

Results

This chapter presents the results of the descriptive statistics, correlation of analysis of variance (ANOVA), and multiple regression analyses. Firstly, it presents the preliminary analyses such as descriptive statistics, analysis based on background, and demographics, and correlations among all the variables. It also outlines the results of the hypotheses tests that examine the influence of individual, perceptual and organizational variables. Finally it tests the relationships between the independent and dependent variables across organizational types, sectors and perceived performance groups. A summary of the major results appear at the end of the chapter.

5.1 Descriptive Analysis

A summary of descriptive statistics for all the study variables is presented in Table 5.1. The descriptive statistics presents the mean, the range, minimum and maximum values and standard deviation. The mean age of the respondents is 35.6 and SD was 9.2 years. It

is important to note that amongst the 3 independent variables, affective commitment is the highest whereas, in the dependent variables In –Role behaviour is the maximum.

Table 5.1: Descriptive Statistics

Study Variables	N	Min.	Max	Mean	SD
Age	634	21	58	35.6	9.2
Affective Commitment	634	1	7	5.5	1.1
Normative Commitment	634	1	7	5.2	1.1
Continuous Commitment	634	1	7	4.1	1.1
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-Individuals	634	1	5	3.1	0.8
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-Organization	634	1	5	3.2	0.8
In-Role Behaviour	634	1	5	3.5	0.7

5.2 Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis was first carried out for to obtain a sense of the strength and direction of relationships across the different variables.

Table 5.2 : Correlation Matrix

	Age	Exp	AC	CC	NC	OC	OCB-I	OCB-O	OCB-total	IRB
Age	1.000									
Exp	0.813**	1.000								
AC	0.221**	0.257**	1.000							
CC	0.142**	0.102*	0.051	1.000						
NC	0.239**	0.197**	0.588**	0.211**	1.000					
OC	0.277**	0.256**	0.748**	0.601**	0.819**	1.000				
OCB-I	0.127**	0.154**	0.207**	-0.030	0.134**	0.141**	1.000			
OCB-O	0.166**	0.199**	0.252**	-0.038	0.189**	0.182**	0.880**	1.000		
OCB-total	0.149**	0.180**	0.234**	-0.034	0.164**	0.165**	0.975**	0.964**	1.000	
IRB	0.115**	0.154**	0.304**	-0.068	0.180**	0.188**	0.782**	0.793**	0.812**	1.000

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

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

The table above shows the correlations of the ten variables with each other. We can see that age and experience are positively correlated with the three commitment components

(AC, CC, and NC) as well as with the citizenship behaviour sub-components and OCBtotal (ie. OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB) and with In-role behaviour (IRB). The results suggest that as people grow older and gain more work experience they become more committed (in all the 3 components Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment and Normative Commitment) and they also exhibit higher Citizenship and In-Role behaviours. Affective Commitment has a significant positive correlation with Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-Individuals ($r=0.207$, $p<0.01$), Organizational Citizenship Behaviour -Organization (0.252 , $p<0.01$), Organizational Citizenship Behaviour –total ($r=0.234$, $p<0.01$) In-Role Behaviour (0.304 , $p<0.01$).

Continuance Commitment has a negative but insignificant correlations with all the dependent variables.

Normative Commitment also shows significant positive correlation with Organizational Citizenship Behaviour - Individuals (0.134 , $p<0.01$).

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour – Organization (0.189 , $p<0.01$), Organizational Citizenship Behaviour –total (0.164 , $p<0.01$), In-Role Behaviour (0.180 , $p<0.01$) though these correlations are weaker than that of Affective Commitment with the dependent measures.

Within the performance parameters we see that In-Role Behaviour has a significantly high positive correlation with Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-Individuals (0.782 , $p<0.01$) Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-Organization (0.793 , $p<0.01$) Organizational Citizenship Behaviour –total (0.812 , $p<0.01$). This shows that there is a high correlation amongst the performance parameters, where the correlations of IRB are higher with OCB-O than that with OCB-I.

5.3 Testing of Group Differences - Influence of Individual Demographic variables on Organizational Commitment Components, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and In-Role-Behaviour

5.3.1 Gender as an antecedent

Hypotheses 1 to 7, for each of the 3 independent variables (AC, CC and NC) and 4 dependent variables (OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB-total and IRB) have been drawn up and tested to see if there is any significant difference in the variables, vis-à-vis male and female respondents.

For each of the 7 variables the null hypothesis stated was, that there is no difference in the variables between genders, while the alternate hypotheses suggested the prevalence of differences.

The list of these 7 variables and their alternate hypotheses and ensuing results (notably the p-value) appear in the table below:

Table 5.3 : ANOVA results for Gender differences (N = 634, df = 1)

Alternate Hypotheses (H_a) : Significant difference in the under-mentioned variables (between Genders)

H_a Variable	Gender	N	Mean	S.D.	F	p-value
1 Affective Commitment	Male	557	32.907	6.474	1.346	0.246
	Female	77	31.987	6.839		
2 Continuance Commitment	Male	557	24.729	6.886	0.736	0.391
	Female	77	25.442	6.441		
3 Normative Commitment	Male	557	31.260	6.363	0.660	0.417
	Female	77	30.636	5.967		
4 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour – Individuals	Male	557	50.370	12.339	0.422	0.516
	Female	77	49.390	12.947		
5 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour – Organization	Male	557	41.648	10.172	4.504	0.034*
	Female	77	38.974	11.673		
6 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Male	557	92.018	21.812	1.850	0.174
	Female	77	88.364	24.100		
7 In-Role –Behaviour	Male	557	49.147	9.617	1.989	0.159
	Female	77	47.468	11.015		

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

A significant difference was found only in the levels of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour - Organizations ($F = 4.504$, $p < 0.05$) displayed by males and females, with males displaying higher levels. Therefore, the alternate hypothesis 5, about existence of difference in OCB-O between genders is accepted. None of the other 6 measurement variables showed any significant differences in gender, so we accept their null hypotheses 1,2, 3, 4, 6 and 7.

5.3.2 Age as an antecedent

Hypotheses 8 to 14 for each of the 3 independent variables (AC, CC and NC) and 4 dependent variables (OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB and IRB) have been drawn up and tested to see if there is any significant difference in the variables, vis-à-vis age profile of respondents.

For each of the 7 variables the null hypothesis stated was, that there is no difference in the variables across age profiles, while the alternate hypothesis suggested the prevalence of differences.

The list of these 7 variables and their alternate hypotheses and ensuing results (notably the p-value) appear in the table below :

Table 5.4 : ANOVA results for Age Profile differences (N = 634, df = 3)Alternate Hypotheses (H_a) : Significant difference in the under-mentioned variables (between Age Profiles)

H_a Variable		Age	N	Mean	S.D.	F	p-value
8	Affective Commitment	A (21 – 25 years)	80	29.638	7.306	14.540	0.000***
		B (26 – 35 years)	255	31.980	6.400		
		C (36 – 45 years)	213	34.033	5.947		
		D (46 & above)	86	35.081	5.993		
9	Continuance Commitment	A (21 – 25 years)	80	23.538	7.198	7.002	0.000***
		B (26 – 35 years)	255	24.396	6.405		
		C (36 – 45 years)	213	24.592	6.988		
		D (46 & above)	86	27.802	6.665		
10	Normative Commitment	A (21 – 25 years)	80	29.013	6.584	13.548	0.000***
		B (26 – 35 years)	255	30.039	6.451		
		C (36 – 45 years)	213	32.390	6.080		
		D (46 & above)	86	33.616	4.703		
11	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-Individuals	A (21 – 25 years)	80	47.663	12.376	4.676	0.003**
		B (26 – 35 years)	255	48.839	11.833		
		C (36 – 45 years)	213	52.216	13.259		
		D (46 & above)	86	51.977	11.064		
12	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-Organizations	A (21 – 25 years)	80	38.825	10.392	6.650	0.000***
		B (26 – 35 years)	255	39.886	10.306		
		C (36 – 45 years)	213	43.225	10.463		
		D (46 & above)	86	43.198	9.426		
13	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	A (21 – 25 years)	80	86.488	22.248	5.885	0.001***
		B (26 – 35 years)	255	88.725	21.422		
		C (36 – 45 years)	213	95.441	23.070		
		D (46 & above)	86	95.174	19.594		
14	In-Role-Behaviour	A (21 – 25 years)	80	46.513	9.563	4.863	0.002**
		B (26 – 35 years)	255	48.000	9.691		
		C (36 – 45 years)	213	50.643	10.155		
		D (46 & above)	86	49.791	8.753		

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

The results showed that there was a significant difference in the levels of Affective Commitment ($F = 14.540$, $p < 0.001$) Continuance Commitment ($F = 7.002$, $p < 0.001$) and Normative Commitment ($F = 13.548$, $p < 0.001$) displayed by employees of different age groups. Therefore, the alternate hypotheses in 8, 9 and 10 about existence of difference between age groups in commitment components are accepted. It was seen that the mean scores were in ascending order from groups A to D for AC, CC and NC which implies that as employee's age, they develop higher levels of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization.

Also the results showed that there was a significant difference in the levels of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour - Individual ($F = 4.676, p < 0.01$) Organizational Citizenship Behaviour - Organization ($F = 6.650, p < 0.001$), Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-total ($F = 5.885, p < 0.001$) and In-Role Behaviour ($F = 4.863, p < 0.01$) displayed by employees of different age groups. Therefore, alternate hypotheses in 11, 12, 13 and 14 about existence of difference between age groups in both citizenship behaviour and in-role behaviour are accepted. It was seen that the mean scores were the highest for Age group C, followed by group D and then by groups B and A for OCB, OCB-I, OCB-O and IRB. Overall, the results imply that as employees' age, they display higher levels of extra role and in role behaviours.

5.3.3 Educational Backgrounds as an antecedent

Hypotheses 15 to 17 for each of the 3 independent variables (AC, CC and NC) and hypotheses 18 to 21 for each of the 4 dependent variables (OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB and IRB) have been drawn up and tested to see if there is any significant difference in the variables, vis-à-vis educational backgrounds.

For each of the 7 variables the null hypothesis stated was, that there is no difference in the variables across educational backgrounds, while the alternate hypothesis suggested the prevalence of differences.

The list of these 7 variables and their alternate hypotheses and ensuing results (notably the p-value) appear in the table below :

Table 5.5(a) : ANOVA results for Educational Profile differences (N = 634, df = 8)

Alternate Hypotheses (H_a) : Significant difference in the under-mentioned variables (between Educational Backgrounds)

H _a Variable		Educational Backgrounds	N	Mean	S.D.	F	p-value
15	Affective Commitment	Chartered Accountants	12	30.500	5.729	1.982	0.055
		Master in Business Administration	50	35.020	6.526		
		Post-Graduates	66	33.758	6.638		
		Engineering	97	35.711	6.125		
		Non-Engineering Graduates	278	32.718	6.340		
		Diploma in Engineering	30	33.600	6.355		
		Diploma in Non Engineering Fields	9	30.444	10.224		
		Higher Secondary	92	32.239	6.852		
16	Continuance Commitment	Chartered Accountants	12	21.167	7.837	2.940	0.005**
		Master in Business Administration	50	23.120	6.073		
		Post-Graduates	66	25.242	6.962		
		Engineering	97	22.959	6.734		
		Non-Engineering Graduates	278	25.252	6.537		
		Diploma in Engineering	30	26.900	6.116		
		Diploma in Non Engineering Fields	9	27.000	6.461		
		Higher Secondary	92	25.652	7.678		
17	Normative Commitment	Chartered Accountants	12	27.000	7.568	4.048	0.000***
		Master in Business Administration	50	31.540	6.795		
		Post-Graduates	66	32.727	5.851		
		Engineering	97	28.835	6.664		
		Non-Engineering Graduates	278	31.212	6.010		
		Diploma in Engineering	30	32.833	4.720		
		Diploma in Non Engineering Fields	9	32.444	8.383		
		Higher Secondary	92	32.163	6.250		

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

The results showed that there was a significant difference in the levels of Continuance Commitment displayed by employees of different educational levels ($F = 2.940$, $p < 0.01$). Therefore, we accept the alternate hypothesis 16 about existence of difference between education backgrounds for Continuance Commitment. We note here that the mean CC scores are the lowest for Chartered Accountants and the highest for employees from Diploma in Non Engineering fields. Further, employees from professional courses such as Masters in Business Administration ($M = 23.120$) and Engineering ($M = 22.959$) showed lower levels of continuance commitment as compared to non professional courses Non Engineering Graduates ($M = 25.252$) and Post Graduates ($M = 25.242$).

The results showed that there was a significant difference in the levels of Normative Commitment displayed by employees of different educational levels ($F = 4.048$, $p <$

0.001). Therefore we accept the alternate hypothesis 17 about existence of difference between educational backgrounds for Normative Commitment. An analysis of trends revealed that Engineers and Chartered Accountants displayed lower levels of Normative Commitment (M=28.835) ,(M=27.000) respectively, as compared to the other groups. The results also showed that there was no significant difference in Affective Commitment by employees of different educational levels. Therefore, we accept the null hypothesis 15.

Table 5.5(b) : ANOVA results for Educational Profile differences (N = 634, df = 8)

Alternate Hypotheses (H_a) : Significant difference in the under-mentioned variables (between Educational Background)

H _a Variable	Educational Background	N	Mean	S.D.	F	p-value
18 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour- Individuals	Chartered Accountants	12	53.250	10.420	3.078*	0.0034
	Master in Business Administration	50	55.120	9.415		
	Post-Graduates	66	51.061	14.032		
	Engineering	97	50.814	12.534		
	Non-Engineering Graduates	278	50.353	12.298		
	Diploma in Engineering	30	50.267	11.197		
	Diploma in Non Engineering Fields	9	50.111	11.784		
	Higher Secondary	92	45.739	12.473		
19 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour- Organization	Chartered Accountants	12	43.083	8.490	1.299	0.2483
	Master in Business Administration	50	43.960	8.921		
	Post-Graduates	66	41.788	11.872		
	Engineering	97	41.784	9.997		
	Non-Engineering Graduates	278	41.410	10.463		
	Diploma in Engineering	30	40.400	9.786		
	Diploma in Non Engineering Fields	9	40.889	9.74		
	Higher Secondary	92	38.924	10.524		
20 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Chartered Accountants	12	96.333	18.612	2.290*	0.0261
	Master in Business Administration	50	99.080	17.704		
	Post-Graduates	66	92.848	25.104		
	Engineering	97	92.598	22.069		
	Non-Engineering Graduates	278	91.763	22.047		
	Diploma in Engineering	30	90.667	20.009		
	Diploma in Non Engineering Fields	9	91.000	22.982		
	Higher Secondary	92	84.663	22.280		
21 In-Role- Behaviour	Chartered Accountants	12	52.250	10.814	2.163*	0.0358
	Master in Business Administration	50	52.740	8.585		
	Post-Graduates	66	49.864	10.491		
	Engineering	97	49.381	9.449		
	Non-Engineering Graduates	278	48.540	9.833		
	Diploma in Engineering	30	48.400	8.139		
	Diploma in Non Engineering Fields	9	49.000	11.236		
	Higher Secondary	92	46.717	9.978		

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

The results showed that there was a significant difference in the levels of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-Individuals (OCB-I) displayed by employees of different

educational levels ($F = 3.078, p < 0.01$). Therefore, we accept the alternate hypothesis 18 about existence of difference between educational backgrounds for OCB-I. An analysis of trends once again revealed that employees who were Masters in Business Administration and Chartered Accountants engaged in higher levels of OCB - I compared to the other groups ($M = 55.120$) and ($M=53.250$) respectively. Employees from Higher Secondary displayed lower levels of OCB-I compared to other groups ($M = 45.739$).

The results showed that there was a significant difference in the levels of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour –total displayed by employees of different educational levels ($F = 2.290, p < 0.05$). Therefore, we accept the alternate hypothesis 20 about existence of difference between education backgrounds for OCB-total. An analysis of trends interestingly revealed that employees who were Masters in Business Administration and Chartered Accountants engaged in higher levels of OCB-total compared to the other groups ($M = 99.080$) and ($M=96.333$) respectively. This is contrary, to the results obtained for Organizational Commitment. Employees from Higher Secondary displayed lower levels of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour compared to other groups ($M = 84.663$).

The results showed that there was a significant difference in IRB across the educational backgrounds ($F = 2.163, p < 0.05$). Therefore we accept the alternate hypothesis 21 about existence of difference across education backgrounds for IRB. The trends seen were similar to those seen for Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-total. Employees who were Masters in Business Administration and Chartered Accountants engaged in higher levels of IRB compared to the other groups ($M = 52.740$) and ($M=52.250$) Employees from Higher Secondary displayed lower levels of In Role Behaviour compared to other groups ($M = 46.717$).

The results showed that there is no significant difference in the levels of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour - Organizations (OCB-O) displayed by employees of different educational levels. Therefore we accept the null hypothesis 19.

5.3.4 Nature and Size of Organizations

Hypotheses 22 to 28 for each of the 3 independent variables (AC, CC and NC) and 4 dependent variables (OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB and IRB) have been drawn up and tested to see if there is any significant difference in the variables, vis-à-vis Large-scale and Small-Medium Scale Enterprises.

For each of the 7 variables the null hypothesis stated was, that there is no difference in the variables between employees of the two types of organizations, while the alternate hypothesis suggested the prevalence of differences.

The list of these 7 variables and their alternate hypotheses and ensuing results (notably the p-value) appear in the table below :

Table 5.6 : ANOVA results displayed by Employees in Large Scale Enterprises (LSEs) and Small-Medium Scale Enterprises (SMEs) N = 634, df = 1)

Alternate Hypotheses (H_a) : Significant difference in the under-mentioned variables (between Organizational Sizes)

H_a Variables	Size of Organization	N	Mean	S.D.	F	p-value
22 Affective Commitment	Large-Scale	210	31.881	6.736	6.221	0.013*
	Small-Medium Scale	424	33.248	6.371		
23 Continuance Commitment	Large-Scale	210	23.871	7.717	6.042	0.014*
	Small-Medium Scale	424	25.283	6.306		
24 Normative Commitment	Large-Scale	210	29.519	6.974	22.586	0.000***
	Small-Medium Scale	424	32.009	5.795		
25 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-Individual	Large-Scale	210	51.295	12.883	2.229	0.136
	Small-Medium Scale	424	49.733	12.148		
26 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-Organization	Large-Scale	210	41.543	9.846	0.140	0.709
	Small-Medium Scale	424	41.215	10.662		
27 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Large-Scale	210	92.838	22.159	1.026	0.312
	Small-medium Scale	424	90.948	22.092		
28 In-Role-Behaviour	Large-Scale	210	50.067	9.754	4.145	0.042*
	Small-Medium Scale	424	48.387	9.791		

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

The results showed that there was a significant difference in the levels of Affective Commitment ($F = 6.221$, $p < 0.05$), Continuance Commitment ($F = 6.042$, $p < 0.05$) and

Normative Commitment ($F = 22.586, p < 0.001$) displayed by employees of Large Scale Enterprises and Small-Medium Scale Enterprises. Therefore we accept the alternate hypotheses 22, 23 and 24 about existence of difference between nature and size of organization on all the 3 organizational commitment components (AC, CC and NC). It was seen that the mean scores for all the three components of OC were higher for employees of SMEs than employees of LSEs. Among the three components of OC, NC showed the largest difference between the two groups (2.49 points) as compared to AC (1.367 points) and CC (1.412 points).

In all the other variables no significant differences were found in Organizational Citizenship Behaviour - Individual, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour – Organization and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour displayed by employees of Large Scale Enterprises and Small-medium Scale Enterprises. Therefore, we accept the null hypotheses 25, 26 and 27.

However, there was a significant difference in the levels of In-Role Behaviour displayed by employees of both groups ($F = 4.145, p < 0.05$). Therefore we accept the alternate hypothesis 28 about existence of difference between nature and size of organization in IRB. Employees from LSEs displayed higher levels of IRB than employees of SMEs.

5.3.5 Organizational Sector

Hypotheses 29 to 35 for each of the 3 independent variables (AC, CC and NC) and 4 dependent variables (OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB and IRB) have been drawn up and tested to see if there is any significant difference in the variables, vis-à-vis Manufacturing and Services sectors.

For each of the 7 variables the null hypothesis stated was, that there is no difference in the variables between employees of the two Organizational Sectors, while the alternate hypothesis suggested the prevalence of differences.

The list of these 7 variables and their alternate hypotheses and ensuing results (notably the p-value) appear in the table below :

Table 5.7 : ANOVA results displayed by Employees in Manufacturing and Services Organizations (N = 210, df = 1)

Alternate Hypotheses (H_a) : Significant difference in the under-mentioned variables (between Organizational Sectors)

H _a Variables		Nature of the Organization	N	Mean	S.D.	F	p-value
29	Affective Commitment	Manufacturing	146	31.801	6.576	0.067	0.797
		Services	64	32.063	7.138		
30	Continuance Commitment	Manufacturing	146	24.274	7.281	1.305	0.255
		Services	64	22.953	8.622		
31	Normative Commitment	Manufacturing	146	29.966	6.486	1.974	0.161
		Services	64	28.500	7.938		
32	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-Individual	Manufacturing	146	50.473	13.005	1.962	0.163
		Services	64	53.172	12.498		
33	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-Organization	Manufacturing	146	41.151	9.885	0.759	0.385
		Services	64	42.438	9.775		
34	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Manufacturing	146	91.623	22.379	1.443	0.231
		Services	64	95.609	21.566		
35	In-Role-Behaviour	Manufacturing	146	49.575	9.731	1.217	0.271
		Services	64	51.188	9.791		

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

No significant differences were found in any of the measured variables between employees of the manufacturing and services sectors. Therefore, we accept the null hypotheses 29 to 35.

5.3.6 Testing of Group Differences - Influence of Seniors' Perception on Organizational Commitment Components, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and In-Role-Behaviour

Hypotheses 36 to 42 for each of the 3 independent variables (AC, CC and NC) and 4 dependent variables (OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB and IRB) have been drawn up and tested to see if there is any significant difference in the variables of 'Perceived High' and 'Perceived Average' Performance groups.

For each of the 7 variables the null hypothesis stated was, that there is no difference in the variables between the perceived performance groups, while the alternate hypothesis suggested the prevalence of differences.

The list of these 7 variables and their alternate hypotheses and ensuing results (notably the p-value) appear in the table below :

Table 5.8 : ANOVA results displayed by Employees in Perceived High and Perceived Average Performance Groups (N = 634, df = 1)

Alternate Hypotheses (H_a) : Significant difference in the under-mentioned variables (between performance categories)

H_a Variables	Performance Category	N	Mean	S.D.	F	p-value	
36	Affective Commitment	High	342	34.082	6.242	30.262	0.000***
	Average	292	31.288	6.527			
37	Continuance Commitment	High	342	24.082	6.703	8.664	0.003**
	Average	292	25.675	6.893			
38	Normative Commitment	High	342	32.181	6.443	19.026	0.000***
	Average	292	30.017	5.964			
39	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-Individual	High	342	57.202	10.053	368.205	0.000***
	Average	292	42.110	9.654			
40	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-Organization	High	342	47.249	8.154	389.535	0.000***
	Average	292	34.384	8.213			
41	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	High	342	104.450	17.208	417.298	0.000***
	Average	292	76.493	17.139			
42	In-Role-Behaviour	High	342	55.228	6.787	588.454	0.000***
	Average	292	41.582	7.367			

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

The results showed that there was a significant difference in the levels of Affective Commitment ($F=30.262$, $p < 0.001$), Continuance Commitment ($F=8.664$, $p < 0.01$) and Normative Commitment ($F=19.026$, $p < 0.001$) displayed by employees categorized as 'Perceived High' and 'Perceived Average' in performance. Therefore, we accept the alternate hypothesis 36, 37 and 38 about existence of difference between the two groups of perceived performance in terms of AC, CC and NC. While the 'Perceived High' performance group displayed relatively higher levels of Affective and Normative Commitment, as compared to 'Perceived Average' group, the 'Perceived Average' group however, displayed relatively higher levels of Continuance Commitment.

The results showed that there was a significant difference in the levels of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour - Individual ($F=368.205$, $p < 0.001$), Organizational Behaviour - Organization ($F = 389.535$, $p < 0.001$), Organizational Citizenship Behaviour ($F = 417.298$, $p < 0.001$), and In-Role Behaviour ($F=588.454$, $p < 0.001$). Therefore we accept the alternate hypothesis 39 to 42 about difference between ‘*Perceived High*’ and ‘*Perceived Average*’ performance groups in terms of OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB and IRB. Employees categorized as ‘*Perceived High*’ in performance displayed relatively higher levels of both forms of citizenship behaviours as well as in-role behaviours, compared to employees in the ‘*Perceived Average*’ groups.

5.4 Testing for the Proposed Relationships Models

To test the proposed relationships models we first, conducted Correlations to understand the relationship between each pair of variables. In addition to this, the sequence of different Correlations Matrix, generated on the basis of different perceptual, demographic and organizational groups (quoted with their respective serial numbers) appear in table below:

Table 5.9 : Correlations of complete data and data under different control variables

Sr. No.	Control Variables	Table No.	Sample Size
1	Entire data	5.11	634
2	High Category of respondents	5.13	342
3	Average Category of respondents	5.14	292
4	Large-scale enterprises respondents	5.17	210
5	Small-scale enterprises respondents	5.18	424
6	Respondents Manufacturing Sector respondents	5.21	146
7	Respondents Services Sector respondents	5.22	64

We next conducted Multiple Regressions to determine the explanatory power of each dependent variable with 3 independent variables, in each model.

The sequence of different Regression models, generated for the entire data, as well as across different perceptual, demographic and organizational groups (quoted by their respective serial numbers) appear below :

Table 5.10 : Regression Models

Regression Model Sr. No.	Model Type	Table No.	Sample Size
1 to 4	Overall Model	5.12	634
5 to 8	Model for high performance category	5.15	342
9 to 12	Model for respondents average performance category	5.16	292
13 to 16	Model for respondents of large scale enterprises category	5.19	210
17 to 20	Model for respondents of Small –medium Scale Enterprises	5.20	424
21 to 24	Model for respondents of Manufacturing Sector	5.23	146
25 to 28	Model for respondents of Services Sector	5.24	64

5.4.1 Relationship Analysis of the complete data

5.4.1.1 Correlation Analysis – for the complete data

Correlations across all independent and dependent variables were performed as part of a preliminary analysis of relationships.

Table 5.11 : Correlation Matrix

	AC	CC	NC	OCB-I	OCB-O	OCB-total	IRB
AC	1.000						
CC	0.051	1.000					
NC	0.588**	0.211**	1.000				
OCB-I	0.207**	-0.030	0.134**	1.000			
OCB-O	0.252**	-0.038	0.189**	0.880**	1.000		
OCB-total	0.234**	-0.034	0.164**	0.975**	0.964**	1.000	
IRB	0.304**	-0.068	0.180**	0.782**	0.793**	0.812**	1.000

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

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*

Table 5.11 presents the correlations of the three components of OC (AC, CC, NC) with OCB and its sub-components (OCB-I, OCB-O) and IRB, N= 634.

AC is found to have a significant positive correlation with, OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB and IRB, with correlation coefficients $r=0.207, 0.252, 0.234,$ and 0.304 respectively, where all of which were significant at the 0.01 level. CC is found to have no significant relationship with any of the measured variables. NC is found to have a low positive correlation with, OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB and IRB, with correlation coefficients of, $0.134, 0.189, 0.164, 0.180$ respectively, all of which were weak but significant at the 0.01 level. The correlation coefficients for AC with performance are higher than that of NC.

We found a significant correlation amongst the data and therefore we got motivated to explore the possibility of generating predictive regression models.

5.4.1.2 Regression Analysis for the entire data

The strength of proposed models 1 to 4 have been evaluated by building 4 predictive regression models. The first model, for instance, had OCB-I as the dependent variable which is explained by the three independent variables : the three components of Organizational Commitment (AC, CC, & NC). As already mentioned in the literature review section, such predictive models have been generated earlier. Those models have indicated that AC and NC have a positive relationship with each of the dependent variables while CC has a negative relationship with each of the dependent variables.

Similarly, the second predictive regression model has OCB-O as the dependent variable, with the same set of three, independent, organizational commitment variables (AC, CC, & NC), just as above. Likewise, the third and fourth predictive models have OCB and IRB as dependent variables.

The list of these 4 models and their results appear in the table below. In each of these 4 models, the R-squared (Adj.), the model coefficients of the independent variables and their respective p-values are shown alongside. Discussion about the results appear at the end of the table.

It has also been seen in literature, that such behavioural models have come up with meaningful conclusions when generated across a few specific demographic contexts, over their sample profiles. Hence, we have tested our predictive model across 4 important organizational wide contexts, by using the large and particularly varied sample profile, in the Indian context. Results of such profile based relationship models, appear in the subsequent sub-sections.

Table 5.12 : Results of 4 predictive Regression models using the complete sample

Model No.	Dependent Variable	Adj. R ²		Constant	Independent Variable			F	p- Value
					AC	CC	NC		
1	OCB – I	0.04	Co-efficient	38.50	0.36	-0.084	0.63	9.88	0.00
			p – Value	0.00	0.0001	0.25	0.51		
2	OCB – O	0.07	Co-efficient	28.78	0.33	-0.099	0.13	15.85	0.00
			p – Value	0.00	0.00	0.098	0.099		
3	OCB	0.54	Co-efficient	67.29	0.69	-0.18	0.19	13.18	0.00
			p – Value	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.26		
4	IRB	0.10	Co-efficient	36.35	0.44	-0.13	0.041	23.29	0.00
			p – Value	0.00	0.00	0.023	0.58		

Based on each of the above 4 models we can conclude that AC has a positive explanatory power with each of the dependent variables in each model (OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB-total and IRB) all significant at $p < 0.01$, But for OCB-I the NC coefficient is higher than AC, although the former is not significant. When it comes to CC, the coefficients have a negative sign in each of the 4 models (OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB-total and IRB). However these coefficients are significant only for explaining its impact on IRB, but fail the test of significance in OCB-I, OCB-O and OCB-total models.

In the model regressed to explain OCB, R-squared at 0.54 gives a good predictive model, But for the other three models, R-squared is very poor over a range of 0.04 to 0.10, indicating the prevalence of other non explanatory variables that could drive organizational citizenship behaviour, and in-role-behaviour of the employee. Meanwhile all the 4 regressions models are acceptable since they have showed high and significant F values.

The discussion on the above 4 models concludes our addressing of the first 4 proposed relationship models, that independently connected the 3 components of organization commitment, with the 4 dependent variables of OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB and IRB.

In terms of establishing each of the alternate hypotheses of OC components having significant relationship with the dependent variables, partial support to our models was found. AC had a significant positive explanatory power with all the dependent variables of OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB and IRB, while CC had a negative explanatory power only with IRB.

5.4.2 Seniors' Perception as a Control Variable

In our proposed relationship models for seniors' perception as a control variable we are expecting that AC and NC will have stronger positive relationship in the '*Perceived High*' performance group as compared to the '*Perceived Average*' performance group with each of the dependent variables. CC will have a weaker negative relationship with each of the dependent variables for the '*Perceived High*' performance group as compared to the '*Perceived Average*' performance group.

5.4.2.1 Correlation for '*Perceived High*' and '*Perceived Average*' Performance

Correlations for each of the two groups were done separately, first for the '*Perceived High*' performance group and then for '*Perceived Average*' to see the trends and source of differences in the two groups.

Table 5.13 : Correlations for ‘Perceived High’ Performance Group

	AC	CC	NC	OCB-I	OCB-O	OCB-total	IRB
AC	1.000						
CC	0.126*	1.000					
NC	0.565**	0.241**	1.000				
OCB-I	0.140**	0.058	0.076	1.000			
OCB-O	0.180**	0.035	0.160**	0.784**	1.000		
OCB-total	0.167**	0.050	0.120*	0.956**	0.932**	1.000	
IRB	0.265**	0.026	0.124*	0.637**	0.599**	0.656**	1.000

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

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*

Table 5.14 : Correlations for ‘Perceived Average’ Performance Group

	AC	CC	NC	OCB-I	OCB-O	OCB-total	IRB
AC	1.000						
CC	0.026	1.000					
NC	0.585**	0.232**	1.000				
OCB-I	0.052	0.044	-0.010	1.000			
OCB-O	0.130*	0.054	0.042	0.839**	1.000		
OCB-total	0.091	0.051	0.014	0.966**	0.952**	1.000	
IRB	0.176**	0.010	0.044	0.626**	0.694**	0.685**	1.000

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

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*

The above 2 tables 5.13 and 5.14 presents the correlations of components of OC (AC, CC, NC) with OCB and its dimensions (OCB-I, OCB-O) and IRB for the employees in the ‘Perceived High’ (Table 5.13) and ‘Perceived Average’ (Table 5.14) performance group . For the ‘Perceived High’ performance group, AC is found to have a positive relationship with, OCB-I, OCB-O OCB-total and IRB, with correlation coefficients of $r = 0.140, 0.180, 0.167,$ and 0.265 respectively (all significant at $p < 0.01$) level. However, for ‘Perceived Average’ performance group, AC has a significant relationship only with OCB-O and IRB, with correlation coefficients of 0.130 (significant at the 0.05 level), and 0.176 (significant at $p < 0.01$) respectively.

CC is found to have no significant relationship with all the measured variables for both groups.

For the ‘Perceived High’ performers, NC is found to have a significant relationship with, OCB-O , OCB- total and IRB with correlation coefficients of, 0.160 ($p < 0.01$), 0.120

($p < 0.05$) and 0.124 ($p < 0.05$) respectively. However, NC does not have a significant relationship with any of the measured variables for the average performers.

5.4.2.2 Regression Analysis for the two control groups : ‘Perceived High’ and ‘Perceived Average’ Performance

We now develop 8 sets of regression models to test the predictive power of the 3 independent variables (AC, CC and NC) over 4 different dependent variables. These refer to the set of proposed models 5 to 12. In this context, since data has been collected about employees performance based on the perceptions of seniors – ‘*Perceived High*’ and ‘*Perceived Average*’ in Performance – this was treated as a control variable. Therefore, 4 of these 8 regression equations refer to predictive models for ‘*Perceived High*’ performance employees, while the remaining 4 predictive models refer to ‘*Perceived Average*’ performance employees.

The first set of 4 models, each had OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB and IRB as the dependent variables which are explained by the three independent variables: The Three Components of Organizational Commitment (AC, CC, & NC) for employees perceived to be high performers. The subsequent set of 4 models test for the same for employees perceived to be average.

The proposed models have indicated that AC and NC will have stronger positive relationship in the ‘*Perceived High*’ performance group as compared to the ‘*Perceived Average*’ performance group with each of the dependent variables. CC will have a weaker negative relationship with each of the dependent variables for the ‘*Perceived High*’ performance group as compared to the ‘*Perceived Average*’ performance group.

The list of these 8 models and their results appear in the tables below. In each of these 8 models, the R-squared (Adj.), the model coefficients of the independent variables and their respective p-values are shown alongside. Discussion about the results appear at the end of the table.

Table 5.15 : Relationship between OCB – I, OCB – O, OCB & IRB with AC, CC & NC for Employees ‘Perceived High’ Performance group

Model No.	Dependent Variable	Adjusted R ²		Constant	Independent Variable			F	p-Value
					AC	CC	NC		
5	OCB – I	0.01	Co-efficient	48.56	0.23	0.07	-0.02	2.45	0.063
			p – Value	0.00	0.03	0.44	0.82		
6	OCB – O	0.03	Co-efficient	37.94	0.17	-0.004	0.11	4.39	0.005
			p – Value	0.00	0.04	0.96	0.19		
7	OCB	0.02	Co-efficient	86.50	0.40	0.06	0.09	3.42	0.018
			p – Value	0.00	0.03	0.67	0.63		
8	IRB	0.06	Co-efficient	45.90	0.31	-0.007	-0.04	8.65	0.00
			p – Value	0.00	0.00	0.99	0.56		

Table 5.16 : Relationship between OCB – I, OCB – O, OCB & IRB with AC, CC & NC for Employees ‘Perceived Average’ Performance Group

Model No.	Dependent Variable	Adjusted R ²		Constant	Independent Variable			F	p-Value
					AC	CC	NC		
9	OCB – I	0.002	Co-efficient	39.36	0.14	0.09	-0.13	0.83	0.48
			p – Value	0.00	0.18	0.32	0.28		
10	OCB – O	0.01	Co-efficient	28.66	0.22	0.08	-0.10	2.24	0.08
			p – Value	0.00	0.02	0.27	0.32		
11	OCB	0.004	Co-efficient	68.02	0.36	0.16	-0.23	1.43	0.23
			p – Value	0.00	0.06	0.28	0.28		
12	IRB	0.03	Co-efficient	36.26	0.26	0.03	-0.12	3.69	0.012
			p – Value	0.00	0.0013	0.66	0.18		

Based on each of the above 8 models we can make the following conclusions. AC had a significant positive explanatory power with OCB-I for ‘Perceived High’ performance group, but not so for ‘Perceived Average’ performance group. On the other hand, CC had positive (but insignificant) impact with OCB-I in both groups. NC had a negative (but insignificant) impact with OCB-I in both groups.

When it comes to OCB-O and IRB, similar trends were revealed for both groups in that AC had a significant impact on both the variables, in both the groups. Though CC and NC showed different signs (‘+’ vs. ‘-’) in their values with OCB-O and IRB for both groups, except for NC and IRB, which were negatively related for both groups. However,

all the coefficients were again statistically insignificant. AC was also seen to have a positive impact on OCB- total for the '*Perceived High*' Performance group but not on the '*Perceived Average*' performance group.

In the models regressed to explain the dependent variables for both groups, R-squared is very poor over a range of 0.01 to 0.06 for '*Perceived High*' performance group and 0.002 to 0.03 for '*Perceived Average*' performance group, indicating the prevalence of other non explanatory variables that could drive citizenship behaviour, and also in-role-behaviour of the employees in both the groups.

Some of the models have low predictive power (F value not significant) but that does not rule out the explanatory power of the individual independent variables that have significant values.

The discussion on the above 4 models concludes our addressing of the models 5 to 12 that connected the 3 components of organization commitment, separately with each of the 4 dependent variables of OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB and IRB with perceived performance as the control group. Partial support to our hypotheses was seen where AC had a positive impact on OCB-I and OCB total for the '*Perceived High*' performance group, but not so in the '*Perceived Average*' performance group.

5.4.3 Nature & Size of the Organization as a Control Variable

In our proposed relationship models with type of organizations as a control variable, we are expecting that AC, NC will show a stronger positive relationship with the employees of the 'Small-Medium Scale' as compared with employees of the 'Large-Scale' enterprises with each of the dependent variables. CC will have a weaker negative relationship with each of the dependent variables for the employees of the Small-Medium scale employees as compared to the employees of Large Scale enterprises.

5.4.3.1 Correlation for Large-Scale and Small-Medium Scale Enterprises

Correlations for each of the two groups were done separately, first for employees of Large Scale enterprises and then for employees of Small-Scale enterprises to see the trends and source of differences in the two groups.

Table 5.17 : Correlations for Large-Scale Enterprises

	AC	CC	NC	OCB-I	OCB-O	OCB-total	IRB
AC	1.000						
CC	0.208**	1.000					
NC	0.648**	0.277**	1.000				
OCB-I	0.152*	-0.012	0.101	1.000			
OCB-O	0.115	0.010	0.081	0.899**	1.000		
OCB-total	0.139*	-0.003	0.094	0.981**	0.967**	1.000	
IRB	0.214**	-0.093	0.069	0.822**	0.790**	0.829**	1.000

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

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Table 5.18 : Correlations for Small-Medium Scale Enterprises

	AC	CC	NC	OCB-I	OCB-O	OCB-total	IRB
AC	1.000						
CC	-0.064	1.000					
NC	0.544**	0.140**	1.000				
OCB-I	0.248**	-0.032	0.178**	1.000			
OCB-O	0.323**	-0.063	0.260**	0.875**	1.000		
OCB-total	0.292**	-0.048	0.224**	0.972**	0.964**	1.000	
IRB	0.367**	-0.041	0.278**	0.761**	0.798**	0.803**	1.000

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

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

For employees of LSEs, AC is found to have a significant positive relationship with OCB-I, OCB -total and IRB with correlation coefficients of, $r = 0.152$, 0.139 (both at $p < 0.05$) and $r = 0.214$ ($p < 0.05$) respectively for the 4 dependent variables. However, AC has no significant relationship with OCB-O for employees in LSEs.

On the other hand, AC is found to have a significant positive relationship with all the dependent variables for employees in SMEs. The correlation coefficients with OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB Total and IRB for the employees of SMEs are $r = 0.248$, 0.323 , 0.292 and 0.367 respectively (and all significant at $p < 0.01$).

The variable CC is found to have negative but insignificant relationship with all the measured variables in both the groups.

Also, NC is found to have no significant relationship with all measured variables of employees of LSEs. However, NC is found to have a significant relationship with OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB -total and IRB for the employees in SMEs, with correlation coefficients of $r = 0.178, 0.260, 0.224,$ and 0.278 respectively (all at $p < 0.01$).

5.4.3.2 Regression Analysis for the two control groups - Large-scale and Small-Medium scale Enterprises

We now develop the next 8 sets of regression models to test the predictive power of the independent variables (AC, CC and NC) over different dependent variables. These refer to the proposed models 13 to 20. In this context, since data has been collected from employees of Large-scale and Small-Medium scale Enterprises – type of organizations was treated as a control variable. Therefore, 4 of these 8 regression equations refer to predictive models for employees of Large-scale Enterprises, while the remaining 4 regression equations refer to employees of Small-Medium Scale Enterprises.

The first set of 4 models each had OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB and IRB as the dependent variables which are explained by the three independent variables: the three components of Organizational Commitment variables (AC, CC, & NC) for employees of Large-scale Enterprises. The subsequent set of 4 models test for the same for employees of Small-Medium Scale. The proposed models have indicated that AC and NC will have stronger positive relationship in the employees of the Small-scale Enterprises as compared to the employees of Large-scale enterprises with each of the dependent variables. CC will have a weaker negative relationship with each of the dependent variables for the Small-scale Enterprises, as compared to the Large-scale Enterprises.

The list of these 8 models and their results appear in the tables below. In each of these 8 models, the R-squared (Adj.), the model coefficients of the independent variables and

their respective p-values are shown alongside. Discussion about the results appear at the end of the table.

Table 5.19 : Relationship between OCB – I, OCB – O, OCB & IRB with AC, CC & NC for Employees of Large Scale Enterprises

Model No.	Dependent Variable	Adjusted R ²		Constant	Independent Variable			F	P Value
					AC	CC	NC		
13	OCB – I	0.01	Co-efficient	43.12	0.29	-0.08	0.03	1.77	0.155
			p – Value	0.00	0.096	0.50	0.86		
14	OCB – O	0.0007	Co-efficient	36.36	0.16	-0.02	0.02	0.95	0.420
			p – Value	0.00	0.23	0.81	0.87		
15	OCB	0.006	Co-efficient	79.48	0.45	-0.10	0.05	1.44	0.231
			p – Value	0.00	0.13	0.62	0.86		
16	IRB	0.056	Co-efficient	43.87	0.43	-0.16	-0.12	5.15	0.019
			p – Value	0.00	0.0009	0.063	0.33		

Table 5.20 : Relationship between OCB – I, OCB – O, OCB & IRB with AC, CC & NC for Employees of Small - Medium Scale Enterprises

Model No.	Dependent Variable	Adjusted R ²		Constant	Independent Variable			F	p- Value
					AC	CC	NC		
17	OCB – I	0.06	Co-efficient	33.24	0.399	-0.054	0.14	9.75	0.00
			p – Value	0.00	0.003	0.56	0.23		
18	OCB – O	0.11	Co-efficient	23.39	0.41	-0.11	0.25	18.87	0.00
			p – Value	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.015		
19	OCB	0.08	Co-efficient	55.64	0.80	-0.17	0.40	14.47	0.00
			p – Value	0.00	0.00	0.32	0.07		
20	IRB	0.14	Co-efficient	28.11	0.46	-0.06	0.20	23.72	0.00
			p – Value	0.00	0.00	0.40	0.03		

Based on each of the above 8 models we can make the following conclusions. AC had a significant positive impact on OCB-I for employees in SMEs, but not for employees in the LSE. On the other hand, CC and NC had no significant impact on OCB-I in both groups.

AC and NC both have no impact on OCB-O for employees in the LSE whereas; both AC and NC have an impact on OCB-O for the employees in the SME. On the other hand, CC has no impact on OCB-O on both the groups.

All the three independent variables have no impact on OCB- total for employees from LSEs. AC had an impact on OCB -total for employees from SMEs. CC and NC had no impact on OCB- total for employees from SMEs.

But when it comes to IRB, AC has a positive impact on IRB in both the groups, though NC has a positive impact only in the employees of SMEs .CC once again, has no impact on IRB in both the groups.

In the above models, R-squared is very poor over a range of 0.01 to 0.056 for employees of LSE and 0.06 to 0.14 for employees of SME indicating the prevalence of other, likely, non explanatory variables that could drive both organizational citizenship behaviour, and in-role-behaviour of the employee.

The discussion on the above 4 models concludes our addressing proposed models 13 to 20, that connected the 3 components of organization commitment, separately with the 4 dependent variables of OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB –total and IRB. Partial support for our models was seen in that AC had a positive impact on OCB-I, OCB-O and OCB-total for employees in SMEs but not for employees in the LSEs. NC had a positive impact on OCB-O and IRB, for employees in the SMEs. But the same is not found for employees in the LSEs.

5.4.4 Organizational Sector as a Control Variable

In our proposed relationship models with organizational sector as a control variable , we are expecting that AC and NC will show a stronger positive relationship with the employees of the Manufacturing sector as compared with employees of the Services sector with each of the dependent variables. CC will have a weaker negative relationship with each of the dependent variables for the employees of the Manufacturing sector as compared to the employees of Services sector.

5.4.4.1 Correlation for Large-Scale Enterprises – Manufacturing & Services Sector

Correlations for each of the two groups were done separately, first for the employees of the Manufacturing Sector and then for the employees of the Service Sector to see the trends and source of differences in the two groups.

Table 5.21 : Correlations for Manufacturing Sector (Large-scale Enterprises)

	AC	CC	NC	OCB-I	OCB-O	OCB-total	IRB
AC	1.000						
CC	0.123	1.000					
NC	0.636**	0.129	1.000				
OCB-I	0.213**	0.059	0.157	1.000			
OCB-O	0.189*	0.121	0.155	0.910**	1.000		
OCB-total	0.207*	0.088	0.160	0.983**	0.971**	1.000	
IRB	0.336**	-0.011	0.183*	0.835**	0.812**	0.844**	1.000

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

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*

Table 5.22 : Correlations for Services Sector (Large-scale Enterprises)

	AC	CC	NC	OCB-I	OCB-O	OCB-total	IRB
AC	1.000						
CC	0.365**	1.000					
NC	0.686**	0.499**	1.000				
OCB-I	0.013	-0.133	0.022	1.000			
OCB-O	-0.045	-0.195	-0.040	0.873**	1.000		
OCB-total	-0.013	-0.165	-0.005	0.975**	0.959**	1.000	
IRB	-0.044	-0.236	-0.118	0.787**	0.737**	0.790**	1.000

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

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*

AC is found to have a significant relationship with OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB- total, and IRB for the employees in Manufacturing Sector, with correlation coefficients of $r = 0.213$ ($p < 0.01$), 0.189 ($p < 0.05$), 0.207 ($p < 0.05$) and 0.336 ($p < 0.01$) respectively. But, in the Services sector, AC is found to have no relationship with any of the dependent measured variables.

CC is found to have no significant relationship with the all the dependent measured variables for employees working in both sectors.

NC is found to have no significant relationship with OCB, OCB-I, OCB-O for employees working in both sectors. However NC has positive correlation with IRB for employees in the Manufacturing sector, $r = 0.183$ ($p < 0.05$).

5.4.4.2 Regression Analysis for the two control groups – Manufacturing and Services sectors

We now develop 8 sets of regression models to test the predictive power of the independent variables (AC, CC and NC) over different dependent variables. These refer to our proposed models 21 to 28. In this context, since data has been collected from employees of Manufacturing and Services organizations of Large-scale Enterprises – Organizational Sector was treated as a control variable. Therefore, 4 of these 8 regression equations refer to predictive models for employees of Manufacturing sector, while the remaining 4 regression equations refer to employees of Services sector.

The first set of 4 models, each had OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB-total and IRB as the dependent variables which are explained by the three independent, Organizational Commitment variables (AC, CC, & NC) for employees of Manufacturing sector. The subsequent set of 4 models test for the same for employees of Services sector. AC and NC will have a stronger relationship with employees of Manufacturing sector as compared to the employees of the Services sector, CC will have weaker negative relationship with employees of the Manufacturing sector as compared to the employees of the Services sector.

The list of these 8 models and their results appear in the tables below. In each of these 8 models, the R-squared (Adj.), the model coefficients of the independent variables and their respective p-values are shown alongside. Discussion about the results appear at the end of the table.

Table 5.23 : Relationship between OCB – I, OCB – O, OCB & IRB with AC, CC & NC for Employees of Manufacturing Sector (Large Scale Enterprises)

Model No.	Dependent Variable	Adjusted R ²		Constant	Independent Variable			F	p-Value
					AC	CC	NC		
21	OCB – I	0.03	Co-efficient	35.25	0.37	0.06	0.07	2.35	0.08
			p – Value	0.00	0.08	0.70	0.75		
22	OCB – O	0.03	Co-efficient	28.72	0.22	0.13	0.08	2.33	0.08
			p – Value	0.00	0.17	0.24	0.64		
23	OCB	0.03	Co-efficient	63.98	0.59	0.19	0.15	2.39	0.072
			p – Value	0.00	0.11	0.46	0.69		
24	IRB	0.098	Co-efficient	35.85	0.55	-0.07	-0.07	6.25	0.0005
			p – Value	0.00	0.0004	0.53	0.64		

Table 5.24 : Relationship between OCB – I, OCB – O, OCB & IRB with AC, CC & NC for Employees of Service Sector (Large Scale Enterprises)

Model No.	Dependent Variable	Adjusted R ²		Constant	Independent Variable			F	p- Value
					AC	CC	NC		
25	OCB – I	0.02	Co-efficient	54.17	0.007	-0.28	0.18	0.58	0.63
			p – Value	0.00	0.98	0.196	0.54		
26	OCB – O	0.005	Co-efficient	46.30	-0.32	-0.26	0.113	0.89	0.45
			p – Value	0.00	0.89	0.117	0.63		
27	OCB	0.01	Co-efficient	100.47	-0.03	-0.54	0.29	0.73	0.54
			p – Value	0.00	0.96	0.14	0.57		
28	IRB	0.01	Co-efficient	55.77	0.11	-0.27	-0.07	1.26	0.30
			p – Value	0.00	0.64	0.10	0.77		

AC had a positive explanatory value for IRB for employees in the manufacturing sector while no such impact was found for employees in the services sector.

All other proposed models have not passed the test of significance in this set of models with sector as the control group. The discussion on the above 8 models concludes our addressing of the proposed models 21 to 28 that connected the 3 components of organization commitment, separately with each of the 4 dependent variables of OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB-total and IRB for organizational sector the control variable.

Summary

Testing for Differences - The results of the study indicate support for several of our hypotheses in testing for differences in the impact of the of the individual, perceptual and organizational factors on all the measured variables of commitment to the organization (AC, CC and NC), on the citizenship behaviours (OCB-I, OCB-O, OCB-total) and IRB. In gender, significant differences were only seen in case of OCB-O, with males showing higher levels than females.

Significant differences were seen in commitment levels, citizenship behaviour and in-role behaviours with respondents of different the age profiles. Older employees displayed higher commitment and both Citizenship and In-Role behaviour.

Broad results in educational background showed that, while there were no differences in the AC across the Educational backgrounds, there were significant differences in CC where employees from the professional courses showed lower CC as compared to non-professional groups. Engineers and CA's showed the lowest NC.

Interestingly, MBAs and CAs exhibited higher OCB-I, and OCB-total and IRB in spite of lower AC and NC levels as compared to other groups. No differences were seen OCB-O across educational backgrounds.

With regard to the influence of seniors' perception of employees performance it was seen that the '*Perceived High*' performance group consistently displayed higher levels in all the measured variables as compared to the '*Perceived Average*' group. The exception was in CC, where the '*Perceived Average*' group displayed higher levels as compared to the '*Perceived High*' group.

With regard to nature and size of Organizations, employees in the SME showed higher levels of all the three components(AC,CC and NC) as compared to the employees in the LSE, but interestingly there were no such differences in the OCB-I, OCB-O and OCB

total in employees of the two groups. Employees of LSEs displayed higher levels of IRB than employees of SMEs.

No differences were seen in all the measured variables vis-à-vis Manufacturing and Services sector.

In-testing for Relationship models - AC was consistently related to all the dependent variables across perceptual factors, across organizational size and across organizational sector groups. Also AC showed a greater impact on all the dependent variables in the complete sample and in the '*Perceived High*' group with each of the dependent measures. In the '*Perceived Average*' group it showed a positive impact on OCB-O and IRB.

AC had a positive impact on all the measured variables in the SME Sector. Further, AC had a positive impact on IRB in the LSE Sector as well as Manufacturing Sector.

CC showed negative but insignificant relationship with all the dependent measures and had a significant negative impact only with IRB in the complete sample.

NC showed a positive impact on OCB-O and IRB in the SME Sector.