA**

SRIVIDYA P

**ASIA e UNIVERSITY
2023**

FACTORS INFLUENCING ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP
BEHAVIOUR OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROFESSIONALS IN
CHENNAI, INDIA

SRIVIDYA P

A Thesis Submitted to Asia e University in
Fulfilment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

October 2023

ABSTRACT

Organization is one of the vital economic factors which coordinates the rest of the other factors such as land, labour and capital. The best organization structure reveals the successful business environment. In a dynamic environment adhered by globalisation, the major challenge for human resource upshots in gaining organizational competitive advantage. The investment scenario of the organisation largely depends on its employee performance as well as citizenship behaviour of the employees. Questionnaire was administered to 834 sample respondents chosen by simple random method. Five-Point Likert Scaling method was used to gather opinion of the respondents regarding constructs of the study. Structural Equation Modelling was used to examine the hidden relationship among the constructs of the study. The study found that personality and organizational commitment has significant effect on overall OCB and overall OCB has significant and positive impact on organizational performance.

Keywords: OCB, Civic virtue- Altruism- Courtesy – Conscientiousness- Sportsmanship- Personality, commitment, organisation performance

APPROVAL

This is to certify that this thesis conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in quality and scope, for the fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The student has been supervised by: **Professor Dr Juhary Ali**

The thesis has been examined and endorsed by:

Professor Dr Nor Zaidi Daud

Universiti Teknologi Mara

Examiner 1

Associate Professor Dr Ilham Sentosa

Universiti Kuala Lumpur

Examiner 2

This thesis was submitted to Asia e University and is accepted as fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.



Professor Dr Siow Heng Loke

Asia e University Chairman,

Examination Committee

(31 October 2023)

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis submitted in fulfilment of the PhD degree is my own work and that all contributions from any other persons or sources are properly and duly cited. I further declare that the material has not been submitted either in whole or in part, for a degree at this or any other university. In making this declaration, I understand and acknowledge any breaches in this declaration constitute academic misconduct, which may result in my expulsion from the programme and/or exclusion from the award of the degree.

Name: Srividya P

Signature of Candidate:

Date: 31 October 2023

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Quite a few people played a significant role directly or indirectly in shaping up my academic career. I cherish and value the great support of these individuals and would like to pay tribute to all of them.

My heartfelt gratitude to my guide, Prof. Dr. Juhary Ali , Dean, SAHUSS, AeU University, Malaysia for guiding me towards the vision. His strong commitment, encouragement and support helped in completing the doctoral program.

I remain extremely thankful to the management of IIM Calcutta and Institutions who facilitated and supported in data collection for the project. Lots of thanks to all the corporate who contributed to this endeavour.

My profound thanks to my parents, Mr. A Parameswaran (Retd., Ministry of Defence, Govt. of India) & Mrs. Padmavathy Parameswaran. I owe them everything and wish I could show them how much I love and appreciate them. Thanks to my son, Akshay Shravan who endured the pain of my absence during the final stages of the project and supported in completing it. Heartfelt thanks to my husband, Vijayakumar G, and all my near and dear, for all the wishes, love, encouragement, support and guidance.

I am extremely thankful to Mr. Vijayasundaram, (Retd. Deputy Registrar, and University of Madras) and family for their unconditional support and affection. My sincere thanks to my sister and family, Mr. Krishnamoorthy and Mrs. Parimala Krishnamoorthy for the warm hospitality and care extended during my stay in their home which supported me in completing my program.

Srividya P

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|--------------|
| ABSTRACT | ii |
| APPROVAL | iii |
| DECLARATION | iv |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | vi |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | vii |
| LIST OF TABLES | ix |
| LIST OF FIGURES | xvi |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATION | xviii |
| | |
| CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.0 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Background of the Study | 23 |
| 1.2 Statement of the Problem | 33 |
| 1.3 Research Questions | 35 |
| 1.4 Research Objectives | 35 |
| 1.5 Significance of the Study | 36 |
| 1.6 Scope of the Study | 36 |
| 1.7 Operational Definitions | 37 |
| 1.8 Organisation of the Chapters | 38 |
| | |
| CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE | 40 |
| 2.0 Introduction | 40 |
| 2.1 Analysis of the Independent and Dependents Variables and Their Relationship/Effects/Determination | 40 |
| 2.2 Previous Empirical Studies on the Variables of the Study | 41 |
| 2.3 Theories and Theoretical Framework to Device the Conceptual Framework | 58 |
| 2.4 Conceptual Framework | 60 |
| 2.5 Summary | 65 |
| | |
| CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY | 66 |
| 3.0 Introduction | 66 |
| 3.1 Research Philosophy | 66 |
| 3.2 Research Design | 67 |
| 3.3 Hypotheses | 67 |
| 3.4 Description of Dimensions and Measurement of Variables | 68 |
| 3.5 Population and Sampling Techniques | 70 |
| 3.6 Description of the Procedures Used to Collect Data | 74 |
| 3.7 Description of the Statistical Methods Used to Analyse the Data | 79 |
| | |
| CHAPTER 4 FINDINGS | 81 |
| 4.0 Introduction | 81 |
| 4.1 Descriptive Statistics | 81 |
| 4.2 Statistical Analysis and Findings | 82 |
| 4.3 Summary of Findings | 217 |
| 4.4 Summary | 221 |

| | |
|------------------------------------|------------|
| CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION | 223 |
| 5.0 Introduction | 223 |
| 5.1 Discussion | 224 |
| 5.2 Research Contribution | 229 |
| 5.3 Research Implications | 229 |
| 5.4 Research Limitations | 230 |
| 5.5 Future Research Suggestions | 231 |
| 5.6 Conclusions | 234 |
| 5.7 Summary | 236 |
| REFERENCES | 237 |
| APPENDICES | 251 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|-------------|
| 1.1 Stages of human growth | 8 |
| 1.2 Particulars of SEZs in Tamil Nadu | 30 |
| 3.1 Descriptions of dimensions of OCB factors | 68 |
| 3.2 Sample size | 70 |
| 3.3 Estimation of Cronbach's coefficient alpha and CFA loadings for OCB dimensions | 76 |
| 3.4 Estimation alpha coefficient and CFA loadings for personality dimensions | 77 |
| 3.5 Estimation of Cronbach's coefficient alpha and CFA loadings for organizational commitment factors | 78 |
| 3.6 Estimation of Cronbach's coefficient alpha and CFA loadings for performance factors | 79 |
| 4.1 Gender-wise classification | 82 |
| 4.2 Age-wise classification | 83 |
| 4.3 Nativity-wise classification | 84 |
| 4.4 Position in the management | 85 |
| 4.5 Qualification-wise classification | 86 |
| 4.6 Work experience wise classification | 87 |
| 4.7 Pay scale (CTC per annum) | 88 |
| 4.8 Non-cash benefits | 89 |
| 4.9 Reason for providing reward and recognition | 90 |
| 4.10 Level of satisfaction towards performance appraisal | 92 |
| 4.11 Level of satisfaction towards company policies | 93 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 4.12 | Level of satisfaction towards company training | 94 |
| 4.13 | Opinion about working environment | 95 |
| 4.14 | Opinion about safety standards | 96 |
| 4.15 | Involvement in corporate social responsibility | 97 |
| 4.16 | Performance appraisal bases | 98 |
| 4.17 | Voluntariness to give suggestions | 99 |
| 4.18 | Opportunity to give suggestions in official meetings | 100 |
| 4.19 | Encouragement of manager in personal growth | 101 |
| 4.20 | Awareness of present role in organization | 102 |
| 4.21 | Clear communication on target dates | 103 |
| 4.22 | Frequency of feedback given to you by reporting authority | 104 |
| 4.23 | Rating of morale level in your organization | 105 |
| 4.24 | Frequency of performance assessment | 106 |
| 4.25 | Opinions about dimensions of OCB | 107 |
| 4.26 | Courtesy factors | 109 |
| 4.27 | Conscientiousness factors | 111 |
| 4.28 | Civic virtue factors | 113 |
| 4.29 | Sportsmanship factors | 115 |
| 4.30 | Difference between gender and OCB dimensions | 117 |
| 4.31 | Difference between age and OCB dimensions | 118 |
| 4.32 | Post-hoc test | 119 |
| 4.33 | Difference between nativity and OCB dimensions | 120 |
| 4.34 | Difference between management position and OCB dimensions | 121 |
| 4.35 | Difference between educational qualification and OCB dimensions | 122 |
| 4.36 | Difference between work experience and OCB dimensions | 123 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 4.37 | Post-hoc test | 124 |
| 4.38 | Difference between pay scale and OCB dimensions | 125 |
| 4.39 | Post-hoc test | 126 |
| 4.40 | Level of OCB dimensions | 127 |
| 4.41 | Chi-square between level of OCB dimensions and reason for providing reward and recognition | 128 |
| 4.42 | Chi-square between level of OCB dimensions and reason for performance appraisal base | 129 |
| 4.43 | Chi-square between level of OCB dimensions and availing non cash benefits | 129 |
| 4.44 | Extroversion personality factors | 130 |
| 4.45 | Agreeableness personality factors | 131 |
| 4.46 | Conscientiousness personality factors | 132 |
| 4.47 | Neuroticism personality factors | 133 |
| 4.48 | Openness personality factors | 135 |
| 4.49 | Affective commitment factors | 137 |
| 4.50 | Continuance commitment factors | 139 |
| 4.51 | Normative commitment factors | 141 |
| 4.52 | Individual performance factors | 142 |
| 4.53 | KMO and Bartlett's test | 143 |
| 4.54 | Communalities | 144 |
| 4.55 | Total variance explained | 147 |
| 4.56 | Rotated component matrix | 148 |
| 4.57 | Inter-correlation between OCB dimensions | 152 |
| 4.58 | Inter-correlation between personality dimensions | 154 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 4.59 | Inter-correlation between organizational commitment dimensions | 157 |
| 4.60 | Correlation between OCB, personality and organizational commitment dimensions | 158 |
| 4.61 | Difference between gender and personality dimensions | 159 |
| 4.62 | Difference between age and personality dimensions | 159 |
| 4.63 | Post-hoc test | 160 |
| 4.64 | Difference between nativity and personality dimensions | 161 |
| 4.65 | Difference between management position and personality dimensions | 161 |
| 4.66 | Post-hoc | 162 |
| 4.67 | Difference between educational qualification and personality dimensions | 162 |
| 4.68 | Difference between work experience and personality dimensions | 163 |
| 4.69 | Post-hoc test | 163 |
| 4.70 | Difference between pay scale and personality dimensions | 164 |
| 4.71 | Post-hoc test | 165 |
| 4.72 | Difference between gender and organizational commitment dimensions | 166 |
| 4.73 | Difference between age and organizational commitment dimensions | 166 |
| 4.74 | Difference between nativity and organizational commitment dimensions | 167 |
| 4.75 | Difference between management position and organizational commitment dimensions | 167 |
| 4.76 | Difference between educational qualification and organizational commitment dimensions | 168 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 4.77 | Difference between work experience and organizational commitment dimensions | 168 |
| 4.78 | Post-hoc analysis | 170 |
| 4.79 | Difference between pay scale and organizational commitment dimensions | 171 |
| 4.80 | Post-hoc test | 172 |
| 4.81 | Difference between gender and individual performance factors | 173 |
| 4.82 | Difference between age and individual performance factors | 174 |
| 4.83 | Difference between nativity and individual performance factors | 175 |
| 4.84 | Difference between management position and individual performance factors | 176 |
| 4.85 | Difference between educational qualification and individual performance factors | 177 |
| 4.86 | Difference between work experience and individual performance factors | 179 |
| 4.87 | Difference between pay scale and individual performance factors | 180 |
| 4.88 | Difference between gender and civic virtue improvement factors | 181 |
| 4.89 | Difference between age and civic virtue improvement factors | 182 |
| 4.90 | Difference between nativity and civic virtue improvement factors | 183 |
| 4.91 | Difference between management position and civic virtue improvement factors | 184 |
| 4.92 | Difference between educational qualification and civic virtue improvement factors | 184 |
| 4.93 | Difference between work experience and civic virtue improvement factor | 185 |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 4.94 | Post-hoc test | 186 |
| 4.95 | Difference between pay scale and civic virtue improvement factors | 187 |
| 4.96 | Post-hoc test | 188 |
| 4.97 | Correlation between satisfaction factors | 188 |
| 4.98 | Correlation between civic virtue and level of satisfaction towards performance appraisal | 190 |
| 4.99 | Correlation between civic virtue and level of satisfaction towards company polices | 192 |
| 4.100 | Correlation between civic virtue and level of satisfaction towards company training and development programs | 194 |
| 4.101 | Level of personality dimensions | 195 |
| 4.102 | Chi-square between level of personality dimensions and reason for providing reward and recognition | 195 |
| 4.103 | Chi-square between level of personality dimensions and reason for performance appraisal bases | 196 |
| 4.104 | Chi-square between level of personality dimensions and availing non cash benefits | 196 |
| 4.105 | Level of organizational commitment dimensions | 197 |
| 4.106 | Chi-square between level of organizational commitment factors and reason for providing reward and recognition | 198 |
| 4.107 | Chi-square between level of organizational commitment factors and reason for performance appraisal bases | 198 |
| 4.108 | Chi-square between level of organizational commitment factors and availing non cash benefits | 199 |
| 4.109 | ANOVA table | 200 |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 4.110 | Summary of the regression model | 200 |
| 4.111 | Regression coefficient for impact of different levels of personality on overall OCB | 201 |
| 4.112 | ANOVA table | 203 |
| 4.113 | Summary of the regression model | 203 |
| 4.114 | Regression coefficient for impact of different levels of organizational commitment factors on overall OCB | 204 |
| 4.115 | ANOVA table | 205 |
| 4.116 | Summary of the regression model | 206 |
| 4.117 | Regression coefficient for impact of different levels of OCB dimensions on overall performance | 207 |
| 4.118 | Paired T test with overall level of personality and OCB | 208 |
| 4.119 | Paired samples correlations | 208 |
| 4.120 | Paired sample test result | 208 |
| 4.121 | ANOVA table | 209 |
| 4.122 | Summary of the regression model | 210 |
| 4.123 | Regression coefficient for impact of different levels of personality dimensions on overall performance | 211 |
| 4.124 | Multiple regression analysis between organizational commitment factors and overall level of performance | 212 |
| 4.125 | Regression coefficient for impact of different levels of Organizational commitment factors on overall performance | 213 |
| 4.126 | Model fit statistics | 215 |
| 4.127 | Standardized regression weights: (Group number 1 - Default model) | 216 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure | | Page |
|---|--|-------------|
| 1.1 Trends of IT export growth in Tamil Nadu | | 29 |
| 1.2 IT product-wise export from Tamil Nadu | | 29 |
| 3.3 Measurement model for OCB dimensions | | 75 |
| 3.4 Measurement model for personality dimensions | | 76 |
| 3.5 Measurement model for organizational commitment factors | | 77 |
| 3.6 Measurement model for performance factors | | 78 |
| 4.1 Gender wise classification | | 82 |
| 4.2 Age-wise classification | | 83 |
| 4.3 Nativity-wise classification | | 84 |
| 4.4 Position in the management | | 85 |
| 4.5 Qualification-wise classification | | 86 |
| 4.6 Work experience-wise classification | | 87 |
| 4.7 Pay scale-wise classification | | 88 |
| 4.8 Non-cash benefits | | 90 |
| 4.9 Reason for providing reward and recognition | | 91 |
| 4.10 Level of satisfaction towards performance appraisal | | 92 |
| 4.11 Level of satisfaction towards company policies | | 93 |
| 4.12 Level of satisfaction towards company training | | 94 |
| 4.13 Opinion about working environment | | 95 |
| 4.14 Opinion about safety standards | | 96 |
| 4.15 Involvement in corporate social responsibility | | 97 |
| 4.16 Performance appraisal bases | | 98 |
| 4.17 Voluntariness to give suggestions | | 99 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 4.18 | Opportunity to give suggestions in official meetings by reporting authority | 100 |
| 4.19 | Encouragement of manager in personal growth | 101 |
| 4.20 | Awareness of present role in organization | 102 |
| 4.21 | Clear communication on target dates | 103 |
| 4.22 | Frequency of feedback given to you by reporting authority | 104 |
| 4.23 | Rating morale level in your organization | 105 |
| 4.24 | Frequency of performance assessment | 106 |
| 4.25 | Effect of structure equation model | 215 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATION

| | |
|-------|---|
| 16PF | The Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire |
| ADM | Application Maintenance and Development |
| ANOVA | Analysis of Variance |
| BPM | Business Process Management |
| BPO | Business Processing Outsourcing |
| CADM | Custom Application Development and Maintenance |
| CAGR | Compound Annual Growth Rate |
| CANOE | Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Neuroticism, Openness, Extraversion |
| CFA | Cronbach Alpha Value |
| CTC | Cost to Company |
| DIPP | Development of Industrial Policy and Promotion |
| ENTJ | Extraversion, Intuition, Thinking, Judging |
| EOU | Export Oriented Units |
| ER&D | Engineering, Research and Development |
| ESDM | Electronic System Design Management |
| ESTJ | Extraversion, Sensing, Thinking, Judging |
| FDI | Foreign Direct Investment |
| GDP | Gross Domestic Product |
| GICs | Global Industrial Classification Standards |
| IANS | Indo Asian News Service |
| ISFJ | Introversion, Sensing, Feeling, Judging |
| iSPIR | Indian Software Product Industry Roundtable |

| | |
|----------|---|
| IT | Information Technology |
| ITBPM | Information Technology Business Process Management |
| ITeS | Information Technology enabled Services |
| KMO | Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin |
| MGS | Multiplier Grants Scheme |
| MMPI | The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory |
| MSA | Measure of Sampling Adequacy |
| NASA | The National Aeronautics and Space Administration |
| NASSCOM | The National Association of Software and Service Companies |
| NDA | National Democratic Alliance |
| NEO-FFI | The Neo Five-Factor Inventory |
| NEO-PI-R | The Revised NEO Personality Inventory |
| NSL | Nuziveedu Seeds Limited |
| OCB | Organisation Citizenship Behaviour |
| OCEAN | Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Neuroticism |
| OSS | Open Source Solutions |
| PC | Personal Computer |
| PE | Private Equity |
| R&D | Research and Development |
| SEEPZ | Santacruz Electronics Export Processing Zone |
| SEZ | Special Economic Zones |
| SIP-EIT | Support International Patent Protection in Electronics & IT |
| SMEs | Small and Medium Enterprises |

| | |
|------|------------------------------------|
| STPI | Software Technology Parks of India |
| TAT | The Thematic Appreciation Test |
| TCS | Tata Consultancy Services |
| USA | United States of America |
| WEF | World Economic Forum |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

The thesis deals with the effectiveness of organisational citizenship behaviour factors in the organisation's success. The success of an organization no longer stands on its ability to only meet individual goals and performance metrics in today's ultra-competitive business environment. When coworkers help each other or are willing to go the extra mile, it generates a good environment for collaboration and innovation. Companies that can tap into the discretionary effort of their workforces by giving employees reasons to volunteer extra value than what is outlined as their formal job responsibilities and take maximum organizational success out of this added effort will delight customers, retain more employees for longer periods and enjoy better overall organizational performance.

An excellence driven organization evolves by dedication, by treasuring employees' efficiency, merits and providing them high job satisfaction. An organization which aims at success prefers employees who can perform over and beyond specified job scope. This behaviour is coined as Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) which motivates employees intrinsically to perform beyond their prescribed role requirements. In a basket of success lies one crucial — albeit sometimes forgotten — piece: Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). Companies that build an OCB culture often have better collaboration, employee engagement, and productivity. Organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) as defined by Dennis Organ, generally considered as the father of 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". OCB is an extra role behaviour which facilitates organizational functioning. While there are many researches in this area, studies continue with the operationalization or definition of OCB. The reason may be that OCB research is yet to define the construct while studies were carried out to understand the OCB and related factors. Nevertheless, employees do not look for rewards and even managers cannot insist their subordinates to execute OCB. However, as observed by Organ, Managers do consider the accomplishments of their subordinates and recognize them in the form of promotion or better ratings in performance appraisals.

Citizenship Behaviour

In Organizational Management Science, a new paradigm Organizational Citizenship Behaviour propounded by Bateman and Organ in 1980's (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983). The concept came into operation by taking series of Managers views on the behaviour which they prefer their subordinates to evince without forcing or attaching any monetary benefits. The behaviour which evolved by this process formed the basis for the idea of organization Citizenship Behaviour. These behaviours "lubricate the social machinery of organizations" (Smith et al., 1983).

OCB is work behaviour that is defined as discretionary, not related to the formal organizational reward system, and collectively taken to promote the organizational effectiveness (Moorman, 1991; Niehoff, 2005; Podsakoff) Organ (1997) observed certain issues with OCB as extra-role behaviour. (Mackenzie, 1994; Walz & Niehoff, 2000; Yen & Niehoff, 2004) As OCB is not contractually obligated for reward system there were many problems in the earlier conceptualization (Organ 1997). The definition of the terms "role" and "job" were in the grey area and there were problems due to this. The advancement of Leader-member exchange theory

explained the roles evolved from leader-subordinate interactions, which helped to explain the difficulties (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen & Uhl- Bien, 1995).

Two problems emerged from this explanation. First, performance appraisal was followed to offer rewards. However, research has exhibited that certain forms of OCB is likely to be considered as in-role performance to attach financial rewards (Mackenzie et al., 1991; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Werner, 1994). Secondly, Organ (1997) expressed that only a few rewards are assured contractually. Indeed, due to economic crises in the last decade, several employees were not only denied of rewards but also lost their jobs.

Borman & Motowidlo (1983) came with the construct of contextual performance, though not with an intention to address definitional problems of OCB. The concept of OCB was initially comprehended as an interest on behavioural consequences of job satisfaction which results in organisational effectiveness. Contextual performance was developed from the keenness to know why only task performance is given importance in personnel selection, whereas behavioural aspects like helping, following rules, persisting and volunteering are not touched upon which also get ratified in organizational effectiveness. (Motowidlo, 2000). Borman & Motowidlo (1993, p. 73) debated that these behaviours are valuable for the organisation as they “support the organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function”. Accordingly, contextual performance was mooted in response to the question “What part of the performance domain is being relatively neglected by selection research and practice, and how this part is different? Contextual performance is defined as “behaviours that do not support the technical core itself so much as they support the broader organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function” (Borman