Chapter 3

Research Design and Methodology

This chapter focuses on the research design and methodology of the study. It highlights the processes the researcher went through the designing, compiling and documenting of the study. The study is explorative-cum-descriptive in nature, which is described as “a design as one which examines the conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that are held, processes that are going on, effects that are evident or trends that are developing” (Best and Kahn, 1992). An attempt in the research is made to investigate the association between psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour. The research methodology which has been adopted was extensively discussed with the experts and academicians in the field as the researcher found the necessity for blending the theoretical aspects of research with the practical methods adopted for understanding the big picture. The questions that the researcher came up with during the discussions with the experts and the study of literature helped in drawing out the objectives, hypotheses and the scheme for measuring the different variables of the study. The chapter discusses the methodology undertaken with focus on objectives of the study, hypotheses development, questionnaire development, sampling process and data collection administration. Further, the data analysis strategy to analyse the data and to test the hypotheses in the study is also discussed. Finally, the limitations and future research relevant to this research are also discussed.

3.1 Need of the study

Psychological capital and subjective well being have emerged a new concept in the field of human resource management. The relationship of between psychological capital and subjective well being has been studied at an individual level and at the organizational level. The organization’s productivity and its efficacy is affected by organizational citizenship behaviour which is reflected in the behaviour of employees. In Indian context no major research has been done as compared to other countries especially in the field of organizational development and employee behaviour. Further, the studies which have been done are not related to Indian banking sector.
Psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviours along with their impact have not been studied in Indian context. The rise and growth of banking sector has made it imperative now to study these positive psychological behaviours in the organization to increase efficacy among employees. As Indian banking sector is undergoing through dynamic changes to become a world leader, the need to study these concepts have become necessary. Thus, this study, intended to study the impact of these psychological determinants on banking sector in India.

3.2 **Research objectives**

1) To study the various dimensions of the existing psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour in the select banks.

2) To examine the various effects of demographic variables (age, educational qualification, years’ of experience, gender and marital status) on psychological capital.

3) To examine the various effects of demographic variables (age, educational qualification, years’ of experience, gender and marital status) on subjective well being.

4) To examine the effect of demographic variables (age, educational qualification, years’ of experience, gender and marital status) on organizational citizenship behaviour.

5) To study the relationship and impact of psychological capital on organizational citizenship behaviours among the employees in the select banks.

6) To study the relationship and impact of subjective well being on organizational citizenship behaviours among the employees in the select banks.

7) To suggest various ways by which psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour in the banks under this study be enhanced for future needs.
3.3 Proposed research model

Psychological Capital
- Hope
- Self-efficacy
- Resilience
- Optimism

Organizational Citizenship Behaviours
- Altruism
- Conscientiousness
- Sportsmanship
- Courtesy
- Civic Virtue

Subjective Well Being
- Life Satisfaction
- Happiness Conditions
- Happiness Evaluation

3.4 Hypotheses

H1.1: There is a significant relationship between psychological capital with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.1a: There is a significant relationship between self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.1b: There is a significant relationship between hope dimension of psychological capital with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.1c: There is a significant relationship between resiliency dimension of psychological capital with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.1d: There is a significant relationship between optimism dimension of psychological capital with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.
H1.2: There is a significant relationship between psychological capital with regard to gender of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.2a: There is a significant relationship between self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital with regard to gender of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.2b: There is a significant relationship between hope dimension of psychological capital with regard to gender of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.2c: There is a significant relationship between resiliency dimension of psychological capital with regard to gender of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.2d: There is a significant relationship between optimism dimension of psychological capital with regard to gender of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.3: There is a significant relationship between psychological capital with regard to marital status of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.3a: There is a significant relationship between self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital with regard to marital status of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.3b: There is a significant relationship between hope dimension of psychological capital with regard to marital status of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.3c: There is a significant relationship between resiliency dimension of psychological capital with regard to marital status of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.3d: There is a significant relationship between optimism dimension of psychological capital with regard to marital of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.4: There is a significant relationship between psychological capital with regard to academic qualification of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.4a: There is a significant relationship between self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital with regard to academic qualification of employees in the selected banks under study.
H1.4b: There is a significant relationship between hope dimension of psychological capital with regard to academic qualification of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.4c: There is a significant relationship between resiliency dimension of psychological capital with regard to academic qualification of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.4d: There is a significant relationship between optimism dimension of psychological capital with regard to academic qualification of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.5: There is a significant relationship between psychological capital with regard to level of management of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.5a: There is a significant relationship between self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.5b: There is a significant relationship between hope dimension of psychological capital with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.5c: There is a significant relationship between resiliency dimension of psychological capital with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H1.5d: There is a significant relationship between optimism dimension of psychological capital with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H2.1: There is a significant relationship between subjective well being with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H2.1a: There is a significant relationship between life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H2.1b: There is a significant relationship between happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H2.1c: There is a significant relationship between happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.
H2.2: There is a significant relationship between subjective well being with regard to gender of employees in the selected banks under study.

H2.2a: There is a significant relationship between life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being with regard to gender of employees in the selected banks under study.
H2.2b: There is a significant relationship between happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being with regard to gender of employees in the selected banks under study.
H2.2c: There is a significant relationship between happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being with regard to gender of employees in the selected banks under study.

H2.3: There is a significant relationship between subjective well being with regard to marital status of employees in the selected banks under study.

H2.3a: There is a significant relationship between life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being with regard to marital status of employees in the selected banks under study.
H2.3b: There is a significant relationship between happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being with regard to marital status of employees in the selected banks under study.
H2.3c: There is a significant relationship between happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being with regard to marital status of employees in the selected banks under study.

H2.4: There is a significant relationship between subjective well being with regard to academic qualification of employees in the selected banks under study.

H2.4a: There is a significant relationship between life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being with regard to academic qualification of employees in the selected banks under study.
H2.4b: There is a significant relationship between happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being with regard to academic qualification of employees in the selected banks under study.
H2.4c: There is a significant relationship between happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being with regard to academic qualification of employees in the selected banks under study.
H2.5: There is a significant relationship between subjective well being with regard to level of management of employees in the selected banks under study.

H2.5a: There is a significant relationship between life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being with regard to level of management of employees in the selected banks under study.

H2.5b: There is a significant relationship between happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being with regard to level of management of employees in the selected banks under study.

H2.5c: There is a significant relationship between happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being with regard to level of management of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.1: There is a significant relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.1a: There is a significant relationship between altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.1b: There is a significant relationship between consciousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.1c: There is a significant relationship between sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.1d: There is a significant relationship between courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.1e: There is a significant relationship between civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to age of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.2: There is a significant relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to gender of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.2a: There is a significant relationship between altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to gender of employees in the selected banks under study.
H3.2b: There is a significant relationship between consciousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to gender of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.2c: There is a significant relationship between sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to gender of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.2d: There is a significant relationship between courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to gender of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.2e: There is a significant relationship between civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to gender of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.3: There is a significant relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to marital status of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.3a: There is a significant relationship between altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to marital status of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.3b: There is a significant relationship between consciousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to marital status of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.3c: There is a significant relationship between sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to marital status of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.3d: There is a significant relationship between courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to marital status of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.3e: There is a significant relationship between civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to marital status of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.4: There is a significant relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to academic qualification of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.4a: There is a significant relationship between altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to academic qualification of employees in the selected banks under study.
H3.4b: There is a significant relationship between consciousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to academic qualification of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.4c: There is a significant relationship between sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to academic qualification of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.4d: There is a significant relationship between courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to academic qualification of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.4e: There is a significant relationship between civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to academic qualification of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.5: There is a significant relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to level of management of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.5a: There is a significant relationship between altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to level of management of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.5b: There is a significant relationship between consciousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to level of management of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.5c: There is a significant relationship between sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to level of management of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.5d: There is a significant relationship between courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to level of management of employees in the selected banks under study.

H3.5e: There is a significant relationship between civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour with regard to level of management of employees in the selected banks under study.

H4: There exists a significant relationship between psychological capital and organizational citizenship behaviour.

H4.1: There is a significant relationship between psychological capital and altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.
H4.1a: There is a significant relationship between self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital and altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.1b: There is a significant relationship between hope dimension of psychological capital and altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.1c: There is a significant relationship between resiliency dimension of psychological capital and altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.1d: There is a significant relationship between optimism dimension of psychological capital and altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.1e: There is a significant relationship between self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital and organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.1f: There is a significant relationship between hope dimension of psychological capital and organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.1g: There is a significant relationship between resiliency dimension of psychological capital and organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.1h: There is a significant relationship between optimism dimension of psychological capital and organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.2: There is a significant relationship between psychological capital and conscientiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.2a: There is a significant relationship between self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital and conscientiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.2b: There is a significant relationship between hope dimension of psychological capital and conscientiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.
H4.2c: There is a significant relationship between resiliency dimension of psychological capital and conscientiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.2d: There is a significant relationship between optimism dimension of psychological capital and conscientiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.2e: There is a significant relationship between sm dimension of psychological capital and organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.3: There is a significant relationship between psychological capital and sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.3a: There is a significant relationship between self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital and sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.3b: There is a significant relationship between hope dimension of psychological capital and sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.3c: There is a significant relationship between resiliency dimension of psychological capital and sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.3d: There is a significant relationship between optimism dimension of psychological capital and sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.4: There is a significant relationship between psychological capital and courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.4a: There is a significant relationship between self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital and courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.4b: There is a significant relationship between hope dimension of psychological capital and courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.
H4.4c: There is a significant relationship between resiliency dimension of psychological capital and courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.4d: There is a significant relationship between optimism dimension of psychological capital and courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.5: There is a significant relationship between psychological capital and civic virtue of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.5a: There is a significant relationship between self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital and civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.5b: There is a significant relationship between hope dimension of psychological capital and civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.5c: There is a significant relationship between resiliency dimension of psychological capital and civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H4.5d: There is a significant relationship between optimism dimension of psychological capital and civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5: There exists a significant relationship between subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.1: There is a significant relationship between subjective well being and altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.1a: There is a significant relationship between life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being and altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.1b: There is a significant relationship between happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being and altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.
H5.1c: There is a significant relationship between happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being and altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.1d: There is a significant relationship between life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.1e: There is a significant relationship between happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.1f: There is a significant relationship between happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.2: There is a significant relationship between subjective well being and conscientiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.2a: There is a significant relationship between life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being and conscientiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.2b: There is a significant relationship between happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being and conscientiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.2c: There is a significant relationship between happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being and conscientiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.3: There is a significant relationship between subjective well being and sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.3a: There is a significant relationship between life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being and sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.3b: There is a significant relationship between happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being and sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.
H5.3c: There is a significant relationship between happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being and sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.4: There is a significant relationship between subjective well being and courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.4a: There is a significant relationship between life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being and courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.4b: There is a significant relationship between happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being and courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.4c: There is a significant relationship between happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being and courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.5: There is a significant relationship between subjective well being and civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.5a: There is a significant relationship between life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being and civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.5b: There is a significant relationship between happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being and civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H5.5c: There is a significant relationship between happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being and civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6: There exists a significant impact of psychological capital on organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.1: There is a significant impact of psychological capital on altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.1a: There is a significant impact of self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital on altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.
H6.1b: There is a significant impact of hope dimension of psychological capital on altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.1c: There is a significant impact of resiliency dimension of psychological capital on altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.1d: There is a significant impact of optimism dimension of psychological capital on altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.1e: There is a significant impact of self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital on organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.1f: There is a significant impact of hope dimension of psychological capital on organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.1g: There is a significant impact of resiliency dimension of psychological capital on organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.1h: There is a significant impact of optimism dimension of psychological capital on organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.2: There is a significant impact of psychological capital on conscienctiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.2a: There is a significant impact of self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital on conscienctiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.2b: There is a significant impact of hope dimension of psychological capital on conscienctiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.2c: There is a significant impact of resiliency dimension of psychological capital on conscienctiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.
H6.2d: There is a significant impact of optimism dimension of psychological capital on conscientiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.3: There is a significant impact of psychological capital on sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.3a: There is a significant impact of self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital on sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.3b: There is a significant impact of hope dimension of psychological capital on sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.3c: There is a significant impact of resiliency dimension of psychological capital on sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.3d: There is a significant impact of optimism dimension of psychological capital on sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.4: There is a significant impact of psychological capital on courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.4a: There is a significant impact of self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital on courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.4b: There is a significant impact of hope dimension of psychological capital on courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.4c: There is a significant impact of resiliency dimension of psychological capital on courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.4d: There is a significant impact of optimism dimension of psychological capital on courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.
H6.5: There is a significant impact of psychological capital on civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.5a: There is a significant impact of self-efficacy dimension of psychological capital on civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.5b: There is a significant impact of hope dimension of psychological capital on civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.5c: There is a significant impact of resiliency dimension of psychological capital on civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H6.5d: There is a significant impact of optimism dimension of psychological capital on civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7: There exists a significant impact of subjective well being on organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.1: There is a significant impact of subjective well being on altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.1a: There is a significant impact of life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being on altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.1b: There is a significant impact of happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being on altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.1c: There is a significant impact of happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being on altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.1d: There is a significant impact of life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being on organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.1e: There is a significant impact of happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being on organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.
H7.1f: There is a significant impact of happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being on organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.2: There is a significant impact of subjective well being on conscientiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.2a: There is a significant impact of life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being on consciousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.2b: There is a significant impact of happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being on consciousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.2c: There is a significant impact of happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being on consciousness dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.3: There is a significant impact of subjective well being on sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.3a: There is a significant impact of life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being on sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.3b: There is a significant impact of happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being on sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.3c: There is a significant impact of happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being on sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.4: There is a significant impact of subjective well being on courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.4a: There is a significant impact of life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being on courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.
H7.4b: There is a significant impact of happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being on courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.4c: There is a significant impact of happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being on courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.5: There is a significant impact of subjective well being on civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.5a: There is a significant impact of life satisfaction dimension of subjective well being on civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.5b: There is a significant impact of happiness conditions dimension of subjective well being on civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

H7.5c: There is a significant impact of happiness evaluation dimension of subjective well being on civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour amongst the employees of the banks.

3.5 Scope of the research study

The research study is on Indian banking sector and northern region banks are covered under its scope. In total the research study has included seven banks i.e. SBI, two associate banks of SBI, three nationalized banks and three private sector banks. The various employees who are working at managerial position in the above banks would be sample frame for the research study. The various banks included in the study are majorly taken from the states of Punjab, Haryana, Chandigarh and Himachal Pradesh. The banks were selected according to their rank as per the list given in the RBI bulletin for the year 2015-16 according to their deposits as per Annexure II.

3.6 Research design

This research study is exploratory cum descriptive in nature. The variables which have been included in this research study are psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour. The psychological capital and
subjective well being is taken as independent variable and the organizational citizenship behaviour is taken as dependent variable which is to be studied in the present research study.

**Determinants of the variables**

Following are the determinants of the variables to be studied in the present research study:

**A. Psychological capital (independent variable)**

A1: Hope  
A2: Self-efficacy  
A3: Resilience  
A4: Optimism

**B. Subjective well being (independent variable)**

B1. Life satisfaction  
B2: Happiness conditions  
B3: Happiness evaluation

**C. Organizational citizenship behaviour (dependent variable)**

C1: Altruism  
C2: Conscientiousness  
C3: Sportsmanship  
C4: Courtesy  
C5: Civic Virtue

**Population and sample size**

The managers who are working at various managerial levels in the banks in the states of Punjab, Haryana, Chandigarh and Himachal Pradesh are taken as population of the study. A sample of 474 respondents working at various managerial levels in the banks is the sample size of the research study.
Source of the Data

The data collection has been done from the primary as well as secondary sources. A questionnaire was given to the employees of the banks and the responses become the primary source of the study. The data collected from various books, journals, documented reports, online resources, researches done on the variables etc. become the secondary source of the data.

Data collection tools

To collect the data from the various respondents a questionnaire was given having the following parts:

Section A

It comprised of various demographic variables namely the name of the respondent, name of the bank, type of bank (public or private sector), age, gender, marital status, work experience etc.

Section B

The various questions in relation to the selected variables under the study which include psychological capital were given to the respondents.

Section C

The various questions in relation to the selected variables under the study which include subjective well being were given to the respondents.

Section D

The various questions in relation to the selected variables under the study which include organizational citizenship behaviour were given to the respondents.

Statistical tools for data analysis

To collect the data a quantitative methodology has been adopted in the present study. In this approach statistics is used to analyze and infer the data collected. Further, to analyze and infer the quantitative data collected in the research study various statistical tools are used like structure equation modelling, multiple regression analysis, coefficient of correlation, descriptive analysis etc.
The statistical analysis was carried out using IBM SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) statistical version 20 and AMOS version 20. The analysis includes frequency table, bar, pie graph and histogram. All quantitative variables were estimated using measures of central location (mean and median), measures of dispersion (standard deviation) and range. Normality of data was checked by Kolmogorov–Smirnov tests of normality. For normally distributed data, means were compared using Student’s t-test (for two groups) and One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) (for more than two groups). For relationship with the different parameters Pearson’s correlation was used. Predict the organizational citizenship behaviour by the multiple linear regression models and structural equation modelling with the help of subjective well being and psychological capital. For reliability and validity use of Cronbach’s alpha, exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis were employed.

All statistical tests were seen at two-tailed level of significance (p ≤0.01 and p≤0.05).

1. p-value is than or equal to 0.01 level of significance its highly significant using double star (**).

2. p-value is than or equal to 0.05 level of significance its significant using single star (*).

3. p-value is greater than 0.05 level of significance its non significant.

**Survey research**

As this research requires data collection, the questionnaire is administered to the respondents for the data collection. In questionnaire the respondent gave his answers to the defined alternatives under a reorganized set of questions Sekaran (2010). The data collected from the questionnaire is considered to be most cost effective methodology when sample size is large in number Marshall (2007). As questionnaire gives anonymity to the respondents it removes the biasness, gives more quality of data collected and best answer from the respondent.

A composite questionnaire, incorporating three measuring instruments was utilised to gather the data for the purpose of this study. These instruments were the modified version Luthans et al. (2007) psychological capital questionnaire (PCQ), a
self designed subjective well being (SWB) scale modified version of life satisfaction scale of Diener et al, (1985) and PANAS scale Watson et al. (1988) and a modified version of Podsakoff et al. (1990) organisational citizenship behaviour scale (OCBS). These instruments will be outlined below. However, it should be noted that the researcher is aware that the composite scale length could potentially influence responses, however each of the instruments are short in duration and therefore this should lessen the chances of respondent’s experiencing fatigue.

**Reliability analysis for pilot study**

The research instrument was tested for its reliability. The internal consistency of the grouping of items was estimated using a reliability coefficient called Cronbach’s alpha and alpha value of 0.60 and 0.70 or above generally indicates satisfactory internal consistency reliability of scales.

**Psychological capital questionnaire**

The psychological capital questionnaire, PCQ-24, as developed by Luthans et al, (2007) was utilised to measure PsyCap levels in customer service staff. The 24-item instrument uses a 6-point Likert response scale ranging from “1” being strongly disagree to “6” being strongly agree to determine PsyCap levels, measuring the four dimensions. The self-efficacy subscale was adapted from Parker’s (1998, cited in Luthans et al. 2007b) work on confidence and formed items 1-6. An example of a self-efficacy item is “I feel confident presenting information to a group of colleagues.” The hope subscale stems from the work of Snyder et al. (1996) and comprises items 7-12. “I can think of many ways to reach my current work goals” is an example of one of the items in this subscale. Resiliency was adapted from Wagnild and Young (1993) making up items 13-18. An example of a resiliency item is “I usually take stressful things at work in stride.” Optimism is derived from an adaptation of Scheier and Carver’s (1985) work, comprising items 19-24. “I always look on the bright side of things regarding my job” is an example of an item in the optimism subscale. PsyCap subscales were calculated by adding the scores on a particular subscale and dividing the sum by the number of items of the subscale involved, bearing in mind that items 13, 20 and 23 are reverse scored. A similar process was followed to determine the total score for PsyCap. In other words, the PsyCap produces four subscale scores and a total score that ranges between 1 and 7
which indicates levels of PsyCap. The closer the score is to seven, the higher the individual’s level of critical processing of their responses. This should help eliminate response pattern biases.

Luthans et al. (2007a) conducted two studies to determine the psychometric properties of the PCQ, using three samples of management students in the first study and a sample of engineers and technicians in the second study. All four samples indicated reliability consistently above accepted standards (0.8 and above) for the overall PsyCap measure.

The self administered questionnaire is a modified version of PsyCap 24 on 7-point Likert scale is used to measure psychological capital in the present study. The table 3.1 below summarizes the reliability coefficients of psychological capital and its four dimensions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1: Cronbach’s Alpha for psychological capital and its dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resiliency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Cronbach’s Alpha for psychological capital is .912 which shows high internal consistency reliability for psychological capital. The dimensions of the psychological capital also shows high internal consistency reliability as for self-efficacy it is .861, for hope it is .855, for optimism it is .702 and for resiliency it is .804.

**Subjective well being**

The Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS) was developed by Diener et al, (1985) which became the standard measure of life satisfaction and has been translated into many languages. This 7-item scale is among the most widely-used measures in psychology to assess life satisfaction as a cognitive judgmental process or global cognitive judgment of one’s life. The SWLS has been administered to different groups of participants and has been found to have favourable psychometric properties.
The SWLS has high levels of internal consistency and temporal reliability (Pavot et al. (1991). The internal consistency and reliability across gender, ethnicity, and age (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.83 and test-retest = 0.69). This measure also has high convergent validity – for example, it correlates well with clinical ratings of satisfaction, a memory measure of satisfaction, and informant reports of satisfaction, as well as with scales assessing self-esteem.

The language used for the scale items is relatively broad and nonspecific, allowing the respondents to evaluate their overall life satisfaction subjectively. The instructions for SWLS ask participants to rate the following five statements on 7-point Likert-type scales. Respondents were asked their level of agreement using a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) with each of the following statements: “In most ways my life is close to my ideal,” “The conditions of my life are excellent,” “I am satisfied with my life,” “So far I have gotten the important things I want in life,” “If I could live my time over, I would change almost nothing.” The maximum possible score is 35 with higher score indicative of higher life satisfaction.

The self administered questionnaire is a self designed subjective well being (SWB) scale modified version of life satisfaction scale of Diener et al. (1985) and PANAS scale Watson et al. (1988) having 20 items to measure subjective well being of the respondents working at managerial position in the banks on 7-point Likert scale in the present study. The table 3.2 below summarizes the reliability coefficients of subjective well being and its three dimensions:

| Table 3.2: Cronbach’s Alpha for subjective well being and its dimensions |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| **Variables**                                   | **Cronbach’s Alpha** | **N of Items**   |
| Subjective well being                           | .905                | 20               |
| Life satisfaction                               | .916                | 10               |
| Happiness conditions                            | .833                | 7                |
| Happiness evaluation                            | .754                | 3                |

The Cronbach’s Alpha for subjective well being is .905 which shows high internal consistency reliability for subjective well being. The dimensions of the subjective well being also shows high internal consistency reliability as for life satisfaction it is .916, for happiness conditions it is .833 and for happiness evaluation it is .754.
Organisational citizenship behaviour scale

The organizational citizenship behaviour was measured by means of a modified version of 24-item questionnaire which was adapted from Podsakoff et al., (1990). The original instrument is based on a conceptualisation of organizational citizenship behaviour as developed by Organ (1990) and measures altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue. Typically, this scale would require another party to measure the construct, however in the present study it was necessary for the individuals to report on their perceptions of their own organizational citizenship behaviours. This was also required because of the way in which the data was gathered, which was by means of an electronic questionnaire.

The original questionnaire yielded satisfactory psychometric qualities when applied to research samples in the United States, with Cronbach’s coefficients as follows: conscientiousness (0.82), sportsmanship (0.85), civic virtue (0.70), courtesy (0.85) and altruism (0.85). However, when applied to a South African sample the items only loaded onto two factors after numerous rounds of factor analysis (Bosman, 2003). These two factors were named sportsmanship and functional participation, demonstrating satisfactory reliability with Cronbach’s coefficients of 0.79 and 0.91 respectively (Bosman, 2003). The 20-item instrument rates employee perceptions of their organizational citizenship behaviours on a 7-point Likert response scale, where “1” means strongly disagree and “7” means strongly agree. Examples of the items include “I help others who have been absent” (altruism); “I do not abuse the rights of others” (courtesy) and “I do not take extra breaks” (conscientiousness). The organizational citizenship behaviour is calculated by averaging all the subscales across all the items, bearing in mind that items 7, 11, 12 and 14 are negatively phrased and therefore are reverse scored.

The self administered questionnaire is a self designed modified version of Podsakoff et al. (1990) organisational citizenship behaviour scale (OCBS) having 24 items to measure organizational citizenship behaviours of the respondents working at managerial position in the banks on 7-point Likert scale in the present study. The table 3.3 below summarizes the reliability coefficients of organizational citizenship behaviour and its five dimensions:
Table 3.3: Cronbach’s Alpha for organizational citizenship behaviour and its dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational citizenship</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic virtue</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Cronbach’s Alpha for organizational citizenship behaviour .862 which shows high internal consistency reliability for organizational citizenship behaviour. The dimensions of the organizational citizenship behaviour also shows high internal consistency reliability as for altruism it is .706, for consciousness it is .775, for sportsmanship it is .834, for courtesy it is .735 and for civic virtue it is .742.

As the values exceeded the minimum requirement for all the scales and there dimensions, it thereby demonstrates that all scales are internally consistent. Pilot study has helped to make some minor changes in the wording of some items of the questionnaires. So, accordingly wording of some statements was changed to make the questionnaires simpler and easy to understand.

**Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted with objective of testing the reliability of scales developed by the researcher and to modify the questionnaires as per the requirements of the present study. A total number of 61 respondents were covered to do the pilot study. The details of pilot study are being described under the sub heads: Questionnaire, Sampling, Analysis and Profile of sample for pilot study.

**Questionnaire for pilot study**

The entire questionnaire was divided into four parts: A, B, C and D sections. The section A of questionnaire included the information about the demographics of the respondents. The section B of questionnaire consisted modified version Luthans et al. (2007) psychological capital questionnaire (also known as PCQ-24) having 24 items to measure the psychological capital of the respondents working at managerial
position in the banks. The section C of questionnai
e consisted of a self designed subjective well being (SWB) scale modified version of life satisfaction scale of Diener et al, (1985) and PANAS scale Watson et al. (1988) having 20 items to measure subjective well being of the respondents working at managerial position in the banks. The last section D of the questionnaire consisted of a modified version of Podsakoff et al. (1990) organisational citizenship behaviour scale (OCBS) having 24 items to measure organizational citizenship behaviours of the respondents working at managerial position in the banks. The data was collected by approaching the respondents personally and explaining in detail about the objectives and purpose of the study. The data was also collected by sending the google doc to the respondents through their e-mail ids.

**Sampling for pilot study**

To check the appropriateness of scales in the Indian context for the present study, structured questionnaires were distributed to the middle and lower level employees of banks. A total of 76 employees from various banks organizations were approached using judgemental sampling, out of which 61 employees completed the questionnaires.

**Profile of sample for pilot study**

Table 3.4: Demographic profile of the respondents for pilot study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of applicants</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of applicants</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under graduate &amp; Graduate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate &amp; Above</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Management</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4 shows the age of maximum respondents i.e. 19 (31.1%) belonged to the age group of 21-35 and 36-40 years, followed by 10 (16.4%) in the age group between 41-45 years, 7 (11.5%) in the age group of 25-30 years, 4 (6.6%) in the age group of 46-50 and lastly, 2 (3.3%) were in the age group of more than 51 years. 32 (52.5%) were male employees and 29 (47.5%) were female employees. 9 (14.8%) employees were unmarried and 52 (85.2%) employees were married. 31 (50.86%) employees were post graduate and above, followed by 30 (49.2%) under graduate and graduate employees, 36 (59.0%) employees were from middle management, 18 (29.5%) employees were from senior management and 7 (11.5%) were from junior management.

Descriptive Analysis of the variables and there dimensions

The descriptive analyses of the variables along with the dimensions of the variables are shown in the Table 3.5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31.30</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31.10</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.67</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.52</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological capital</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>123.59</td>
<td>126.00</td>
<td>16.58</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic virtue</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20.92</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational citizenship</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>123.92</td>
<td>126.00</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>163.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52.54</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>67.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness conditions</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35.75</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness evaluation</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective well being</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>136.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table 3.5 exhibits the descriptive statistics of each variable in the data such as self-efficacy, hope, resiliency, optimism, psychological capital, altruism, consciousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, civic virtue, organizational citizenship behaviour, life satisfaction, happiness conditions, happiness evaluation, subjective well being. The second column explains the number of entries in each variable which is same for all as 61. Third column explains the mean of the values lie under each variable. Fourth column explains the median value in each variable. Fifth column explains the standard deviation for each variable. Sixth column explains the skewness, which is the measure of asymmetry of the data, for each variable, all of them are negatively skewed. Seventh column explains the kurtosis which explains the sharpness of the peak of a frequency distribution curve, calculated for each variable. Eighth column explains the minimum value lie in the data of each variable and last column explains the maximum value for each variable.

The results of the pilot study shows in the table and it can be seen that mean of psychological capital is 123.59 which is falling in high range, which shows that employees are high in psychological capital. The mean score of subjective well being is 103.77 which show that employees are high in subjective well being. The mean score of organizational citizenship behaviour is 123.92 which show that employees are high in organizational citizenship behaviour. The three variables and their dimensions are negatively skewed. With all the skewness coefficients displaying negative signs, it is an indication of a negatively skewed distribution, which in this instance means that respondents tended to score on the high side.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>0.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.171</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>0.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic virtue</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness conditions</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>0.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness evaluation</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological capital</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>0.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective well being</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational citizenship behaviour</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The kolmogorov-Smirnov test is the test to check the normality of the data. The null hypothesis for this test is- the sample data are not significantly different than a normal population, while the alternative hypothesis is, the sample data are significantly different than a normal population. Since, the probabilities in the above table 3.6, are greater than 0.05 (the typical alpha value), so we accept the null hypothesis and we reached on the conclusion that the data in these variable are not different from the normal.

All three of the measuring tools and their respective subscales are considered to be reliable in their new form. The instruments are to be used for the present study. Any results discussed will refer to the new measurement tools, unless otherwise stated.

To check the normality of the data the frequency distribution of variables are observed as follows:

![Histogram for psychological capital](image)

Fig. 3.1: Histogram for psychological capital
The above histogram shows the data for the psychological capital, we can observe that most of the data is under the normal curve which was also proven before, using kolmogorov smirnov test, which stated that the data is normally distributed.

![Histogram for subjective well being](image)

**Fig. 3.2: Histogram for subjective well being**

The above histogram shows the data for the subjective well being, we can observe that most of the data is under the normal curve which was also proven before, using kolmogorov smirnov test, which stated that the data is normally distributed.
The above histogram shows the data for the organizational citizenship behaviour, we can observe that most of the data is under the normal curve which was also proven before, using kolmogorov smirnov test, which stated that the data is normally distributed.

3.7 Conclusion

This chapter has described the research methodology used in the study and it was intended to ensure that the results obtained from the study would be valid and reliable. The objective of the research methodology is to design the research to be as systematic and objective as possible. Also, the measurement tools were investigated and their dimensions were determined for the purposes of the current study. The results of the pilot study has shown the Cronbach’s Alpha for psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour are .912, .905 and .862 respectively, which shows high internal
consistency reliability for psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour. The normality of the data was checked by using kolmogorov smirnov test and histograms which stated that the data is normally distributed. The following chapter outlines the results of the present study.