CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In a research the investigator or researcher attempts to choose the method most appropriate to the particular question or issues under consideration. In this chapter the present investigator has dealt with a detailed description of the method used in the present research, which provides information of scientific steps taken in conducting the present research. The research quality depends not only on the research plan but also on the truthfulness of the evaluation procedures administered. This section gives an outline of the method used in the study i.e. the design of the study, sample selection, the tools and various measures used to assess the variables, procedure for scoring and the statistical techniques used to analyze the data.

The important role of methodology is to facilitate communication between investigators who have mutual interest in the topic and often share common evidences. The experimental research method explicates the relevant foundation of reasoned knowledge. It also explicates the accepted criteria for empirical objectivity and the methods and techniques for verification so that the researchers can estimate the probable limits of generalizability of the findings.

HYPOTHESES: To attain the objectives the following hypotheses were formulated

1. There is no significant relationship among personality traits and organizational commitment.
2. There is no significant relationship among organizational citizenship behavior and personality traits.
3. There is no significant relationship among egotism and organizational commitment.
4. There is no significant relationship among egotism and organizational citizenship behavior.
RESEARCH DESIGN

Correlational design was used to determine the contribution of personality traits and egotism in the determination of organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment.

VARIABLES

➢ Predictor Variables

(1). Egotism

(2). Dimensions of Personality: There are five broad domains of personality i.e. (i). Dimension of Neuroticism, (ii). Dimension of Extraversion, (iii). Dimension of Openness to experience, (iv). Dimension of Agreeableness, (v). Dimension of Conscientiousness

➢ Criterion Variables: - (1). Organizational commitment

(2). Organizational citizenship behavior:

➢ Relevant Variables: - Employee’s Age, Sex, Education and Tenure in the organization.

RESEARCH SAMPLE

A representative sample of 200 employees of Insurance companies in Agra was selected randomly for the research. All employees were randomly selected out of the total number of employees of all organizations in Agra. The organizations included LIC of India, ING Life-Insurance Company and Allianz Bajaj Insurance Company. At least graduates employees were taken as the subjects in the research and their range of age was between 25 to 54 yrs. Their tenure of service ranged from 5 yrs to 13yrs. Tables 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 below given a classification of sample on the basis of age, tenure of service and education of employees respectively.
Table 3.1: Age wise distribution of the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Tenure wise distribution of the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure in the organization</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Education wise distribution of the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Details</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inclusion Criteria

- The subjects who were above 25 and below 54 yrs have been included in the sample.
- Only those subjects were selected in the sample whose their tenure of service ranged from 5 to 13 yrs.
- Employees who were at least graduates employees were taken in the sample.
- Only male employees were taken in the sample.

Exclusion Criteria

- The subjects who were below 25 or above 54 yrs have not been taken in the sample.
- Female subjects were excluded from the sample.
- Those subjects whose education was below graduate level have not been included in the sample.

TOOLS

The following tools were used to measure the predictive variables and criterion variables. For the study, four scales were used, which are as follows:

Egotism Scale

“Egotism Scale” was constructed by the investigator herself (by Das and Sisodia, 2013). It consists of 30 items in Hindi language. The egotism scale has six dimensions. These are:

(1) Egotism of physical and mental energy
(2) Egotism of beauty, smartness and physical attraction
(3) Egotism of wealth, property and luxury items
(4) Egotism of social status, & connections with influential and powerful people

(5) Egotism of superior genes, caste or race

(6) Egotism of community services, charity and religiosity.

**Scoring:** In the scoring of Egotism scale every statement responded with tick mark (✓) was assigned ‘1’ mark and the statement marked as (X) was assigned ‘0’. The total score is the total number of ticks. The statement that showed high egotism was given score ‘1’. It was concluded that higher the scores higher the egotism of the subjects. Items no 3, 4 & 16 has reverse scoring i.e. 0 or 1. The minimum possible score of the egotism questionnaire is ‘0’ and the maximum possible score is ‘30’.

**Validity:** Concurrent validity of egotism scale was found by administering the scale on teachers. Teachers’ egotism scores were validated against the criterion of student’s ratings. The coefficient of correlation was found to be 0 .65 which is highly significant at .01 level. So the egotism scale is highly valid.

**Reliability:** The Test Retest Reliability of egotism scale with a time gap of 4 months was .55.

**Norms:** Standardized Z score norms were obtained on a representative sample of 200 cases. The following table 3.4 indicates the conversion of raw scores into Z score norms for Egotism Scale.
Table: 3.4 Norms of Egotism Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw scores</th>
<th>Z scores</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.5 and above</td>
<td>+2 to +3</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.0 to 20.5</td>
<td>+1 to +2</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5 to 16.0</td>
<td>Mean to +1</td>
<td>Above average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 to 11.5</td>
<td>Mean to -1</td>
<td>Below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 to 7.0</td>
<td>-1 to -2</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 2.5</td>
<td>-2 to -3</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Das & Sisodia 2013, p. 87-95]

**Neo Five-Factor Inventory**

Personality of employees in the sample was measured by Five Factor Personality Inventory (NEO PI) by McCrae and Costa (1985). There are five broad domains or dimensions of personality which were measured by this inventory. Each dimension consists of six facets that explain each dimension, including:

**Neuroticism:** (1) Hostility, (2) Anxiety, (3) Vulnerability to stress, (4) Impulsiveness, (5) Self-Consciousness, (6) Depression.


**Openness:** (1) Feelings, (2) Actions, (3) Values, (4) Fantasy, (5) Ideas, (6) Aesthetics.

**Conscientiousness:**  (i) Dutifulness, (ii) Achievement Striving, (iii) Self-Discipline, (iv) Order,  
(v) Deliberation, (vi) Competence.

**Instruction given by the researcher to the subjects:-**

“**Five Factor inventory has total 60 statements. Carefully read every option. For every options mark in the given box with the opinion that accurately represents your response. Get assured that your response is in the accurate box.**

 Tick (√) mark the response ‘Strongly Disagree’ if response is definitely false.

Tick (√) mark the response ‘Disagree’ if response is mostly false.

Tick (√) mark the response ‘Neutral’ if option is equally true and false.

Tick (√) mark the response ‘Agree’ if option is mostly true.

Tick (√) mark the response ‘Strongly Agree’ if option is surely true.

Tick (√) mark only one response for each option, making sure that you mark in the correct answer”.

**Scoring:**

**Neuroticism:** It has total 12 statements maximum score 48 and minimum score 0 (zero). Each statement has five types of responses: which had responsiveness ranging between ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’. Scores range from 0 to 4. Statement no. 6, 11, 21,26,31,36,41,46,51 and 56 were also scored in this way. Statement 1 and 16 had negative scoring and the responses were therefore scored as 4,3,2,1, and 0.

**Extraversion:** It has total 12 statements maximum score 48 and minimum score 0 (zero). Each statement has five types of responses. Statement no 2, 7,17,22,32,37,47,52, and 57 were also scored
in this way. Statement 12, 27, and 42 had negative scoring and the responses were therefore scored as 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0.

**Openness:** It has total 12 statements maximum score 48 and minimum score 0 (zero). Each statement has five types of responses. Statement no. 3,8,13,18,23,28,33,38,43,48,53, and 58 were also scored in this way.

**Agreeableness:** It has total 12 statements maximum score 48 and minimum score 0 (zero). Each statement has five types of responses. Statement no. 4, 19, 34, 44, 49, 54, and 59 were also scored in this way. Statement 9, 14, 24, 29, 39, had negative scoring and the responses were therefore scored as 4,3,2,1, and 0.

**Conscientiousness:** It has total 12 statements maximum score 48 and minimum score 0 (zero). Each statement has five types of response. Statement no. 5, 10, 20, 25, 35, 40, 45, 50, and 60 were also scored in this way. Statement 15, 30, 55 had negative scoring and the responses were therefore scored 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0.

**Reliability**

Internal consistency was calculated for this five factor inventory to be high, at: .79 for Neuroticism dimension, .79 for Extraversion dimension, .80 for Openness dimension, .75 for Agreeableness, .83 for Conscientiousness dimension. Test retest reliability was related to this inventory came out to be 0.83 for Neuroticism dimension, .82 for Extraversion dimension, .83 for Openness dimension, .63 for Agreeableness dimension and .79 for Conscientiousness dimension.

**Validity:** Discriminate validity and criterion validity has been established for these scales.

[McCrae and Costa 1985, p. 587-597]
Organizational Commitment Scale

Allen and Meyer (1990) have developed a scale for measuring organizational commitment of individuals. This questionnaire consists of three domains and has total 24 statements. Subjects are instructed to rate statements on a seven point Likert scales, which had responsiveness ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’.

The dimension covered by this questionnaire includes:

1. Scale of Affective commitment (ACS)
2. Scale of Continuance commitment (CCS)
3. Scale of Normative commitment (NCS)

Scores range from 0 to 6 in accordance to 7 point Likert scale. However, reverse scoring (6 to 0) was done for the items no. 4,5,6,8,9,15,18,19,23,29. The discriminate validity has been established for these scales. The reliability for each of the three scales was as follows: ACS: .87, CCS: .75, NCS: .79.


Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior scale was constructed by Podsakoff, et al. (1990). It is a 24 item scale. This questionnaire was applied to examine five domains of OCB investigated by Organ (1988). The scale consists of five dimensions including ‘altruism’, ‘courtesy’, ‘conscientiousness’, ‘civic virtue’ and ‘sportsmanship’. This scale responses are measured by Likert-Type seven point scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ (1) to ‘strongly agree’ (7). The ratings expressed the extent that each of the behaviors’ was an attributes of the individual’s behavior. Internal consistency was
0.85. Coefficient of Alpha was calculated to be 0.71 for Sportsmanship; 0.67 for Conscientiousness; 0.71 for Altruism; 0.76 for Courtesy and 0.67 for Civic Virtue dimension.


STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Multiple Regression Analysis was used in the present study.