

Personality and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour of Employees at Vivanta by Taj, Aurangabad: A Correlational Study.

Dr. Milind, Professor & Dean, Sushant University, Gurugram

Dr. Vandana Sharma, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Management Studies, (WISDOM) Banasthali Vidyapith

Abstract:

Organizational Citizenship Activity (OCB) is defined as "discretionary behavior that is not immediately or openly acknowledged by the formal incentive system and supports the efficient and effective running of the organization in the aggregate" (Organ, 1988, p. 3). The notion of OCB has been thoroughly researched (e.g. Organ, 1988; Organ and Ryan, 1995; Chen et al, 1998; Podsakoff et al, 2000; Organ et al, 2006).

According to the 'Big Five' concept, personality is made up of five largely independent characteristics that together form a useful taxonomy for studying individual variations. Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism are the five dimensions. Each of the Big Five dimensions' acts as a bucket, containing a collection of qualities that frequently occur together. Our understanding of the Big Five is identical to our assessment of the five-factor personality model.

1. Introduction

Employee emotions, personality, and values systems at work are being discussed by social scientists, who are looking at additional aspects of employee motivation and commitment that are due to employee personality, values, and organizational

structure rather than monetary rewards and incentives. Having dedicated and loyal personnel in the business is a must these days since a committed and loyal workforce is just as vital as finances and technology for a productive and efficient firm. One of the most significant employee behaviors that leads to loyalty and ownership of the

company, coordination and collaboration with coworkers, and dedication to the job is what we term organizational citizenship behavior (Barnard 1938, Katz & Kahn, 1966, Organ, 1988). (1988, Organ)

2.Statement of the problem

OCBs, according to Philip M. Podsakoff and Scott B. MacKenzie (1997), may improve colleague efficiency, managerial productivity, free up resources for more productive reasons, and minimize the need to devote scarce resources to solely maintenance activities. Furthermore, OCB may be a useful tool for organizing activities among team members and work groups.

However, the true problem for businesses is to correctly identify the elements that cause OCB among employees, as well as the factors that prevent employees from displaying such behavior.

Persistence, valuing workers' efficiency and qualities, and providing them with high job satisfaction are all characteristics of a high-performance business. Employees that can perform above and beyond the work scope are preferred by a company that strives for success. Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) are a type of behavior that

inspires workers to go above and beyond their job responsibilities. Organizational performance is measured by OCB. Dennis Organ, widely regarded as the father of OCB, defines it as "organizational citizenship behavior."

Individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or officially acknowledged by the formal incentive system, and contributes to the organization's overall effectiveness. OCB is an additional role behavior that improves organizational performance. Despite the fact that several studies have been conducted in this field, the debate over the operationalization or definition of OCB persists.

It's possible that this is because OCB research has yet to define the construct, whereas studies have been conducted to better understand OCB and related aspects. Employees, on the other hand, are not motivated by prizes, and managers cannot force their subordinates to do OCB. Managers, on the other hand, as Organ pointed out do consider the accomplishments of their subordinates and recognize them in the form of promotion or better ratings in performance appraisals.

Research objectives

The aim of the research is to establish the empirical evidence for the measurement of personality on organization citizenship behavior. To accomplish this, aim the following objectives are framed:

To study the relationship between Personality and Organisation citizenship behavior.

To identify the type of personality and level of Organisation Citizenship behavior of Vivanta by Taj Aurangabad Employee,

To study significant difference exists in Personality type and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour with regards to occupational level.

Review of literature

The theory of personality traits postulates that people naturally deal with different situations and interact with their environment in different ways. From a management perspective, information about an individual's personality can provide valuable information pertaining to what is the best method of communicating with them and what types of jobs and tasks they are most suitable for in the organisation.

The Big Five Model-

Although a number of popular models of personality traits continue to influence contemporary research (Jung, 1971, Kirton and De Ciantis, 1986), the Five Factor Model (the 'Big Five') proposed by McCrae and Costa Jr (1999) is the most widely used and recognized model today (Rossberger, 2014). It builds upon the 35 bipolar clusters of terms related to personality traits developed by Cattell (1943) and the classic Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) by adding an important fifth personality trait, namely neuroticism or emotional stability, which is a core domain predictive of depression and anxiety disorders. A brief description of the Big Five traits is provided below (Rossberger, 2014): Extraversion: extent to which individuals engage with the external world and experience enthusiasm and other positive emotions.

Agreeableness: extent to which individuals value cooperation and social harmony, honesty, decency, and trustworthiness. Agreeable individuals also tend to have an optimistic view of human nature.

Conscientiousness: extent to which individuals value planning, possess the quality of persistence, and are achievement-oriented.

Neuroticism: extent to which individuals experience negative feelings and their tendency to emotionally over react.

Openness to Experience: extent to which individuals exhibit intellectual curiosity, self-awareness, and individualism.

Furthermore, a number of ‘mini-markers’ of each personality trait have been defined and studied, such as ‘talkative’ for Extraversion, ‘sympathetic’ for Agreeableness, ‘disorganized’ (reverse-coded) for Conscientiousness, ‘temperamental’ for Neuroticism, and ‘imaginative’ for Openness to Experience (Bozionelos et al., 2014, Weele, 2013).

Table 1 : Classification of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

Smith ,Organ, and Near (1983)	Altruism, Generalized Compliance
Organ (1988)	Altruism, Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship, Courtesy, Civic virtue
Williams and Anderson (1991)	OCB-Individual and OCB-Organisation
Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994)	Social Participation, Loyalty, Obedience
Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994)	Functional Participation
Morrison (1994)	Altruism, Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship, Involvement, keeping up with Changes
Van Scotter and Motowildo (1996)	Interpersonal Facilitation, Job Dedication
Coleman and Borman (2000)	Interpersonal Citizenship Performance, Organization: Citizenship Performance, Job /Task Citizenship Performance
Ilies et al (2009)	Agreeableness is most closely to OCB-I and Conscientiousness is more closely to OCB-O
Fred Luthans (2011)	Loyalty OCBs, Service Delivering OCB Participation OCBs

Organization Citizenship Behavior concept first discovered by Dennis Organ also knows as Father of Organizational Citizenship behavior in the year 1988 and he defined as “Individual behavior that is discretionary not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization.” Joh L. Pierce et.al. (2002), OCB have certain key features like – They are voluntary on the part of employee, They are intentional; the employee consciously , decides to perform them, They are intended to be positively valued by the employee and the organization and the behavior primarily benefits the organization (or coworkers) and not the employees themselves.

There are different types of OCB which Fred Luthans (2011) has found as loyalty OCBs, Service Delivering OCBs, Participation OCBs that though all are undetected by the reward system but they all lead to high performance and increase effectiveness.

Gregory Moorhead & Rickey W. Griffin (2008) mentioned OCB as “Housekeeping Behaviour”

Typical organ's OCB include five dimensions i.e.

Altruism -helping colleagues on a task or helping behaviors for supporting personnel or the co- workers who have work related problems

Courtesy - alerting others in the organization about changes that may affect their work or polite manners that prevent creation of problem at workplace.

Conscientiousness -- carrying out one's duties beyond the minimum requirements or behaviors that cause a person to do tasks more than what he is expected

Sportsmanship -- refraining from complaining about trivial matters

Civic virtue -- participating in the governance of the organization. Or manners representing individual's involvement in the activities related to the organization.

These five dimensions of OCB have been classified into three main categories by the researchers, namely, interpersonal organizational citizenship behavior (OCBI) which includes altruism and courtesy,

organizational (OCBO) which includes sportsmanship and civic virtue and task (OCBT) that includes Conscientiousness.

Relationship between Personality and Organisation Citizenship Behavior-

OCB literature mostly focused on Personality (Organ and Ryan, 1995; Konovsky and Organ,1996; Chiaburu et el,2011). Relationship between Personality and OCB have found conscientiousness and agreeableness to be the best predictor of OCB (Organ and Ryan, 1995; Ilies et el,2009). There is moderate correlations between extraversion and emotional stability and OCB (Oh and Berry ,2009; Richards and Schat,2011), while others found only extroversion and not emotional stability correlating with OCB (King et el,2005; Cote and Miners,2006). Different studies have been done on personality and OCB Relationship like (Raja, 2004; Kumar et al, 2009; Singh and Singh ,2009; Ariani 2010; Lin and Ho, 2010; Suresh and Venkatammal,2010). Meta-analysis of 87 independent studies on OCB, Chiabaru et al (2011) suggested small to moderate correlations between 'Big Five' personality traits and OCB, indicating that there are

possible intervening variables affecting the personality –OCB relationship. Organ and Ryan revealed that work attitudes might explain the relationship between personality and OCB. (Bouradage, Lee & Shin,2012) suggest that an individual known as an organizational citizen may well be low on Honesty and Humility. a personality trait that has been found to be associated with behaviours that are harmful to the organization and /or to its members. Big Five is a useful framework to explain the person logical basis of OCB (Kumar, Bakshi &Rani, 2009). (Bouradage, Lee & Shin,2012) also suggest that one implication of this finding seems to be that managers should consider not only observable work behaviours but also the motives behind the behaviours. (Patki, Shobhana & Abhyankar,2016) research finding suggest that

Conscientiousness, agreeableness, openness to experience and extraversion are positively correlated with both OCBI and OCBO, Openness to experience is the strongest predictor of both OCBI and OCBO, Openness to experience fully mediates the relationship between agreeableness and OCBI, Extraversion partially mediates the

relationship between agreeableness and OCBI , Openness to experience partially mediates the relationship between conscientiousness and OCBO and Extraversion partially mediates the relationship between conscientiousness and OCBO.

There are several studies have been conducted between OCB and Personality which is mainly in the western culture and countries where they have explored the relationship between all the variables of OCB and Personality Big Five Model. This research specially with Indian context and specially in the services industry with hotels is very significant for academic and industry purpose.

Research methodology

The study used a multi-phased approach to screen personality characteristics and their impact on organizational citizenship behavior. This investigation took a quantitative method. The study is purely descriptive in nature. As the research progressed, both in terms of literature analysis and field work on personality and organizational citizenship behavior, the

concepts and models changed. The variables for the study were obtained from the NEO-Personality Inventory by Paul T. Costa and Robert R. McCrae. These two were the ones that came up with the idea. It has 60 items and is based on Vivek Sharma and Sangeeta Jain's research on Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Measuring Organizational Citizenship Behaviour It has 36 things, including 22 items connected to altruism, 5 items related to organizational compliance, 6 items related to sportsmanship, and 6 items associated to loyalty (3 items).

The sample size was 104, with 77 responses being selected for data analysis, resulting in a response rate of 74%. Using the independent factors of personality, Multiple Regression Analysis was utilized to predict the dependent variable (Organisation Citizenship Behavior of Vivanta by Taj workers) (altruism, organisational compliance, sportsmanship, and loyalty).

The hypothetical Research model

The hypotheses were framed after developing the hypothetical research model as follows:



Figure 1: Hypothetical Research framework for the study

Hypotheses for testing:

H01: There will be significant correlation between Personality domains and Organisation Citizenship Behaviour of VBTA Employees.

H02: There will be significant difference in Organisation Citizenship Behaviour with regard to their occupational levels.

Analysis and results

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics of the dataset were initially examined. The demographic distribution gives the general idea about the respondents who have participated in this research. The study was conducted in Vivanta by Taj Aurangabad- is an Indian hotel chain established in September 2010. The brand is a part of the Indian Hotels Company Limited, a subsidiary of the TATA Group with total employees The Sample is entire population of employee's perusing jobs in Vivanta By Taj- Aurangabad. Their age range is between 20 to 57. They are categorized based on Occupational level in the unit.

Demographic Statistics

Attributes	Frequency	Percentage
Occupational Level		
FTC	33	28.3
Executives	29	59.4
Staff	14	86.8

inferential statistics

Normality of the Data

Normality of the Data

	Mean		Std. Deviation		Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Neuroticism	20.80	.774	4.749	1.641	.276	2.682	.545	
Extraversion	31.37	.644	5.612	-.439	.276	.588	.545	
Openness to experience	24.17	.539	4.697	-.219	.276	1.871	.545	
Agreeableness	29.57	.668	5.825	-.761	.276	1.597	.545	
Conscientiousness	34.25	.637	5.557	-.836	.276	1.017	.545	
Altruism	40.54	.659	6.466	-1.852	.276	1.927	.545	
Organisational Compliance	22.24	.409	3.566	-1.437	.276	1.652	.545	
Sportsmanship	24.34	.529	4.609	-1.337	.276	2.609	.545	
Loyalty	11.61	.354	3.062	-.847	.277	.233	.548	
Valid N (listwise)								

Before inferential analysis of the data, the conditions of normality, reliability and discriminant validity were established. The following table shows the skewness and kurtosis of the data distribution. The means and standard deviations of the latent constructs were then derived to give an idea of the central tendencies and dispersion of the distribution of data.

Analysis of Table _ explains that the data is normally distributed falling well within the range of -2 to +2 (George & Mallery,2010). The reliability of the construct has been measured through Cronbach's alpha to test the internal consistency of the questionnaire.

The Cronbach's Alpha showed an overall reliability of 0.748. (Table)

Table 4: Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.748	9

To measure the discriminant validity, Pearson's correlations was done. Inter-item correlations as well as item-to-total correlations were established (Jackson 2012). Using the criteria presented by Hair et al. (1998), the statements all showed item-to-total correlations greater than the criterion of .50. The latent variables also displayed inter-item correlations exceeding the criterion of .30. Both the item-to-total correlations and inter-item correlations are considered to be significant and represent homogeneity. The correlation matrix was extracted after ascertaining the reliability of the constructs.

Table 5: Correlation

	TOCB		Ptype
TOCB	Pearson Correlation	1	.569**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0
	N	76	76
Ptype	Pearson Correlation	.569**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	
	N	76	76
**. Correlation is significant			

Table 6 :KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-	0.826
Bartlett's Test of Chi-Sphericity	Approx. 378.9 Square
Df	36
Sig.	0

Table 7: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.647a	0.418	0.377	18.914

a. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness,

The model summary table shows that there exist multiple correlations between different personality type and organisation citizenship behaviour of employees is .647 (R). The coefficient of multiple determination (R²) is .418. This implies that 41.8% of the variance in OCB is explained by different personality type. There was significant effect of personality type and OCB at the $p < .05$ level for different personality types [$F(5, 70) = 10.070, p = .000b$]. From the ANOVA table (table) it can be seen that the model significantly ($p < .05$) explains variations in dependent variable.

Table 8: ANOVAa

Table 6. ANOVA						
Model	Sum of Squares		Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	18012.5	5	3602.51	10.07	.000b
	Residual	25042.1	70	357.745		
	Total	43054.7	75			

a. Dependent Variable: TOCB

b. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiouness, Openness to experience, Neuroticism, Agreeableness, Extraversion

Table 9: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	40.567	21.195		1.914	0.06
	Neuroticism	-0.09	0.35	-0.025	-0.256	0.799
	Extraversion	1.311	0.504	0.307	2.602	0.011
	Openness	0.701	0.497	0.138	1.412	0.162
	Agreeableness	0.569	0.471	0.138	1.208	0.231
	Conscientiousness	1.017	0.568	0.236	1.791	0.078

a. Dependent

From the coefficient table (table 4.8) it can be seen that personality type significantly ($p < .05$) contributes to the model.

Table 10: Descriptives

95% Confidence Interval for Mean								
TOCB	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
FTC	33	145.52	21.825	3.799	137.78	153.25	58	176
Executive	29	153.45	23.512	4.366	144.5	162.39	76	178
Staff	14	144.93	29.288	7.827	128.02	161.84	66	171
Total	76	148.43	23.96	2.748	142.96	153.91	58	178

occupational level on Organisation Citizenship Behaviour of employees.

Table 11: ANOVA

TOCB	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1182.328	2	591.164	1.031	0.362
Within Groups	41872.34	73	573.594		
Total	43054.67	75			

To further analyze these outcomes, the regression equation is created as follows:

$$OCB = 40.567 - .025 * N + 0.307 * E + 0.138 * OTE + 0.138 * A + 0.236 * C$$

Analysis of the significance values in table leads to the inference that the Organisation Citizenship behaviour depends on personality variable based on significance values ($p < .05$) from coefficients table, shown that Extraversion ($p < .05$) and Conscientiousness ($p < .05$) found to be statistically significant for the dependent variable. Further analysis has been done to identify the difference in OCB on the basis of three occupational level – FTC, Executive and Staff. Table shows that ANOVA ($F(2,73, p=.362)$), ($p > .05$) explains that there is no significant difference of three

Table12: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Table 14: Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: TOCB

Games-Howell

(I) Occupational LEVEL	(J) Occupational LEVEL	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
FTC	Executive	-7.933	5.788	.363	-21.86	5.99
	Staff	.587	8.701	.997	-21.48	22.65
Executive	FTC	7.933	5.788	.363	-5.99	21.86
	Staff	8.520	8.963	.615	-14.04	31.08
Staff	FTC	-5.87	8.701	.997	-22.65	21.48
	Executive	-8.520	8.963	.615	-31.08	14.04

Above table shows that the data is not homogeneous $P=.563 > .05$ so Games-Howell test has been done to see which group differed from each other. Below table shows that there is no significant difference between the groups Executive $p = .363$, Staff $p = .997$, FTC $p=.615$. each other.

Table 13: Results of Hypotheses Testing		
Hypothesis	Significance	Result
H01	0.009	Fail to Reject
H02	0.563	Fail to Accept

Discussion and Findings

The purpose of this research is to determine the link between organizational citizenship behavior and personality domain, as well as the influence of occupational level on organizational citizenship behavior among Vivanta by Taj Aurangabad workers. Extraversion and consciousness, according to the study, have a positive significant impact on organizational citizenship behavior, whereas neuroticism, openness to experience, and agreeableness have no significant impact on organizational citizenship behavior as measured by Altruism, Organizational Compliance, Sportsmanship, and Loyalty. While the study found no effect of occupational level on organizational citizenship behavior,

Limitation and Further Scope for Research

Future research in the subject of organizational citizenship behavior in many sectors might benefit from the findings of this study. The research was limited to a certain location of the Vivanta by Taj Aurangabad. With its rich culture and possibilities, India offers ample opportunity

for extensive research in the field of organizational citizenship behavior. Despite the fact that this is the first study in this field and there is supporting research material, the researchers recommend that the findings be handled with care and not applied to the whole hotel sector in India. The sample size was a constraint for the researchers, and they claim that if the sample size had been bigger, the outcomes of the research study would have been different. Further research might be conducted in this sector if the findings in this study differ from those in other industries.

REFERENCES

1. Argentero, P. &. (2008). An evaluation of organizational citizenship behavior: Psychometric characteristics of the Italian version of podsakoff et al.'s scale. *TPM - Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*(15), 61-75.
2. Argentero, P. C. (2008). An Evaluation of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Psychometric Characteristics of the Italian Version of Podsakoff Et Al.' S Scale. . *TPM.*, 15(2). 61-75.
3. Ariani, D. (2010). Social capital moderating roles towards relationship of motives, personality and organizational citizenship behavior: Cases in Indonesian banking industry. *Southeast Asian Journal of Management*, 2(4), 161–183.
4. Barnard, C. (1933). *The Functions of the executive*. (It. trans., *Le funzioni del dirigente*, UTET, Torino, 1970). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
5. Bateman, T. S. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and

- employee “citizenship.”. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-595.
6. Bourdage, S. J. (2012). Motives for Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Personality Correlates and Coworker Ratings of OCB. *Human Performance*, 3(25), 179-200.
 7. Bozionelos, N. B. (2014). Mentoring receipt and personality: Evidence for non-linear relationships. *Journal of Business Research*, 2(67), 171-181.
 8. Campbell, D. T. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56, 81-105.
 9. Cattell, R. B. (1943). The description of personality: Basic traits resolved into clusters. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 4(38), 476.
 10. Chen, X.-P. H. (1998). The role of organizational citizenship behavior in turnover: Conceptualization and preliminary tests of key hypotheses. 83(6): 922–931. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 6(83), 922-931.
 11. Chiaburu, D. (2011). The Five – Factor Model of Personality Traits and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours: A Meta- Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 6(96), 1140-1166.
 12. Coleman, V. I. (2000). Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain. *Human Resource Management Review*(10), 25-44.
 13. Cote, S. a. (2006). Emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence and job performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1(51), 1-28.
 14. Debora, E. J. (2014). Personality and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in Indonesia: The Mediating Effect of Affective Commitment. *Asian Business & Management*, 2(14), 147-170.
 15. George, D. a. (2010). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference 17.0 Update. (Vol. 10th Edition)*. Pearson, Boston.
 16. Graham, J. W. (1986). Organizational citizenship informed by political theory.
 17. Ilies, R. F. (2009). Personality and citizenship behavior: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 4(94), 945–959.

18. Joshua S, B. K.-H.-H. (2012). Motives for organisational Citizenship Behaviour: Personality Correlates and Co worker Ratings of OCB,. *Human Performance*, 3(25), 179-200.
19. Jung, C. (1971). Psychological Types, Volume 6 of The Collected Works of CG Jung. (Vol. 18). Princeton University Press,.
20. King, E. G. (2005). Linking personality to helping behaviors at work: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Personality*, 3(73), 585-608.
21. Kirton, M. J. (1986). Cognitive style and personality: The Kirton adaption innovation and Cattell's sixteen personality factor inventories,. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 2(7), 141-146.
22. Konovsky, M. a. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 3(17), 253-266.
23. Kumar, K. B. (2009). Linking the 'Big Five' Personality Domains to Organisational Citizenship Behaviour. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 1(2), 73-81.
24. Kumar, K. B. (2009). Linking the 'big five' personality domains to organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 2(1), 73-81.
25. Lin, L. a. (2010). Guanxi and OCB: The Chinese cases. . *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2(96), 285- 298.
26. Lin, L. a. (2010). Guanxi and OCB: The Chinese cases. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2(96), 285- 298.
27. Luthans, F. (2011). Organisational Behaviour- An evidence based approach (12 ed.). MGH USE/ISE, .
28. McCrae, R. R. (1999). A five-factor theory of personality. *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*(2), 139-153.
29. Milind. (2016). Trends and Validity an Investigative Study of Mauryan Phase HRM Practices and Theories with Modern Corporate World.
30. Mischel, W. (1977). The interaction of person and situation. In: D. Magnusson and N.S. Endler (eds.) *Personality at the Crossroads: Current Issues in Interactional Psychology*. . Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, , 333-352.

31. Moorhead, G. A. (2009). *Organisation Behaviour –Managing People and Organisation*. Dreamtech Press.
32. Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*(37), 1543-1567.
33. Oh, I. a. (2009). The five-factor model of personality and managerial performance: Validity gains through the use of 360-degree performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 6(94), 1498– 1513.
34. Organ, D. P. (2006). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents and Consequences*. London: Sage.
35. Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior - The Good Soldier Syndrome*. (1st ed.). Lexington, Massachusetts/Toronto: D.C. Heath and Company.
36. Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
37. Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, Mass: Lexington Books.
38. Organ, D. W. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior *Personnel Psychology*(48), 775-802.
39. Patki, S. M., & Abhyankar, S. C. (2016). Big Five Personality Factors as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Complex Interplay. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3(2).
40. Pierce, J. L. (2002). *Management Organisational Citizenship Behaviour- An integrated prespective*. South Western Thomas Learning.
41. Podsakoff, P. M. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*(12), 531–544.
42. Podsakoff, P. M. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2(1), 107-142.

43. Podsakoff, P. M. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviours: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 3(26), 513-563.
44. Podsakoff, P. M. (2015). Testing Reliability of Organisation Citizenship Behavior Scale(OCBS). *For Non-Teaching Staff In Academics*, 9(6), 55-66.
45. Podsakoff, P. W. (1986). Effects of organizational formalization on alienation among professionals and nonprofessionals. *Academy of Management Journal*, 4(29), 820–831.
46. Purba, D. E. (2015). Personality and organizational citizenship behavior in Indonesia: The mediating effect of affective commitment. *Asian Business and Management*, 2(14), 147-170.
47. Raja, U. (2004). The relationship of the Big Five personality dimensions to personal and organizational outcomes: Answering the questions who? and when? (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
48. Rossberger, R. (2014). National personality profiles and innovation: The role of cultural practices. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 3(23), 331-348.
49. Rossberger, R. J. (2014). National personality profiles and innovation: The role of cultural practices. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 3(23), 331–348.
50. Sharma, V. &. (2014). A Scale for Measuring Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in Manufacutring Sector. *Pacific Business Review International*, 8(6), 57-62.
51. Singh, A. a. (2009). Does personality predict organizational citizenship behavior among managerial personnel? *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 2(35), 291–298.
52. Singh, A. a. (2009). Does personality predict organizational citizenship behavior among managerial personnel? *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 2(35), 291–298.
53. Smith, C. A. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and

- antecedents. Journal of Applied Psychology(68), 653-663.
54. Smith, C. A. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. Journal of Applied Psychology(68), 653-663.
55. Suresh, S. a. (2010). Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 2(36), 276-286.
56. Suresh, S. a. (2010). Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 2(36), 276–286.
57. Van Dyne, L. G. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement and validation. Academy of Management Journal,, 37, 765-802.
58. Van Scotter, J. R. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facts of contextual performance. Journal of Applied Psychology. (81), 525-531.
59. Williams, L. J. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in.role behaviors. Journal of Management(17), 601-617.