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Job Insecurity and Organizational Citizenship Behavior, with the Moderating Roles of Positive Psychological Capital and Grit

Nataly Farroukh

Abstract

Job Insecurity has been consistently on the rise as a result of Covid-19 and the simultaneous changes taking place as a consequence of current events. The purpose of this research is to analyze how Job Insecurity influences employees’ Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, and whether Positive Psychological Capital and Grit moderate this relationship. This study bridges the gap in the literature regarding the impact of job insecurity on employees’ organizational citizenship behavior during the Covid-19 pandemic. There are also limited studies that explore different personal resources like psychological capital and grit as potential moderators in this relationship. To test the hypotheses set in this study, data was gathered via email and link shared on social media platforms. Using SPSS software and Excel MegaStat, the data collected was analyzed.

The empirical data shows that qualitative job insecurity has a negative relationship with organizational citizenship behavior, and positive psychological capital and grit are established as moderators to this relationship. Managers can alleviate job insecurity in the workplace by promoting positive psychological capital and grit amongst employees, both of which will sustain and promote organizational citizenship behavior even during difficult times.

Keywords: Covid-19, Job Insecurity (JI), Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Positive Psychological Capital (PsyCap), Grit, Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory, Social Exchange Theory (SET).
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Chapter One

Introduction

This chapter provides background information for this study leading to its purpose and research questions. The gaps in literature are highlighted to emphasize the need for this research. Also, the study context and operational definitions of key terms are provided to familiarize the reader with the concepts and setting of this study. Lastly, this chapter outlines the subsequent parts of this thesis.

1.1 Background of the Study

Organizations have come to a realization that their human capital is inevitably the main, irreplaceable asset that “makes or breaks” the firm and is used to enhance their competitive advantage (Vrontis & Christofi, 2020). As such, the Human Resource Department is stepping down from its “personnel-only-management” roles and taking on a more strategic role, as it is considered a strategic partner to senior managers and involved in developing, planning and executing organizational strategies (Mello, 2014). Through various Human Resource Management (HRM) procedures and practices like training, coaching, rewarding and others, companies have been able to successfully improve their employees’ skills and overall performance (Zuñiga-Collaës et al., 2020).

However, organizations nowadays are facing numerous aspects that have shifted the past static industries and shaped the modern economy, from globalization demanding agility and briskness of change, to technological revolutions that are restructuring industrial operations (Van Hootegem & De Witte, 2019), and most recently, Coronavirus (Covid-19). These arising challenges have a ripple effect on an organizational level, as companies are forced to undergo reformations that affect the employees’ employment status and working conditions to adjust to these changes (Benach et al., 2014). For instance, some jobs are now being automated and performed by robots instead of humans to improve efficiency (Lee et al., 2017). The switch to robots has trended more with the Covid-19 pandemic blowout in order to lower costs and prevent further spreading the infection in the workplace (Mahmoud, 2021). Ultimately, this led to the loss of 42% of jobs in the global hospitality sector alone (Mahmoud et al., 2021b). Such changes have troubled employees regarding the continuity of
their jobs in the future, thus triggering their job insecurity (JI) (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984; Karkoulian et al., 2013).

This JI has taken a toll on employees’ personal lives, whereby Chirumbolo et al., (2021) found that it is associated with worse physical and mental health, in addition to lower levels of daily consumption. Moreover, JI resulting from Covid-19 has impacted the employees’ work lives, increasing their financial concerns (Wilson et al., 2020), and reducing their motivation and engagement (Jung et al., 2021).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is one dimension of the overall job performance which includes additional activities taken up by the employee that contribute to the psychological, social and organizational environment (Peral, 2019). JI affects an employees’ behavior at work, and their concern of potentially losing their job might reduce their engagement in OCBs, and increase displays of counterproductive behaviors that negatively impact job performance (Khan & Ghufran, 2018).

According to Gori and Topino (2020), all these organizational and environmental changes taking place have instilled fear and anxiety among employees, thus urging organizations to fixate their attention on the human capital. Human capital is comprised of four main types of capitals; “intellectual”, “emotional”, “psychological” and “social” (Çelik, 2018).

Psychological capital – or PsyCap – stems from “positive psychology” and “positive organizational behavior” (Çelik, 2018), and is perceived as an essential personal resource that builds on the employees’ strengths and allowing them to fulfil their tasks successfully (Avey et al., 2010). Imran and Shahnawaz (2020) highlighted the magnitude of PsyCap in fostering a sense of determination and positivity to try to adapt and succeed in uncertain, challenging times. PsyCap is considered to be an antecedent of enhanced job performance (Newman et al., 2014), and is correlated with improved psychological well-being (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017).

Another personal resource that can equip employees with the ability to withstand ambiguity and adversity is grit (Jordan et al., 2018). Grit determines how an employee perceives and associates with the difficulties s/he faced, and can be an antecedent of success (Moen & Olsen, 2020). According to Blanco (2021), grit was an essential factor during the development of the Covid-19 vaccine, as this process demanded patience during trial and error experiments, and required health researchers and doctors to be persistent in exerting efforts to find an effective vaccine. In other words, grit can positively affect the employee’s
professional and personal life, whereby high levels of grit are associated with better job performance (Blanco, 2021), increased employee engagement (Tang et al., 2019) and lower levels of anxiety and depression (Schimschal et al., 2020).

Evidently, Covid-19, along with the political and economic crises taking place in many countries, have left employees with deteriorated mental health and increasing JI. Organizations are now trying to pursue potential initiatives that can limit the damage of these environmental stressors on the employees’ health and performance. Multiple studies have shown that developing PsyCap of employees can minimize their JI and its impact on job performance (Costa & Neves, 2017). Furthermore, other studies uncovered the role of grit on employee behavior and performance. According to McGinley and Mattila (2020), in the presence of high JI rates, grittier employees are less likely to leave the organization or change their career.

1.2 Need for the Study

This research is built on literature gaps and recommendations found in previous studies. To start with, there is a lack of research on the outcomes of Covid-19 on an employee’s performance, behavior and mental health (Lin et al., 2021), in addition to the absence of studies that uncover the “positive psychological resources” that can mitigate the detrimental influence of employee job insecurity (Duckworth & Quinn, 2009; Probst et al., 2017). Moreover, Shin et al. (2019) stressed on the importance of reassessing the relationship between JI and OCB during Covid-19 to detect potential changes caused by this pandemic. Accordingly, the value added from the current study is to bridge these literature gaps and contribute to the pool of research about JI, OCB, PsyCap, Grit and the various relationships between them.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

In line with the aforementioned literature gaps, the purpose of this research is to explore the impact of job insecurity nowadays on organizational citizenship behavior, and how PsyCap and grit can moderate this relationship. The outcomes of this study will assist organizational leaders, managers and HR personnel in determining whether promoting PsyCap and grit will
help employees in controlling their JI and preventing/reducing it from affecting their behavior, performance and relationship with the organization.

1.4 Identification of the Research Questions

The objectives of this study attempt to answer the following research questions:

1. How does Job Insecurity today influence Organizational Citizenship Behavior?
2. How can promoting Grit and Positive Psychological Capital among employees alleviate the outcomes of Job Insecurity amidst these times of uncertainty, and moderate its relationship with Organizational Citizenship Behavior?

1.5 Study Context

Business leaders and employees in all countries and industries have been facing a common challenge lately – the Covid-19 pandemic (Donthu & Gustafsson, 2020). The spread of Covid-19 – which was declared a pandemic in March 2020 by the World Health Organization – was an unanticipated situation that caused noticeable disruptions among economies and everyday life (El Othman et al., 2021). According to the International Labor Organization (ILO) (2020), economies worldwide are witnessing a recession that is worse than the one recorded during the 2008-2009 financial crisis. Due to lockdowns and social distancing measures, businesses had to resort to opening up to only 50% capacity to avoid overcrowding employees, in addition to remote work, downsizing and lay-offs, which in turn triggered a sense of job insecurity among employees (Jung et al., 2021). In fact, the US reported that between February-May 2020, 41 million workers filed for unemployment due to this pandemic (Wilson et al., 2020). In the service sector alone, Covid-19 declined employment by 50% (El Othman et al., 2021) and over 100 million workers lost their jobs in the hospitality industry worldwide (Mahmoud et al., 2021b). This rising unemployment has increased JI among workers, whereby fear of Covid-19 infection and JI were recorded as psychological stressors correlated with the adverse mental health outcomes in these 2 years (Maatouk et al., 2021). It is hypothesized in this research that this will also have repercussions on the employees’ job attitudes and behaviors on the job.

It was found by several studies that countries undergoing political and socio-economic instabilities – like Lebanon – are suffering more during the Covid-19 pandemic (Maatouk et
al., 2021). As most participants in this study are in Lebanon, it must be noted that this country is witnessing its worst economic crisis nowadays (Mjaess et al., 2021). On October 17, 2019, rebellions erupted among Lebanese citizens due to political, economic and social mayhem, leading to the devaluation of the national currency against the US dollar, leaving more than half the population living under the poverty line and enduring further financial and socio-economic unrest (Mjaess et al., 2021; Bizri et al., 2020). To worsen the situation even more, the Beirut Port Explosion on August 4, 2020, has killed 200 people, leaving thousands injured and tens of thousands homeless, and causing an $8 billion USD dollars economic and physical damage according to the world bank (Abouzeid et al., 2020). Ever since, more than 700 institutions have closed causing 25,000 people to become unemployed, salaries and wages were reduced by 70%, and more than 30% of the youth are now unemployed (Bizri et al., 2020; Maatouk et al., 2021).

On February 21, 2020, the Ministry of Public Health in Lebanon declared the first case of Covid-19, which has spread more since (Mjaess et al., 2021). Similar to most nations, Lebanon enforced lockdowns and social distancing protocols to control infection rates (Maatouk et al., 2021). Thus, thousands of Lebanese workers that relied on their small business institutions as the sole source of income were forced to close to abide by the lockdowns and curfews set (Bizri et al., 2020), which has impacted their profits. After the Port blast, around 81% of citizens admitted of having financial concerns, and with the pandemic, an increase of PTSD, anxiety, job and income insecurities were found among Lebanese (El Khoury-Malhame et al., 2021; Khoury et al., 2020). Moreover, aftermath of the economic instability accompanied by Covid-19 show that OCB among employees is weakened, a third of Lebanese workers are now unemployed, one fifth underwent salary reductions, and due to increased financial concerns, poverty levels, job insecurities, and suicidal rates increased as well (Khalil, 2019; Kharroubi et al., 2021; Maamari et al., 2020).

1.6 Outline of this research

This thesis is divided into six chapters dedicated to answering the research questions and objectives set for this study. Accordingly, the following Chapter (2) will thoroughly cover the history, definitions, dimensions, antecedents and outcomes of each of the four variables – JI, OCB, PsyCap, and Grit. Afterwards Chapter (3), a theoretical framework in which this research is based on will attempt to uncover the potential association between these variables
through formulating clearly stated hypotheses. Chapter (4) will encompass the method used to collect data, the scales used in formulating the questionnaire, the sample population and the data analysis tool used to evaluate the results of this study, which will be included in Chapter (5). Lastly, Chapter (6) will provide a detailed explanation and practical implications of the results recorded in chapter five, along with the limitations of this study, recommendations for future studies, and a comprehensive conclusion.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

This chapter serves as a detailed literature review that deepens the understanding of this study. The four main concepts covered in this research: Job Insecurity, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Positive Psychological Capital and Grit are introduced in the following parts.

2.1 Job Insecurity

2.1.1 Conceptualization of Job Insecurity

Job insecurity (JI) is a future-focused phenomenon with several yet similar definitions, one of which is that of Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984), who stated that it consists of an employee’s perception of possible perpetual loss of the job or certain aspects of it (Mauno et al., 2017). In fact, according to Chirumbolo et al. (2021), all the different definitions incorporate the three basic elements of JI; firstly, it involves the individual’s subjective perception of the situation. In other words, the level of JI experienced by every employee varies according to his/her own subjective perception of the current circumstances, even when all the employees are in the same objective environment (Lee et al., 2017). Secondly, the concern for the potential job loss is futuristic but revolves around the employee’s present job in the firm s/he is currently working in. Thirdly, employees with JI are worried that they might lose their jobs against their will – it is different than an actual job loss in the sense that the worker who is experiencing JI is still employed and the possible job loss will be involuntary (Chirumbolo et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2017).

JI is often perceived as a psychological contract breach (a broken promise) by employees, as they are usually determined to work hard in exchange for the compensation and recognition offered by the organization; nevertheless, feelings of JI make the employees speculate that these promised rewards are being violated (Rousseau, 1995; cited in Mahmoud et al., 2021a). Further, JI is considered as a hindrance work stressor due to its association with feelings of uncertainty, whereby the employee merely forecasts these feelings of ambiguity regarding futurist loss, without knowing whether this loss will actually take place or not (Tomas et al.,
In turn, this uncertainty fosters a sense of stress within the employee who will be struggling to adopt a coping strategy that might alleviate his/her anxiety and assist in adapting to the current vague situation (Darvishmotevali & Ali, 2020).

2.1.2 Dimensions of Job Insecurity

The lack of consensus on a single universal definition for JI may be attributed to the dispute of whether this phenomenon is unidimensional or multidimensional (Lee et al., 2017). Researchers who perceive it as unidimensional or “global form” explain this feeling of insecurity as solely a general sensitivity or concern about job loss, as mentioned by De Witte (2000) and other scholars (cited in Lee et al., 2017). On the other hand, others with the likes of Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984), or Hellgren et al. (1999) highlight the different facets of JI and emphasize the importance of exploring each dimension while studying its manifestation.

Some scholars divide JI into two dimensions; Cognitive and Affective. Cognitive JI includes the “cognitive elements” of the possibility of losing a job, where the worker contemplates the insecurity associated with job loss (Akgunduz & Eryilmaz, 2018). As for Affective JI, it conveys the “emotionality” or the employee’s emotional response to the lack of job continuity, which involves feelings of anxiety, fear, and worry (Jiang & Lavysse, 2018).

Nevertheless, for this study, the two dimensions adopted for JI will be those outlined by Hellgren et al. (1999), which are Quantitative and Qualitative. Most research done on JI portrays Quantitative JI, or the employee’s fear concerning the continuity or loss of the overall current job (Charkhabi, 2019). Conversely, Qualitative JI is more apparent in organizations undergoing continuous changes or restructuring, and refers to the employee’s insecurity about losing the “quality aspects” or job features, such as worsened working conditions, increased demotions, minimal career advancement opportunities, slower salary development, and lack of person-organization fit (Van Hootegem & De Witte, 2019; Chirumbolo et al., 2021). Unlike quantitative JI, employees with qualitative JI are concerned with the quality of the job and not the termination of their employment contract with the organization (O’Neill & Sevastos, 2013). Moreover, according to Chirumbolo et al. (2017), physical and psychological health-related consequences are usually correlated with quantitative JI, whereas qualitative JI is considered as a breach of the psychological contract, and is associated with unfavorable employee attitudes and behavior.
2.1.3 Antecedents of Job Insecurity

The sense of JI among employees arises from several sources, ranging from environmental, organizational, individual, and interpersonal factors. To start with, the employees’ perceptions and feelings are highly affected by their surrounding environment. On a macroeconomic level, the volatility of industries caused by globalization, automation and ongoing technological advances lead to organizational changes, which can cause employees to develop JI (Lee et al., 2017). Further, economic fluctuations are another source of JI, especially nowadays with the Covid-19 outbreak. The International Labor Organization (ILO) detected over 340 million employees that were at risk of losing their jobs in 2020 as a result of Covid-19, not to mention the millions of employees who had already got laid off since the beginning of the pandemic (Lin et al., 2021). According to these authors, employees who perceive Covid-19 as a novel, disruptive phenomenon which the organization has yet to master control over, will show high levels of JI. Other macroeconomic factors that lead to employee JI include market competition and increased costs (Khan & Ghufran, 2018). As for micro-economic factors predicting JI, they include local unemployment rates, economic recession or downturn, policy changes in the country, and so on (Lee et al., 2017; Mahmoud et al., 2021a; Wang et al., 2019).

Other influences that might trigger an employee’s JI can be organizational; one of which is organizational change. Organizations are undergoing various continuous changes that elicit JI, from restructuring or redesigning, mergers and acquisitions, or in some cases, layoffs resulting from downsizing to cope with environmental changes (Jung et al., 2021). Other smaller scale changes, such as introducing a new manager or leader within the organization, or outsourcing external workers to complete internal business operations can also increase the JI level of internal workers (Bouzari & Karatepe, 2018). Another crucial organizational factor to consider is organizational justice and the overall trust an employee has in the leaders of the firm, whereby low levels of procedural, distributive and interactional justice is correlated with high levels of employee JI (Jiang & Lavayssee, 2018). Lee et al. (2017) added that the lack of job resources – training and development, career advancement opportunities, and so on – as well as role ambiguity, can determine high JI levels.

As mentioned earlier, JI is based on subjective perception, meaning that individual factors highly contribute to an employee’s JI levels. Personality traits represent a critical individual characteristic that affect a worker’s perception of his/her employment stability. These traits
incorporate self-concept, self-esteem, and locus of control, whereby employees with an external locus of control are more likely to feel insecure about their employment status, making them more susceptible to JI (Ghosh, 2017). Furthermore, the worker’s employability and employment type within the organization also play a role in eliciting JI (Wang et al., 2019). According to Sora et al. (2019), temporary employees anticipate the termination of their employment which reduces their JI, as opposed to permanent employees, who experience higher JI as they expect their organization to provide career development opportunities and retention incentives. Demographics is yet another individual factor that anticipates JI, from age, years of service (tenure), gender, and so forth. As derived in the work of Lee et al. (2017), younger employees with shorter tenures are more likely to display JI and turnover intentions; nevertheless, older workers with longer tenures are more likely to be correlated with the negative health outcomes of JI.

Lastly, interpersonal factors pertaining to the employee’s relationships in the workplace also contribute to an employee’s JI. The perceived organizational support portrayed by supervisors in particular are vital in reducing JI and buffering its negative outcomes on employee behavior and performance (Lam et al., 2015). In addition, as proven by Wang et al. (2019) who depicted the leader-member exchange (LMX) theory in their study, a supervisor’s approach and communication with the employee affects the latter’s perception of his/her stability of employment, which in turn determines the JI levels experienced by the employee. Glambek et al. (2018) highlight the negative effects of workplace bullying, which presents a threat to the employee’s survival in the organization and can be strengthened by the supervisor’s managerial negligence and non-responsiveness to the bullying complaints, and ultimately induces feelings of JI.

2.1.4 Consequences of Job Insecurity

As a job stressor, JI has major repercussions that can be divided into two main categories. Starting with work-related outcomes, Lavaysse et al. (2018) covered the most common consequences of JI on an employee’s work-life, including lower levels of job satisfaction and involvement, as well as reduced affective, normative and continuous organizational commitment. Employees with qualitative JI particularly refrain from organizational citizenship behaviors, and instead engage in unethical pro-organizational activities and counterproductive work behaviors, all of which hinder their job performance (Ghosh, 2017; Van Hootegem & De Witte, 2019). Examples of these ineffective behaviors include the
employees’ resistance to any changes taking place within the organization, suppression of personal values and feign of organizational ones, as well as the defiance of safety measures, which can lead to an increase in workplace accidents and injury rates (Lee et al., 2017). The threat of losing a job also triggers an employee’s turnover intentions and actual turnover, leading to an increase of employees’ engagement in social loafing and a decrease in efforts to fulfill their responsibilities effectively (Akgunduz & Eryilmaz, 2018). Employee attendance is another element to be considered in the presence of JI. While some employees with JI experience withdrawal from the organization and exhibit higher rates of absenteeism, others refrain from missing work to avoid granting the organization an incentive to let them go, so they show higher rates of presenteeism instead (Jiang & Lavaysse, 2018). In addition, JI among employees promotes burnout in terms of emotional exhaustion and organizational deviance, and is associated with lower levels of engagement, creativity and innovative thinking (Lin et al., 2021; McGinley & Mattila, 2020). The study of Karkoulian et al. (2013) found that employees experiencing JI are more likely to feel a sense of powerlessness, which in turn also intensifies JI. Overall, employees with high levels of JI feel that their psychological needs are not being met, which compromises their trust in the organization and their perception of supervisor and peer support (Khan & Ghufran, 2018). As a result, their intrinsic motivation and willingness to support the organization’s objectives are diminished, as they feel “overburdened” from the fear of losing their current jobs (Mahmoud et al., 2021a).

As for individual outcomes, JI – especially quantitative JI – is associated with long-term negative health outcomes. Physically, employees with JI are 32% more prone to heart diseases, and might experience psychosomatic symptoms and musculoskeletal disorders (Probst et al., 2017; Jiang & Lavaysse, 2018). Not only does this phenomenon influence the employees’ physical health, but it also has detrimental effects on their psychological and mental health. Workers suffering from JI usually undergo feelings of strain, rage, anxiety and depression, and these feelings tend to intensify in the case of worldwide events like Covid-19 and financial difficulties (Jiang & Lavaysse, 2018; Wilson et al., 2020). Wilson et al. (2020) added that such events coupled with JI foster a sense of hopelessness arising from all the ambiguity, which is considered a predictor of depression and psychological distress. Employees with JI become distracted and forced into “survival mode” as their mind is preoccupied with the threat of losing their job (Mahmoud et al., 2021a). Further, their personal resources such as self-esteem and self-concept are compromised in the face of this
job stressor (Bouzari & Karatepe, 2018). In general, JI promotes unfavorable employee behaviors resulting from negative psychological responses, and depletes the individual’s physical and mental energy (Jung et al., 2021). It is also manifested in an employee’s daily life, whereby Chirumbolo et al. (2021) concluded that workers with JI have reduced consumption rates limited to essentials only, and engage in saving behaviors as they are worried about their financial situation as their source of income might be lost (Wilson et al., 2020). Moreover, JI also affects an employee’s family life, whereby a study by Lim and Loo (2003) illustrated an increase in the children’s money anxiety and a reduction of their self-efficacy as a result of their parents’ JI concerns. Lastly, the stress-inducing uncertainty surrounding JI prevents employees from adopting successful coping mechanisms that might alleviate their anxiety, which has a negative rippling effect on their subjective well-being and job performance (Darvishmotevali & Ali, 2020).

2.2 Organizational Citizenship Behavior

2.2.1 Defining Organizational Citizenship Behavior

With the increased volatility of industries resulting from globalization and continuous technological innovations, organizations are attempting to survive by relying on in-role and extra-role behaviors of employees to improve the quality of service for internal and external customers (Sumarmi & Tjahjono, 2021). Whereas in-role behaviors involve the mandatory behaviors required by an employee to carry out tasks assigned in job descriptions and are included in reward systems, extra-role behaviors are done by employees at their free will to benefit the organization, and they go beyond the formal obligations of a job (Srivastava & Shree, 2019). In fact, although extra-role behaviors have been a well-known and widely discussed phenomenon since the late 1980s, Organ et al. (2006) believe that this concept originated from the “satisfaction-productivity” debates that took place in the 1930s; it was first depicted by Chester Barnard (1938), who emphasized the importance of having “cooperative systems” within the organization and that employees should choose to contribute to such systems at their own free will (cited in Ocampo, Acedillo et al., 2018). This concept kept on evolving and was eventually referred to as Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) by Organ (1997).

OCB has multifarious definitions, such as that of Katz and Kahn (1966), cited in Biswas and Mazumder (2017), who mentioned that it is comprised of extra-role behaviors that facilitate
the social relationships of the organization and aim to improve task performance and overall effectiveness. On the other hand, Schnake et al. (1995) referred to OCB as “prosocial” and additional “functional” behaviors that target individual, team and organizational performance (Arifin & Puteri, 2019). However, the most common definition of OCB is that of Organ (1988), who identified it as an employee’s “self-initiated”, discretionary behavior that is not clearly incorporated in the reward system and ultimately boosts organizational efficiency and effectiveness (cited in Teng et al., 2020). This definition combines Barnard’s (1938) idea of “willingness to cooperate” as well as the idea of Katz (1964) which separated regular performance of tasks from “spontaneous behaviors” (Çınar et al., 2013; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Organ later on redefined OCB in 1997, and integrated the idea that these behaviors sustain the employee’s social and psychological environment (Zeinabadi & Salehi, 2011).

Overall, a common theme appears in all the definitions of OCB; these behaviors are voluntary, exceed the requirements mentioned in the position’s job descriptions (JD), and involve prosocial behaviors (Bolino et al., 2013). An employee is considered a good organizational citizen if he/she willingly chooses to contribute more to the organization by engaging in additional tasks and behaviors that are not included in the formal JD and will not be rewarded (Munawir et al., 2019). Such employees display common characteristics of OCB, such as sharing knowledge, developing a sense of responsibility and duty to the organization among others, volunteering to carry out extra tasks, assisting co-workers in their workload, providing support and help for newly joined employees, and so on (Biswas & Mazumder, 2017; Khan & Ghufran, 2018; Munawir et al., 2019). These employee behaviors are desired by employers, essential for organizational sustainability and represent the “employee added value” to the organization (Aldag & Resckbe, 1997; Munawir et al., 2019).

2.2.2 Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCB has different conceptualizations that vary among different researchers. Klotz et al. (2018) stated that some studies approach OCB as a single latent construct; a set of comparable yet unique dimensions; or an aggregate of its different dimensions.

Regarding the dimensions of OCB, Smith et al. (1983) mentioned that it is hard to detect or measure, and has two distinct dimensions; Altruism – behaviors including assisting co-workers in direct interactions, and Generalized Compliance – “impersonal behaviors” that include abiding by the organization’s policies and norms. In 1986, Graham included another dimension – civic virtue; in 1988, Organ identified five main dimensions according to the
nature of OCBs; altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy, and sportsmanship (Ocampo, Acedillo et al., 2018; Teng et al., 2020). Altruism represents the employees’ selfless assistance of co-workers in their tasks or obstacles, and usually stimulates teamwork and collaboration among employees (Indarti et al., 2017; Ocampo, Acedillo et al., 2018). Civic Virtue, is when the employees’ genuine concern for the organization’s welfare is displayed through their increased involvement and voluntary participation in job-related duties (Kumar & Shah, 2015). Conscientiousness is a vital dimension that illustrates the employees’ devotion to the job through working additional hours, going beyond the typical and mandatory requirements to conforming to organizational regulations and policies (Jabeen & Munir, 2018). Courtesy stands for employee “gestures” relating to respecting others and avoiding interpersonal conflicts among colleagues by giving them prior notice regarding work agendas, keeping office equipment in good conditions and so on (Organ et al, 2006; Tambe, 2014). Lastly, Sportsmanship refers to the employees’ preparedness to endure challenging situations and fulfil additional workload without grievance (Anjala & Sandamali, 2019).

A year after Organ’s (1988) classification of OCB, Graham (1989) suggested an OCB model consisting of four dimensions; interpersonal helping, individual initiative, personal industry and loyal boosterism (cited in Biswas & Mazumder, 2017). Furthermore, another prominent model is that of Williams & Anderson (1991) who built a 2-dimensional model based on the targets of these behaviors; OCB-I – “individualistic behaviors” that refer to employees’ assistantship and contribution to the organization (includes altruism and courtesy); and OCB-O – “organization-directed behavior” that refer to the job’s requirements (includes conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue). As for the current research taking place, Organ’s (1988) five dimensions will be utilized to measure OCB.

2.2.3 Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

There are numerous factors that contribute to the development of OCB among employees. To start with, the leadership style and behavior of top executives highly influence an employee’s behavior. A study by Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara and Viera-Armas (2019) deduced that ethical leadership accompanied by moral behaviors is a motive for OCB among employees. Other leadership styles, such as benevolent and transformational leadership styles are also considered antecedents of OCB (Sumarmi & Tjahjono, 2021; Tan et al., 2019).
Besides leadership, there are other organizational elements that play a role in stimulating OCBs, encompassing HR practices, organizational climate and policies (Lavy, 2019; Maamari & Messarra, 2021; Ocampo, Acedillo et al., 2018). Ismail (2015) stressed on establishing procedural, distributive and interactional organizational justice, as employees are more likely to display citizenship behaviors if they perceive their employers are treating them fairly and justly. Along with organizational justice, organizational trust is just as essential, whereby the higher the organizational trust is, the more appreciative employees will be and the more they will engage in OCBs as a repayment for this trust (Yildiz, 2019). POS is another predecessor of OCB, as the perceived support from supervisors and co-workers “develops a sense of reciprocity among employees” and motivates them to contribute more to the organization (Gouldner, 1960; Tremblay, 2019). Ocampo, Tan et al. (2018) added that establishing open communication channels with higher management levels, implementing a fair performance management system and balancing work and leisure times are other actions that encourage OCB. Further, there is a direct and significant relationship between Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and OCB (El-Kassar et al., 2021), whereby organizations embracing CSR allow workers to perceive their jobs as more meaningful, and therefore, they will more likely perform extra-role behaviors (Choi et al., 2020).

On the other hand, numerous individual characteristics can be assessed to determine whether the employee will engage in OCB; first of which is personality (Puteri & Arifin, 2020). In particular, the study of A. K. Singh and A. P. Singh (2009) showed that specific personality dimensions – entailing conscientiousness, agreeableness and extraversion – as well as values for achievement, are considered significant predictors of OCB. Employees who aspire to help co-workers are usually characterized with prosocial values, which is another individualistic factor that increases the probability of an employee engaging in citizenship behaviors (Bolino & Grant, 2016). Lavy (2019) also stated that since emotions are considered a driver for behaviors, then positive emotions generate positive behaviors, such as OCBs.

Also, several researchers highlight job satisfaction and organizational commitment as key antecedents of OCB (Ocampo, Tan et al., 2018). Biswas & Mazumder (2017) concluded that when employees are satisfied with their work, they feel inclined to engage in citizenship behaviors in return, and their “positive experiences” on the job motivate them to engender prosocial and altruistic behaviors among co-workers. As for organizational commitment, Tan et al. (2019) found that organizational commitment is a major antecedent of OCB and mediates the relationship between the latter and benevolent leadership. Moreover, OCB is an
outcome of job involvement and organizational identification, whereby employees who are highly involved in their work and psychologically identify with the organization tend to demonstrate extra-role behaviors more (Dartey-Baah & Addo, 2019; Teng et al., 2020). In addition, employees who are concerned for the organization’s well-being and care about its status and success usually voluntarily carry out additional organization-directed and interpersonal OCBs (Klotz et al., 2018). Other antecedents involve perceived person-organization fit, person-job fit, as well as job characteristics in terms of the autonomy, nature of the tasks and working conditions (Biswas & Mazumder, 2017; Sumarmi & Tjahjono 2021).

2.2.4 Outcomes of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Businesses reap the benefits of OCBs on individual, team and overall organizational levels (Banwo & Du, 2020). Individually, it increases individual development, and since it leads to enhanced performance, employees get to benefit from extra rewards and recognition, innovation and career advancement opportunities (Sumarmi & Tjahjono, 2021). This upgrade in performance is portrayed through the employees’ increased productivity, efficiency and time-saving actions, as well as the reduction of absenteeism and turnover intentions; and ultimately leads to an increase in managerial ratings of employee performance as a return for their OCB contributions (Podsakoff, et al., 2009; Ocampo, Tan et al., 2018; Weeks & Sen, 2016). Furthermore, employees who engage in such behaviors develop a positive reputation among others, reach a higher workplace status and improve their own self-concept (Klotz et al., 2018; Teng et al., 2020). Shams et al. (2020) incorporated in their study Organ’s (1990) findings that suggested OCB among workers endorses positive behaviors that benefit the organization and inhibits negative behaviors that might cause any harm. Such employees are also more satisfied in their work, and the study of Indarti et al. (2017) deduced that OCB indirectly mediates the relationship between personality, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and performance.

On a team level, OCB reduces group-level turnover and boosts group-work proficiency (Koopman et al., 2016). Moreover, it entails respecting fellow co-workers and assisting them in overcoming potential obstacles and transcending above any challenge or change taking place, all of which generate trust and respect among employees and their associates (Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2015), and increase the workers’ social capital (Bolino et al., 2002).
At the organizational level, OCB stimulates social networking among employees, thus creating and sustaining healthy interpersonal relationships (Shams et al., 2020). It also promotes synchronization and clearer communication channels between different organizational levels, which in turn impacts performance (Harvey et al., 2018). Hence, OCB generally fosters a positive working environment (Liu et al., 2019). This promotes harmony, expedites the process of recruiting and retaining talented workers (Podsakoff et al., 2014), and generates a positive employee perception of their work and the organization (Fisher, 2010). In addition, OCB increases customer satisfaction and improves the service quality (Teng et al., 2020). Employees carrying out extra-role behaviors are willing to go “an extra mile” for customers by prioritizing their concerns and ensuring their needs are met in order to maintain their satisfaction and loyalty, which strengthens the relationship between internal and external customers (Mossholder et al., 2005). Overall, OCB leads to organizational success, whereby it is associated with increased organizational performance at the financial, social and environmental levels (Choi et al., 2020; Tan et al., 2019).

Despite the abundant advantages OCBs offer, organizations need to monitor their employees to limit the potential downturns of extra-role behaviors. Employees going beyond their job description and taking on additional responsibility might lead to role overload and increased stress (Bolino & Turnley, 2005). These negatives are more prevalent if employees feel obliged to engage in OCBs to meet the manager’s expectations or due to strict organizational politics and regulations (Lavy, 2019), whereby they will most likely experience “citizenship fatigue” (Bolino & Klotz, 2015). Additional negative outcomes of enforced OCB include higher turnover intentions, increased burnout and work-family struggles, and reduced job satisfaction, all of which negatively impact task performance (Lavy, 2019). Klotz et al. (2018) added that employees who turn to OCBs to impress their supervisors will incur high resource depletion and exhaustion.

2.3 Positive Psychological Capital

2.3.1 Historical Background on Positive Psychological Capital

As World War II ended, individuals relied on psychology to analyze human functioning and stimulate growth in healthy people (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Traditional psychology was fixated on the negative facets of individuals’ health and mental illnesses (Luthans et al., 2004). Nevertheless, a team led by Seligman in 1990s initiated a movement
that was later on known as positive psychology, and it highlighted the importance of having a positive mindset, building on the individuals’ strengths rather than weaknesses and improving the proficiency of their talents (Çelik, 2018; Nolzen, 2018). In general, positive psychology targets understanding the well-being and optimal functioning of typical people, and assisting them to reach their greatest potential (Seligman et al., 2005). Positive Organizational Psychology (POP) is embedded within the positive psychology movement, and accentuates the role positive emotions play in improving an individual’s life (Fredrickson, 2003). Among the POP movement were concepts that emphasized the importance of positivity in the workplace (Luthans & Youssef, 2004), such as Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) – focusing on promoting resilience and vitality in people to improve performance on different levels (Cameron & Caza, 2004) – and more importantly, the Positive Organizational Behavior (POB) – defined by Luthans (2002) as the implementation of positive individual strengths and psychological capabilities that are measurable, manageable and can be fostered to enhance the working environment and overall organizational success. POB incorporates several constructs, most famously, Positive Psychological Capital (PsyCap).

Psychological capital (PsyCap) denotes the “positive mental state” during a person’s development, and is a multifaceted construct consisting of four particular dimensions; Hope, Self-Efficacy, Resilience and Optimism – also known as HERO (Luthans et al., 2007). Firstly, as mentioned by Probst et al. (2017), Hope is defined by Snyder et al. (1991, p.287) as a “positive motivational state” originating from two elements; “agency” – goal-directed energy that boosts an individual’s perseverance to fulfill goals set, and “pathway” – way-power component facilitating the process of finding new paths as alternatives to those that have been blocked by potential obstacles. According to Yu et al. (2019), hopeful people are proactive risk-takers, investing additional energy while pursuing goals and taking on a positive attitude in the face of adversity. Secondly, Self-Efficacy was established by Albert Bandura who defined it as the person’s confidence in his/her capabilities and aptitudes to successfully complete his/her tasks (Bandura, 1982, 1997; cited in Santos & Liquori, 2019). Self-efficacy takes no interest in assessing previous accomplishments or current skill sets, rather, it consists of predicting what the person can do later on (Shiau et al., 2020). It regulates a person’s thoughts, reactions (Iqbal & Dagasteer, 2017), and has an impact on the instigation, intensity and perseverance of behavior (Paglis, 2010). Individuals who are characterized with high levels of self-efficacy are more confident in their abilities; they are motivated, resourceful, have realistic expectations and are known for their “can-do it”
outlook (McShane & Glinow, 2018). Thirdly, Resilience refers to the individual’s capacity to endure and recover from potential obstacles, hardships and misfortunes (Luthans et al., 2007). People with high resilience are capable of accepting reality and establish a stable set of beliefs, which expedites the process of developing beneficial adaptation arrangements to respond and adjust to changes (Nolzen, 2018). Further, resilient people are able to successfully deploy their cognitive, social, psychological assets and other resources to reduce the negative effects of adversities and setbacks (Masten & Reed, 2002). Finally, Optimism signifies a person’s logical awareness regarding what s/he is capable and incapable of, and the sustainability of a “positive attribution style” for current and futuristic triumphs (Chen et al., 2019). Optimistic people perceive favorable circumstances as “internal and permanent”, and challenging times as “external and temporary”, which helps in reducing the feeling of guilt and pressure people withstand during difficult circumstances (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017; Luthans et al., 2007; Youssef & Luthans, 2007).

Overall, Norman et al. (2010) deduced that in the case of PsyCap, these four dimensions together have a superior positive impact together than the impact of each dimension separately. Nolzen (2018) expanded on this idea by referring to PsyCap as the “higher construct” and explained that these four positive psychological resources create a “synergistic resource” that generates a feeling of control within an individual chasing his/her goals. Therefore, it can be concluded that the sum of the HERO components has a greater effect than each individual component alone (Nolzen, 2018).

Besides these four HERO dimensions, there are other positive psychological resources, such as creativity, mindfulness, forgiveness, emotional intelligence, authenticity and others (Luthans et al., 2015). According to Avey (2014), previous studies indicate that there are seven main conditions and aspects of PsyCap that are used to dictate whether a certain psychological resource can be included in this construct. To start with, PsyCap is multidimensional, whereby the HERO dimensions acting together as PsyCap has a greater impact than each dimension alone. Secondly, it is “domain specific”; a person can have a high family PsyCap but low work PsyCap. Thirdly, among the State-Trait continuum, PsyCap falls under “state-like” (Vilariño de Castillo & Lopez-Zafría, 2021). In this continuum, states such as emotions are transient and unstable; state-like resources such as PsyCap are considerably more stable and agile in terms of their changeability; trait-like resources like personality characteristics are usually preset and rigid; and finally, traits like intellect are “genetically based” and inflexible or difficult to change (Luthans & Youssef-
Morgan, 2017). Fourthly, PsyCap is measurable in terms of its level and its overall influence on the profitability of the organization, which makes it possible to deduce its return on investment (Luthans & Youssef, 2004). Fifthly, it is self-rated, whereby each individual rates how much s/he relates to or exhibits each dimension. The last two characteristics of PsyCap components are the level of analysis – PsyCap can be assessed on an individual or team-level – and their impact on organizational performance (Avey, 2014). Additional features of PsyCap include its agency, malleability and sociability (Costa & Neves, 2017).

In general, PsyCap is distinct from the various other types of capital (Wu & Nguyen, 2019), whereby it explores the idea of “who you are”, instead of “who you know”, “what you know” and “what you have”, which are typically the questions social, human and economic capital answer respectively (Luthans et al., 2004). PsyCap is aligned with the positive psychology movement, whereby it employs strengths as key personal assets which in turn can augment a person’s success in complex workplaces and ambiguous times (Avey et al., 2010). Yu et al. (2019), perceived it as a “set of justified psychological beliefs” that improve an individual’s attitude and behavioral outcomes. In fact, Shahnawaz and Jafri (2009) indicated that PsyCap is a sub-component of human capital that specifically manages the relationships among members of the organization. On an individual level, PsyCap illustrates a positive psychological state composed of the HERO dimensions that ultimately improve individual performance (Avey et al., 2011; Luthans et al., 2004). On the other hand, on an organizational level, it is measured and overseen by the human resource agents who aim on capitalizing and maximizing these psychological resources (Youssef & Luthans, 2012).

2.3.2 Antecedents and Outcomes of Positive Psychological Capital

Despite the limited research on the antecedents PsyCap (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017), it is clear that it can be developed and nurtured based on different individual, team and organizational factors. At an individual level, personality traits and dimensions are a key antecedent, as studies show that people with high levels of extraversion, intuition and thinking have a higher self-esteem and reach higher levels of PsyCap in all its dimensions (Nolzen, 2018). Moreover, a person’s psychological health – from emotions, occupational stress, workaholism, and others – also plays a role in determining his/her PsyCap levels (Vilariño del Castillo & Lopez-Zafra, 2021). Particularly, the study of Burns et al. (2019) depicts the influence positive and negative emotions – from happiness and interest to anxiety and sadness – have on an individual’s psychological resources, whereby positive emotions
represent a “driving force” that pushes a person to overcome current obstacles and maintain a positive perception of past, present and future situations (Siu et al., 2015).

In fact, the overall well-being of a person is considered as an antecedent of PsyCap, whereby the former fuels an individual’s enthusiasm and intrinsic motivation when chasing difficult goals, which helps in developing and maintaining high levels of PsyCap (Luthans et al., 2013). Furthermore, demographics, specifically age, are also considered important indicators of PsyCap levels (Avey, 2014). Wu and Nguyen (2019) elaborated by stating that the relationship between PsyCap and job satisfaction is moderated by an employee’s age, whereby young workers with high PsyCap levels are more likely to experience higher job satisfaction than older workers. On the other hand, Liu et al. (2012) believed that older employees have usually lived through more positive experiences and hence tend to exhibit higher levels of PsyCap than younger workers. Other demographic factors that boost PsyCap levels include ethnic identity, culture or country of origin, and strong gender role orientation (Brant et al., 2011; Combs et al., 2012; Ngo et al., 2014).

In addition, team-level elements affect PsyCap levels among employees. For example, Kwok et al. (2015) mentioned the role of social and emotional support provided by family members in enhancing PsyCap levels, particularly self-efficacy and optimism. Moreover, the leadership styles adopted are essential antecedents of PsyCap (Vilariño de Castillo & Lopez-Zafra, 2021). These authors covered different leadership styles, from transformational, authentic, humble, empowering and servant leaderships, portraying their positive relationship with both the leader’s and followers’ PsyCap. Further, the leader’s PsyCap levels can be used to predict that of the followers, as individuals’ PsyCap impacts each other easily in group settings (Story et al., 2013). This emphasizes the importance of leader’s representation of positive behaviors with their followers in terms of making them feel supported, cared for and recognized, which in turn will increase their optimism levels, and ultimately their PsyCap; therefore, leaders are considered and “active predictor” of employees’ PsyCap (Wu & Nguyen, 2019). However, in the case of negative leadership behavior, such as abusive supervision that is characterized by aggressive verbal and non-verbal behaviors and actions taken by leaders, it deteriorates the followers’ PsyCap levels (Liao & Liu, 2015).

As for the organizational level, multifarious factors precede employee PsyCap; namely, Hackman and Oldham (1980), cited in Vilariño del Castillo and Lopez-Zafra (2021), found that job characteristics – including “skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy,
and feedback” affect the employees’ intrinsic motivation, and have a direct association with their PsyCap levels. The organization’s HR policies also impact the employees’ attitude through PsyCap, particularly when relying on high-performance work systems which leads to increased job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Miao et al., 2021). Additionally, an organization that involves employees in decision-making plans, such as budget setting, will positively impact the resources they count on, such as PsyCap (Nolzen, 2018).

Moreover, organizational climate is an important antecedent of PsyCap; organizations with a positive, supportive workplace environment, characterized by compassionate leaders and peers and the recognition of employees’ hard work will boost their PsyCap (Luthans et al., 2008; Qadeer & Jaffery, 2014; Woolley et al., 2011).

Other elements of a healthy and positive organizational climate incorporate autonomous, innovative, learning and service working environments (Vilariño del Castillo & Lopez-Zafra, 2021). Slätten et al. (2019) concluded that the relationship between a supportive organizational climate and employees’ performance is mediated by their PsyCap levels. Conversely, negative organizational climates including workplace violence and bullying are detrimental to employees’ PsyCap and result in emotional exhaustion, especially when employees are experiencing high psychological distress (Qiu et al., 2019).

Nolzen (2018) added that occupational stress and work-family problems hinder the employees’ ability to fixate their energy on work tasks, which reduces their PsyCap levels. Consequently, it is crucial for a firm to maintain a positive, supportive organizational climate to nurture PsyCap among its employees.

Regarding the outcomes of PsyCap, it yields several benefits that allow it to be a predictor of employee performance (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017). Multiple research have found that employees with high levels of PsyCap as a higher construct are more likely to engage in desirable work behaviors and attitudes – including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, improved well-being; and are less likely to exhibit undesirable work attitudes and behaviors – such as turnover intentions, cynicism, and counterproductive work behaviors (Avey et al., 2011; Imran & Shahnawaz, 2020). In fact, Lanzo et al. (2016) found that employees characterized with workaholism followed by frequent uncivil behaviors tend to have low levels of PsyCap, noting that the latter appeared to be a mediator in the relationship between workaholism and uncivil behaviors. Also, PsyCap assists employees in sustaining their ambitions while achieving their tasks, and is positively associated with an improved...
resistance to workplace violence and bullying, whereby this relationship is moderated by organizational identity (Norman et al., 2010; Yang et al., 2020). Rajapaksha and Kalyani (2020) also found that PsyCap can be used to enhance the sales-persons’ organizational identification, as hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism are positively associated with the latter. Moreover, all the four dimensions of PsyCap are negatively correlated with voluntary absenteeism, and overall assist organizations in forecasting and governing involuntary absenteeism and its costs (Avey et al., 2006). Not to mention, PsyCap positively influences the employees’ job involvement and reduces burnout, whereby it was found to be a mediator between work-family conflict and burnout (Demir, 2018; Y. Wang et al., 2012). Alternatively, employees with high levels of PsyCap – particularly hope and optimism – have higher levels of creativity (Yu et al., 2019). The findings of Luthans et al. (2011) supported this notion, as they deduced that employees working in a positive environment and having a positive mindset (PsyCap) will more likely have improved innovative and problem-solving skillsets that are essential tools when facing challenges. Employees characterized with PsyCap tend to concentrate on job resources rather than job demands and workload, which helps in reducing their levels of exhaustion (Aybas & Acar, 2017). Consequently, PsyCap is positively correlated with increased work happiness, as well as subjective and objective career success (Chen et al., 2018; Youssef & Luthans, 2007).

The four dimensions of PsyCap share a mutual characteristic of providing positive cognitive appraisals of different types of situations, as these psychological resources stimulate perseverance and replace the negative bias with positive mood, attitudes, emotions, thinking and behavior (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017; Luthans et al., 2007; Sihag & Sarikwal, 2015; Youssef & Luthans, 2013; Yu et al., 2019). Such positive emotions are beneficial in allocating personal resources more efficiently in terms of constructing and reinstating the different resources (physical, psychological and social) that have been worn-out, not to mention that the positivity in PsyCap assists employees in concentrating on and retaining positive memories, all of which allow employees to withstand negative situations, increase their enthusiasm to fulfill their goals, and boost their satisfaction and well-being at personal and professional levels (Frederickson, 2001; Imran & Shahnawaz, 2020). PsyCap improves employees’ self-confidence, empowerment and intrinsic motivation, which allows them to be willing to put more energy and effort to contribute more in the organization’s pursuit of its goals, which ultimately enhances their performance (Kang & Busser, 2018; Luthans et al., 2007; Nolzen, 2018).
Lastly, PsyCap positively impacts the employees’ physical well-being in terms of improved Body Mass Index (BMI), cholesterol levels, and contentment with their physical health (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017). These positive psychological resources help individuals in overcoming health concerns, enhancing doctors’ physical and psychological health and lowering their exhaustion levels, all of which lead to healthier workplace behavior and attitudes (Yang et al., 2020). Furthermore, in terms of mental health, PsyCap leads to reduced levels of anxiety and prevents the employees’ distress in affecting their level of empathy (Demir, 2018; Jin et al., 2020). More importantly, it assists employees in adapting to stressful events and environments, as it amplifies their “resistance threshold”, making them well-equipped with skillsets to endure and overcome stress (Çelik, 2018).

2.4 Grit

2.4.1 Establishing Grit and its Dimensions

A research carried out by Schmidt and Hunter (1998) showed that intelligence and personality accounted for merely 36% of the factors that influence employee performance, inferring that there are numerous other psychological components that affect performance, one of which is grit (Febriawan & Maulina, 2020). Grit is a relatively new concept in behavioral sciences that is found in several work and non-work fields; from philosophy, education, and performance, to suicide prevention and illness coping (Eskreis-Winkler et al., 2014; Jordan et al., 2018; Widodo & Sriyono, 2020). It is considered as a source for psychological strength (Jordan et al., 2018; Tang et al., 2019), and was first established by Duckworth et al. (2007) who defined grit as “perseverance and passion for long-term goals”. Duckworth (2016) mentioned that people with high grit levels are characterized by four psychological assets; “hope” – persevering and having faith that futuristic events will be positive even when the current situation is discouraging, “interest” – sincerely appreciate what they are doing and exhibiting purpose-driven behavior, “practice” – attempting to master and develop new skills through consistent rehearsal and repetition, and lastly, “purpose” – driver of a person’s behavior and a reflection of his/her genuine identity – all of which are embedded within goal-setting theories and research (Jordan, Ferris et al., 2019; Jordan, Wihler et al., 2019).

Grit is not an inborn and stagnant trait; rather, it is a personality trait that functions as a “stamina” for people to continuously invest their energy and efforts to reach high-
performance outcomes and readjust their goals and allocation of resources when facing challenging situations (Blanco, 2021; Jordan, Ferris et al., 2019; Moen & Olsen, 2020). Moreover, grit is considered a non-cognitive attribute as it mirrors a person’s accumulated patterns of attitudes and judgements based on socioemotional and behavioral competencies, and therefore, it is malleable – capable of further development (Jordan, Ferris et al., 2019; West et al., 2016).

With the continuous rise of new challenges nowadays, the human resources department in organizations are targeting the recruitment of “knowledge workers” who possess the new knowledge that makes them equipped to overcome such adversities; this pinpoints the need for employee grit that allows workers to prolong their dedicated efforts and interest uninterruptedly, regardless of potential difficulties or failures (Duckworth et al., 2007; Widodo & Sriyono, 2020). Initially, grit was introduced as a hierarchical construct made up of two main dimensions – consistency of interest and perseverance of effort (Duckworth et al., 2007). Firstly, “perseverance of effort”, which entails an individual’s determination and persistence in the face of hardships to reach futuristic goals (Millonado Valdez & Daep Datu, 2021). Employees high in this dimension are attentive, meticulous and dedicate their time and efforts to put all their energy into making the most out of limited resources, assisting peers in fulfilling their tasks, and achieving their own tasks successfully regardless of any hardships (Widodo & Sriyono, 2020; Febriawan & Maulina, 2020). Secondly, “consistency of interest”, whereby an individual is able to concentrate and sustain his/her interest on that particular goal on the long-term (Nisar et al., 2020). Consistency of effort inspires people to maintain their attention and energy on the long run without changing their goals when encountering difficulties, nor getting frustrated or distracted (Ting & Datu, 2020; Widodo & Sriyono, 2020). Nevertheless, different research cited limitations and problems in the theoretical validity of these two dimensions of grit, which led to the creation of the Triarchic Model of Grit (TMG) consisting of the same two dimensions as the original two-factor model (consistency of interest and perseverance of efforts), in addition to a new dimension – “adaptability to situations”, which is defined as the capability to be agile and to successfully anticipate, embrace and cope with changes and adversities that might take place (Datu et al., 2017; Ting & Datu, 2020). People with high adaptability to situations are able to adjust their thinking and behavioral patterns and regulate unrealistic objectives according to external changes (Datu et al., 2017; Ting & Datu, 2020). While perseverance of effort and consistency of effort target the sustainable pursuit of long-term goals, adaptability to situations fixates on
the individual’s ability to conquer potential adversities to fulfill the goals set (Febriawan & Maulina, 2020). The value of the TMG model resides in its focus on the importance of modifying or shifting interests according to the actions required in different circumstances (Ting & Datu, 2020). As a result, grit has been reintroduced as “consistency of interest and long-term resilience in pursuit of passion”, in addition to the consistent adaptation and growth in the face of hardships (Duckworth, 2016; Weisskirch, 2018). This modern definition helps in establishing a clear disparity between grit and persistence; the latter is concerned with the time and energy spent on achieving goals, whereas the former focuses on “passion” and “goal adaptation” (Jordan, Ferris et al., 2019).

Overall, there are three elements – “passion”, “perseverance of effort” and “long-term goal commitment” – that are present in all of the definitions of grit irrespective of its different conceptualizations (Jordan, Wihler et al., 2019). Particularly, according to Cormier et al. (2019), passion is the ultimate factor that makes grit distinctive from any other concept, and it is expressed by the steady work attitudes and objectives that reflect an individual’s emotional and determined “state of desire on the basis of cognitive and affective work appraisals” (Perrewé et al., 2014, p. 146). There are several personality traits that are frequently correlated with grit, namely, self-regulation, resilience, conscientiousness, low impulsivity, dutifulness and self-discipline (Buzzetto-Hollywood et al., 2019). It should be noted that there is a difference between grit and other personality traits, theoretical and psychological constructs, from conscientiousness, need for achievement, and resilience, to industriousness, hardiness and self-control (Christopoulou et al., 2018; Datu, 2021; Duckworth et al., 2007; Febriawan & Maulina, 2020; Jordan, Wihler et al., 2019). Grit is a purpose-driven construct focusing on long-term stamina, conscious commitment to goals set and quest of passion (Disabato et al., 2019; Duckworth, 2016; Duckworth et al., 2017).

2.4.2 Antecedents and Outcomes of Grit

Grit is influenced by both nature (inborn or biological) and nurture (environmental) factors (Duckworth, 2016). Research on grit as well as neuroscience revealed that growth mindset, which stems from critical thinking, is one of the most common antecedents of grit, and this relationship is believed to be mediated by several factors, including passion, learning motivation and executive intelligence (Blanco, 2021). People with a growth mindset are characterized with learning motivation and a specific learning goal-orientation that is directed towards mastery – in other words, these people perceive obstacles as “learning
opportunities”, are unafraid of failure and persevere to achieve their goals through investing consistent efforts, both of which are key dimensions of grit (Dweck, 1986; Tang et al., 2019).

As a psychological concept, grit is triggered by the presence of several psychological factors, namely characteristics of positive psychology, such as positive affect, purpose commitment and mindfulness (Hill et al., 2016; Vela et al., 2018). In fact, positive psychology facilitates the development of grit’s four psychological assets – interest, hope, practice and purpose (Frankish et al., 2018; cited in Schimschal et al., 2021). Having a self-transcendent purpose for learning and being committed in terms of dedicating time and efforts to socialize and work on achieving purposes fixated on success and on others are all predictors of grit (Christopoulou et al., 2018; Sriram et al., 2018; Yeager et al., 2014). The study of Lin and Chang (2017) recorded that certain Big Five personality traits – specifically, agreeableness, conscientiousness, intellect and neuroticism – in addition to psychological and social support, such as parental involvement and acceptance can act as antecedents of grit. Moreover, having a sense of relatedness with different people can also affect an individual’s grit levels; for example, relatedness to teachers and parents fosters perseverance and consistency respectively, as well as overall grit (Datu, 2017). Also, Duckworth (2016) highlighted some psychological concepts that are misinterpreted as solely outcomes of grit, but actually play the roles of both antecedents and outcomes, including conscientiousness (Fite et al., 2017), hardiness (Lovering et al. 2015), and self-regulation (Schimschal et al., 2021). Fite et al. (2017) also found that having a high self-concept clarity solidifies the relationship between conscientiousness and grit.

A person’s life philosophy can be another predecessor of grit, whereby people who reflect on previous failures, adopt emotional regulation skillsets, and learn from negative and hurtful events are more capable of adjusting to changing situations and effectively choose which goals to focus on (Duckworth, 2016; p. 86, 89; Hwang & Nam, 2021). In addition, the study of Li et al. (2018) revealed that people who believe in free will have higher marks on perseverance of effort, compared to people who believe in determinism; this shows that the belief in free will is considered an antecedent of grit. Hodge et al. (2019) also found that spirituality – along with employment hope serving as a mediator – has a direct and positive impact on grit, and hence, it is yet another predecessor.

Dugan, Hochstein et al. (2019) concluded that competitiveness and social astuteness facilitate the development of grit in employees and strengthen grit’s impact on performance.
Febriawan and Maulina (2020) also mentioned that employee creativity, as well as the pace of internal and external changes in the organization are drivers of grit. Lastly, some studies even argue that demographics can predict grit; whereby older employees who have a higher tenure or work experience tend to display higher levels of grit (Camp et al., 2019; Duckworth et al., 2007).

Grit is associated with improved well-being (Moen & Olsen, 2020); physically, gritty individuals engage more in frequent physical exercise routines (Reed et al., 2013), have an enhanced autonomous nervous system activity (Silvia et al., 2013), and are less likely to suffer food insecurity (Nikolaus et al., 2019). In addition, a research done by Guerrero et al. (2016) showed that Latino adolescents with high levels of grit are less likely to use alcohol and marijuana.

Grit also considered as a “protective factor” against psychological hazards (Pennings et al., 2015, pp.132), boosting an individual’s psychological well-being and mental health in terms of reducing lowering anxiety, depression, stress, suicide tendencies and unhealthy eating habits and disorders like bulimia (Datu, 2021; Kleiman et al., 2013; Knaufft et al., 2019; Musumari et al., 2018). Gritty individuals develop prosocial behaviors such as beneficial habits, seek happiness and experience increased self-esteem, gratitude, meaning and satisfaction in life, and harmony in life whereby this particular relationship is mediated by sense of coherence (Datu, 2021; Nisar et al., 2020; Vainio & Daukantaité, 2016; Von Culin et al., 2014; Wenner & Randall, 2016). Gritty people are not afraid of being mocked or laughed at, and when facing obstacles, they are not intimidated by potential threats nor do they let frustration prevent them from carrying on; instead, they exert stamina, adopt adaptive learning strategies and perceive stressful situations as challenges to overcome (Datu, 2021; Eskreis-Winkler et al., 2014; Jordan et al., 2018; Weisskirch, 2018).

Grit also impacts employees and their work performance (Duckworth et al., 2007). For leaders, grit is considered a noteworthy predecessor of leadership behavior (Blanco, 2021) and a positive influence on followers (Caza & Posner, 2019). Further, gritty leaders are capable of relying on transformational leadership behaviors to deliver an effective performance during bleak times (Robertson-Kraft & Duckworth, 2014). As for employees in general, grit is considered a driver of worker behavior leading to reduced counterproductive workplace behavior, career changes, burnout, absenteeism, and turnover intention rates (Ceschi et al., 2016; Duckworth et al., 2007; Mullen & Crowe, 2018; Nisar et al., 2020).
Simultaneously, grit promotes positive attitudes, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, retention, productivity, proactivity and employee contribution in terms of increased effort (Credé et al. 2017; Duckworth et al., 2011; Dugan et al., 2019; Hodge et al., 2018; Jordan, Ferris et al., 2019; Jordan, Wihler et al., 2019). Motro et al. (2020) added that grit acts as a moderator between the misery caused by negative feedback received and task performance. Grit in employees acts as a buffer that helps them cope with challenges and prevents them from being discouraged by challenges or setbacks in their careers (Jordan et al., 2018; Schimschal et al., 2020). On the other hand, it boosts flexibility (Blanco, 2021), goal attainment in workers (Sheldon et al., 2015), and ultimately leads to professional success and better performance (Duckworth et al., 2007; Musumar et al., 2018). Grit also affects employees’ relationships with others, as gritty workers tend to be more considerate with others, and exhibits feelings of empathy and social support towards them (Jordan et al., 2018). Not to mention, grit plays a significant role in the human resources functions, pertaining recruitment and selection (staffing), training and development, performance management systems and succession planning (Jordan, Wihler et al., 2019).

Other benefits of grit include money-saving behavior, desirable academic performance – higher GPA, improved school engagement and teacher effectiveness, and reduced procrastination – as well as the successful fulfilment of military courses (Muenks et al., 2017; Robertson-Kraft & Duckworth, 2014; Pierro et al., 2011). Nevertheless, grit can have a potential dark side; sometimes, gritty individuals hold on to their original goals since they don’t want to acknowledge that their time and efforts went to waste – also known as “sunk cost” (Duckworth & Eskreis-Winkler, 2013), and hence might miss out on better opportunities due to their relentless devotion to their current goal (Jordan, Ferris et al., 2019). Also, an overflow of grit might cause a person to refuse asking others for help, which affects the overall performance (Credé et al., 2017).
Chapter Three

Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses Development

This chapter interprets the theoretical framework upon which this study is based. This theoretical framework is used in exploring the potential relationships between the concepts previously presented, which leads to the development of a conceptual model and hypotheses that will be tested in later stages of this research.

3.1 Theoretical Framework

The two main theoretical pillars of this study are the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory and Social Exchange Theory (SET). To start with, COR theory is a motivational theory that aims to interpret human behavior from an evolutionary-based perspective, whereby it argues that humans need to procure and protect resources for their survival, as well as for meeting present and future needs (Hobfoll et al., 2018). This theory postulates that people pursue the attainment, retention and protection of their resources, and evade resource loss (Hobfoll, 1989, 2001). The term “resources” refers to materialistic and non-materialistic assets that facilitate an individual’s goal attainment (Halbesleben et al., 2014, p. 1338). Hobfoll et al. (2018, p. 105) listed several types of resources, such as object (equipment), condition (employment), personal (skills and personality traits) and energy (knowledge and money) resources. According to COR theory, resources come in packages; they coexist together rather than existing individually, which Hobfoll et al. (2018) refer to as “resource caravan”. Moreover, the concept of “resource caravan passageways” states that these resources are present in environments that can either facilitate individuals and organizations to nurture and preserve or diminish and restrict their attainment and retention (Hobfoll, 2011).

COR theory offers an expedient framework for analyzing how people preserve their current resources and avoid resource depletion or loss in the face of adversities (Hobfoll, 1989). Since resources are limited, people tend to avoid wasting or losing them as that would result in more undesirable outcomes than acquiring new resources (Mauono et al., 2017; Ng and Feldman, 2012). Xu et al. (2021) mention that there are two opposing outcomes of resource losses in organizations. The first is “resource conservation”, whereby resource loss causes
anxiety and pressure as it is more “salient” or common than resource gain, which means its influence is more significant (Hobfoll, 2001; Hobfoll et al., 2018). Conversely, the second outcome is “resource acquisition”, where people capitalize on their current resources to gain more resources, redeem resource losses and limit future resource losses (Hobfoll, 2001; Hobfoll et al., 2018). Ng and Feldman (2012) noted that people opt for resource conservation more than resource acquisition when they are going through hardships.

As for the second theory, SET is one of the oldest theories exploring social behavior, and has been incorporated in various organizational studies pertaining workplace relations (Chernyak-Hai & Rabenu, 2018; Homans, 1958, p. 606). Starting during the 1920s, SET traverses multiple disciplines such as psychology, anthropology, sociology, and recently, management (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Despite the different depictions of SET in different fields, a common notion of this theory persisted, stating that it entails a “series of interactions” that are interdependent on the actions of both parties, and usually result in obligations (Blau, 1964; Emerson, 1976). These interactions are comprised of any social form of exchange that involves either tangible or intangible products that are traded between parties (Emerson, 1976; Lambe et al., 2001; Cortez & Johnston, 2020). There are six different resources involved in exchanges; love, status, money, information, goods and services (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). A key point in SET is that these interactions progress with time to form reliable and reciprocal commitments/relationships if the parties involved adhere to the rules of exchange (reciprocity, negotiation or other rules) that outline its procedure (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

SET encompasses a socio-psychological point of view that interprets individual behavior in “social exchanges”, which Blau (1964) differentiated from “economic exchanges” (Kim et al., 2018). On one hand, in social exchanges, parties presume there is a long-term relationship between each other and exchange resources with the expectation that there is a futuristic return from the other party for their contribution (Kim et al., 2018; Molm, 1997). Social exchanges are characterized with attitudinal and behavioral elements, such as fairness (Molm et al., 2006), negotiated rules (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005), reciprocity (Molm, 2010), commitment and obligation (Emerson, 1981; cited in Kim et al., 2018). On the other hand, unlike social exchanges, economic exchanges are usually short-term and encompass a “contractual give-and-take” exchange of materialistic resources, such as money (Kim et al., 2018). Conversely, social exchange involves a trade of unmaterialistic resources between
parties, such as love or happiness, and this relationship persists as long as it is considered rewarding by both parties (Blau, 1964; Kim et al., 2018).

In its essence, SET states that the foundation of human relations relies on a cost-benefit analysis, where costs represent the undesirable consequences or resources invested during the social exchange, and benefits refer to the desirable outcomes or resources gained from the exchange (Blau, 1964; Chernyak-Hai & Rabenu, 2018). SET has five main elements – valuable rewards resulting from economic exchanges (Homans); social rewards (i.e. respect and gratification) acquired from social exchanges (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959); costs representing valuable resources given up by one party or a punishment resulting from the exchange (Homans, 1961); profits that are calculated by reducing costs from rewards (Redmond, 2015); and lastly equity and distributive justice that dictate whether rewards and costs are balanced in a way that makes the trade fair (Redmond, 2015). According to SET, people preserve their relationship as long as the benefits/rewards are greater than costs so that the exchange generates value for them (Cortez & Johnston, 2020).

### 3.2 Job Insecurity and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The incessant spread of Covid-19 worldwide has left employees insecure about their income and overall job, thus negatively influencing their concentration at work (Chanana, 2020). Recent studies have been integrating COR theory in aim of rationalizing the perception employees have about JI and its consequences (Lee et al., 2018). According to COR theory, individuals experience emotional exhaustion in the presence of a threat of losing a resource, actually losing it, or being unsuccessful in acquiring a new resource after investing existing resources (Hobfoll, 1989, 2001). During Covid-19, the increased fear and anxiety of people led them to lose abundant resources in attempting to cope with their stress (Hobfoll et al., 2018). Not to mention, secure employment is considered a valuable resource, so with increased JI, resource losses might accumulate and employees might respond to this threat with a change in their behavior and attitude in the workplace (Jiang & Probst, 2016; Kinnunen et al., 2003; Mauno et al., 2017). The “Desperation Principle” is one of the four main principles of COR theory, and states that when employees feel that their resources have been drained, they tend to engage in defensive and destructive behaviors (Hobfoll et al., 2018). This can justify the premise of some studies that suggest that JI leads to an increase in
counterproductive behaviors and a decrease in OCB (Reisel et al., 2010; Stynen et al., 2015; Van den Broeck et al., 2014; Van Hootegem & De Witte, 2019).

Further, according to the SET theory, high JI levels among employees diminish their sense of belonging to the organization, which negatively affects their performance and OCB (Khan & Ghufran, 2018). SET also emphasizes the role of reciprocity and obligation in relationships (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960). Psychological contract is defined by the worker’s perception of the mutual obligations shared between him/herself and the organization (Ma et al., 2019; Rousseau, 1995). When the organization breaches the employees’ psychological contract through triggering JI, employees might respond with a decline in performance levels as a result to this defilement in the exchange relationship (De Cuyper & De Witte, 2006; Robinson & Morrison, 1995; Probst et al., 2017; Van den Broeck et al., 2014).

Although JI has an instant impact on employees’ attitudes and job satisfaction, the unpleasant effect JI has on performance and OCB may add up on the long-term and thus might not be recognizable promptly (Probst et al., 2017). In fact, Lam et al. (2015) posited that JI and OCB have a “curvilinear relationship”, whereby low to moderate levels of JI lower OCBs as people experience a reduction in social exchanges, but OCB levels increase again when JI increases more in order to create a better impression for managers and preserve their employment within the organization.

In this study, it is suggested that, in line with the COR and SET theories, employees experiencing JI feel alienated and left out by their organization, and they spend too many resources on dealing with their stress to a point where there are minimal resources left to be used in engaging in OCBs, which ultimately leads to lower OCB levels.

**H.1.a Qualitative Job Insecurity is negatively related to Organizational Citizenship Behavior.**

**H.1.b Quantitative Job Insecurity is negatively related to Organizational Citizenship Behavior.**

### 3.3 Job Insecurity and Positive Psychological Capital

PsyCap is a multidimensional and vigorous construct that expresses a person’s individual potential, and is associated with his/her “adaptive decisional strategies” to adjust to hardships and persevere to achieve pre-established objectives (Ramaci et al., 2021). For instance, when
experiencing stress, hopeful employees are more capable of discovering other paths and actions that replaces their feelings of helplessness with power amidst uncertain times (Darvishmotevalu & Ali, 2020).

According to COR principles, specifically “Resource Investment” principle, individuals are forced to invest resources to avoid resource loss, acquire new resources or recover from resource loss (Hobfoll et al., 2018). Moreover, as mentioned in the “Gain Paradox” principle, resource gain is more valuable when resource losses are more frequent (Hobfoll et al., 2018). As such, Tomas et al. (2019) indicated that when the workplace is full of resources, employees might be more immune to identifying possible job loss as an intimidating threat. In this case, the employees’ human capital, which entails PsyCap, becomes more significant and cherished by the organization and makes them less susceptible to job loss (De Cuyper et al., 2008).

Siu et al. (2015) found that employees with higher PsyCap exhibited less symptoms of job stress. When employees have more resources stored, they are more capable of adapting to the stress and ambiguity accompanied by JI (Hobfoll, 1989; Probst et al., 2017). Since PsyCap is more persistent and stable relative to the rest of the personality paradigms, individuals can rely on it as a coping mechanism for adversities like JI (Probst et al., 2017). PsyCap can assist employees in boosting their readiness to potential job loss and engagement in active job searches to find new opportunities (Probst et al., 2017). It can also help them in coping with the psychological contract breach caused by JI (Costa & Neves, 2017).

In this study, it is suggested that hope, self-efficacy, resilience and optimism together as PsyCap construct are capable of mitigating the negative outcomes of JI.

**H.2.a** Positive Psychological Capital reduces the negative outcomes of Qualitative Job Insecurity.

**H.2.b** Positive Psychological Capital reduces the negative outcomes of Quantitative Job Insecurity.

### 3.4 Moderating effect of Positive Psychological Capital

According to SET, when organizational leaders promote positive self-development constructs among employees, these workers will reciprocate this development by doing something to benefit the organization, such as enhancing their performance (Wu & Lee, 2018). An
example of positive self-development construct is PsyCap, and employees characterized with high PsyCap are usually more satisfied with their workplace and are enthusiastic about helping the organization grow (Lee et al., 2018). Having high levels of hope, self-efficacy, resilience and optimism triggers the “good soldier syndrome” in a worker (Liaquat & Mehmood, 2017), whereby prior studies indicated that PsyCap results in desirable workplace behaviors and attitudes that is not necessarily incorporated in an employee’s job description (Nolzen, 2018). Thus, it is suggested that PsyCap is positively associated with a positive work behavior like OCB. Positive emotions affect a person’s thinking process and allows him/her to think and behave positively (Norman et al., 2010). Positive emotions are linked with PsyCap, which in turn is positively associated with positive workplace behaviors and attitudes, and negatively related to deviance behaviors (Yildiz, 2019).

One of the corollaries of COR theory referred to as “Resource loss cycles” states that the stress caused by resource loss and the influence it has might lead to even more frequent and grave resource losses (known as resource loss spirals), as the individual will have less resources to counterbalance the loss he/she endured (Hobfoll et al., 2018). This can justify why employees might not engage in OCBs when they have high JI levels. However, COR theory also claims that individuals who have more resources stored are less prone to resource loss and more competent of resource gain (Hobfoll et al., 2018).

Therefore, it can be hypothesized that employees who have personal resources like PsyCap may be more immune to resource losses such as JI, and more capable of gaining new resource that facilitate their engagement in OCB in such stressful times.

**H.3.a Positive Psychological Capital moderates the relationship between Qualitative Job Insecurity and Organizational Citizenship Behavior.**

**H.3.b Positive Psychological Capital moderates the relationship between Quantitative Job Insecurity and Organizational Citizenship Behavior.**

### 3.5 Job Insecurity and Grit

Workers perceive job security as a reward given by the organization in exchange of their efforts, so JI signifies the lack of such a reward and threatens an essential resource for employees – their employment (Piccoli & De Witte, 2015). Consequently, according to SET, JI represents an imbalance in the employee-employer exchange relationship, indicating a psychological contract breach (Piccoli et al., 2017; Shoss, 2017). As a result, employees
experiencing high levels of JI usually have increased turnover intentions (Jung et al., 2021), in addition to other negative repercussions.

COR theory states that personal resources, such as grit, allow employees to be better equipped to pursue their goals and attain personal growth (Khan et al., 2021; Xanthopoulou et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2020). Gritty employees are perseverant and passionate, so their robust interest and efforts to chase their initial goals and thrive in the workplace is evident (Duckworth & Quinn, 2009; Ramasamy & Mun, 2017). Therefore, gritty employees are less likely to engage in turnover as a response to a potential threat. As such, workers are motivated to strive to find an alternative solution to succeed (Eskreis-Winkler et al., 2014). Following the reciprocity norm incorporated within SET, employees who invest persistent efforts and disregard other job opportunities externally despite their JI might expect the organization to acknowledge and reciprocate their determination (Duckworth & Gross, 2014; Ramasamy & Mun, 2017). Thus, grittier employees might find other solutions than turnover and quitting to a JI threat, such as capitalizing on their resources and efforts, and adopting job preservation strategies (McGinley et al., 2020; Shoss, 2017).

Based on the above-mentioned findings of prior studies, and building on both COR and SET theories, it can be hypothesized that grit can diminish the negative impact of JI.

**H.4.a Grit mitigates the negative outcomes of Qualitative Job Insecurity.**

**H.4.b Grit mitigates the negative outcomes of Quantitative Job Insecurity.**

### 3.6 Moderating effect of Grit

Grit is correlated with higher employee engagement, which in turn has a direct positive impact on OCB (Schimschal et al., 2021; Shams et al., 2020). Gritty individuals aim for meaningful actions and take interest in the well-being of others, whereby they willingly help others to complete their tasks and objectives, which is linked to OCB (Choi et al., 2020). In fact, Puteri and Arifin (2020) claimed that grit can even be considered an antecedent of OCB. Other researchers agreed that there is a positive relationship between grit and OCB (Arifin & Puteri, 2019; Choi et al., 2020).

In compliance with COR theory, grit is regarded as a beneficial behavior that assists in acquiring, preserving and improving the employees’ resources (Nisar et al., 2020). Although engaging in grit requires spending resources, its benefits on the worker’s performance and
behavior in the workplace exceed its costs (Jordan et al., 2018). One of the main benefits is that grit is a personal resource that inspires employees to maintain their pursuit of their goals when enduring obstacles and hardships (Khan et al., 2021; Sinclair, 2017). In other words, grit is considered a “general resistance resource” that influences how people identify and approach potential stressors, such as JI (Jin & Kim, 2017; Jordan et al., 2018).

Accordingly, since grit is viewed by COR theory as a valuable personal resource which allows employees to gain and maintain resources during stressful times, it can be hypothesized that grit permits employees to have enough resources to participate in OCBs, even when they are under the threat of losing a crucial resource (their employment) when experiencing JI.

**H.5.a** Grit moderates the relationship between Qualitative Job Insecurity and Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

**H.5.b** Grit moderates the relationship between Quantitative Job Insecurity and Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

### 3.7 Conceptual Model

In line with the theories used to establish correlations between the concepts under study in this research, Figures 1 and 2 represent a conceptual model that illustrates the hypotheses formed.
Figure 1: The Conceptual Model with Moderator Positive Psychological Capital

Figure 2: The Conceptual Model with Moderator Grit
As shown in the figures above, each of the dimensions of JI have a negative relationship with OCB ($H_{1a}$ and $H_{1b}$). Figure 1 illustrates how PsyCap can have a positive impact on Qualitative and Quantitative JI ($H_{2a}$ and $H_{2b}$), and how it can moderate the relationship between JI dimensions and OCB ($H_{3a}$ and $H_{3b}$). Similarly, Figure 3 shows the potential positive influence of Grit on JI dimensions ($H_{4a}$ and $H_{4b}$), and its moderation in the relationship between JI dimensions and OCB ($H_{5a}$ and $H_{5b}$).
Chapter Four

Methodology

This chapter depicts the procedure of collecting data to test the hypotheses set for this research. As such, the following parts detail the objectives, methods, scales used to measure the constructs the current study revolves around, sample population, and data collection and analysis.

4.1 Construct Operationalization

4.1.1 Instrumentation

This research incorporates a cross-sectional model, as data will be collected at a fixed point in time to test the preset hypotheses. Accordingly, a quantitative research method is used, whereby a self-administered survey measuring the effect of JI on OCB, as well as the moderation of PsyCap and Grit is distributed among employees using Google Forms, and was circulated through a link and/or email to employees who willingly chose to participate. The adoption of a survey method is advantageous in terms of speed, ability to reach a large pool of participants, and ease of distribution and analysis of data collected.

The survey is made up of 53 questions, 51 of which are closed-ended, while the other 2 are open-ended and related to demographic questions. All questions are required to be answered in order to submit the survey, which is divided into the following seven sections:

Section One: Consent

A general overview depicting the objective and ethicality of this research is listed in this part. Such ethical considerations ensure the voluntary participation in this study, the anonymity of respondents in terms of not collecting names, emails or IP addresses, and the acknowledgement that the IRB board has already given the approval for this study to take place. Participants must give consent to these statements in order to move on to the next parts of the survey. Should they refuse to do so, their participation is immediately terminated and no data is recorded.
**Section Two: Demographics**

This part is for gathering background information about participants, first of which is the nominal variable “gender”, whereby respondents choose the option they identify with. The ordinal variable “age” is divided into five categories; 18-24 years, 25-34 years, 35-44 years, 45-54 years and above 55 years. The two open-ended questions require participants to identify the country location where they currently live and where their organization is based. These two questions in particular will help in the analysis part to determine whether JI is specifically associated with a certain country’s situation. The final question of this part is the years of service in the current organization, where respondents choose between five categories ranging from 1-5 years to over 20 years of service.

**Sections Three and Four: Job Insecurity and Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

Sections three and four cover the dependents variables in this research – JI and OCB respectively. Section Three consists of seven questions introduced with “From 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), please rate how you feel about your current employment status at work”, and is used to collect information about the participants’ JI levels. Section Four pertains to 15 questions that explore the OCB levels of participants by requesting “From 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), please rate whether you exhibit such behavior at your workplace”.

**Sections Five and Six: Positive Psychological Capital and Grit**

These two sections cover the two independent variables in this study – positive PsyCap and Grit. Section Five consists of 12 questions measuring the participants’ PsyCap, whereas Section Six includes 10 questions evaluating Grit levels. Both sections are introduced with “From 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with these statements”.

The questions in sections three to seven adopt a 5-point Likert scale that is included in the description part of each section, and this scale ranges from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5).
4.2 Scale Development

4.2.1 Job Insecurity Scale

For JI, a 7-item scale developed by Hellgren et al. (1999) is adopted in this study. These statements incorporate the two dimensions of JI – Quantitative and Qualitative JI – and assess the individual’s feelings regarding his/her working status, career opportunities, and pay development in the organization (Hellgren et al., 1999). Examples of these statements include “I am worried about having to leave my job before I would like to”, “I feel that [the organization] can provide me with a stimulating job content in the near future” and “My pay development in this organization is promising”. This scale has been used by several researchers such as Patrick (2020), Guo et al. (2019), Joe-Akunne et al. (2014), and others. Further, the Cronbach’s Alpha for the items in this scale are broken down in Table 1 (Hellgren et al., 1999; Partrick, 2020), all above 0.75, proving that this scale is characterized with internal consistency reliability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (Quantitative JI Subscale)</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Qualitative JI Subscale)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (JI Scale)</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale

For (OCB), a 15-item scale covering the 5 dimensions of OCB is adopted in this research. This scale is derived from the 24-item OCB scale by Podsakoff in 1990, as Podsakoff et al. (2006) pointed out that the latter lacks “consideration of cultural context”. Thus, after conducting a pilot study, the statements that recorded an absence of internal consistency and reliability were removed from the 24-item scale, leading to the development of the 15-item scale, whereby each dimension of OCB is represented in 3 statements (Kumar & Shah, 2015). These statements include “I willingly help newcomers to get oriented towards job”, “I don’t abuse the rights of others”, “I always keep myself abreast of the changes in the organization”,
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“I always require frequent doses of motivation to get the work done”, and “My attendance at work is above the norm”. Numerous studies relied on this 15-item scale in their depiction of OCB, among of which are Bozdoğan (2021), Halimsetiono and Santosa (2021) and others. The study of Kumar and Shah (2015) confirmed the validity and reliability of the 15-item OCB scale, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Reliability Statistics for the OCB Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (Altruism Subscale)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Courtesy Subscale)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Civic Virtue Subscale)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Sportsmanship Subscale)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Compliance Subscale)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (OCB Scale)</td>
<td>0.844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 Positive Psychological Capital Scale

Most researchers utilize the famous 24-item Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ) developed by Luthans et al. (2007) to measure PsyCap (Dawkins et al., 2013). However, Lorenz et al. (2016) suggested that the PCQ is domain-specific, and went ahead to develop a shortened, non-domain-specific PsyCap scale in order to expand the research that explore PsyCap with different outcomes and constructs. As such, Lorenz et al. (2016) used the State Hope Scale (SHS) measuring Hope, Affektive Valenz der Zukunftsoorientierung (AFF) and Life Orientation Test (LOT-R) measuring Optimism, The German General Self Efficacy Scale (GSE) for Self-Efficacy and Resilience Scale (RS-13); having Cronbach’s alpha of 0.84, 0.82, 0.74, 0.88, and 0.79 respectively. The best three items from each scale was used to reflect the four HERO categories of PsyCap in the newly constructed scale. This resulted in the Compound Psychological Capital Scale (CPC-12), a 12-item scale used to measure a person’s PsyCap level. Such statements in the CPC-12 used in this research include “If I should find myself in a jam, I could think of many ways to get out of it”, “I am looking
forward to the life ahead of me”, “Sometimes I make myself do things whether I want to or not”, and “I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events”. Multiple researchers attempted to prove the validity and reliability of CPC-12 scale, such as Lorenz et al. (2016), Platania and Paolillo (2022) and Idemudia et al. (2020). It was also used by Jackson (2018), Stange (2021), Hidayat et al. (2020), and Dudasova et al. (2021). The reliability of this scale is depicted through the Cronbach’s Alpha of the 4 subscales and the overall CPC-12 scale (Jackson, 2018; Lorenz et al., 2016), shown in Table 3. It can be noted that only the optimism subscale scored a low reliability coefficient whereby its Cronbach’s Alpha $\alpha =0.209 < 0.60$.

### Table 3: Reliability Statistics for the PsyCap CPC-12 Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha ($\alpha$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (Self-Efficacy Subscale)</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Hope Subscale)</td>
<td>0.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Optimism Subscale)</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Resilience Subscale)</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (CPC-12 scale)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2.4 Grit Scale

Typically, studies that used the definition of Duckworth et al. (2007) to introduce grit utilize either the Grit-O 12-item, 10-item or Grit-S 8-item scales developed by Duckworth et al. (2007), Duckworth (2016) and Duckworth & Quinn (2009) respectively to assess the two dimensions of grit - consistency of interests (passion) and perseverance of effort (Tedesqui & Young, 2017; McGinley & Mattila, 2020). However, as previously mentioned, several studies pointed out that the two-dimensional scales of grit need to be adjusted to include more of the psychometric properties of grit (Duckworth et al., 2007), not to mention that there were some limitations in the psychometric and theoretical validity in the Grit-O and Grit-S scales (Datu et al., 2017). Accordingly, the study of Datu et al. (2017) led to the discovery of a third dimension of grit called “adaptability to situations”, and thus led to the redefinition of grit.
and the development of the Triarchic Model of Grit Scale (TMGS) – a 10-item scale reflecting all the three dimensions of grit. The TMGS is made up of statements such as “I finish whatever I begin”, “New ideas and projects sometimes distract me from previous ones” and “Changing plans or strategies is important to achieve my long-term goals in life”. The TMGS scale has been incorporated in the studies of different researchers, such as that of Datu and Zhang (2021), Datu et al. (2018), Ting & Datu (2020), Datu et al. (2021), Hasan et al. (2020), and others. They proved the reliability of this scale, whereby the Cronbach’s Alpha values of the subscales and whole scale are demonstrated in Table 4 (Datu et al., 2017; Hasan et al., 2020).

#### Table 4: Reliability Statistics for the Grit TMGS Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (Perseverance of Effort Subscale)</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Consistency of Interest Subscale)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Adaptability to Situations Subscale)</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (TMGS Scale)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 Data Collection

#### 4.3.1 Sample and Procedure

This study targets working employees from different countries, such as Lebanon, Canada, Australia, France, Germany and the United Arab Emirates (UAE). These employees come from different industries and positions. As mentioned earlier, the survey is disseminated among participants via a link as well as emails. A brief paragraph clarifying the objective of the study, the length of the survey and the ethicality (anonymity and voluntarily) of participating in this research accompanies the link to the survey. Data collection began during the last few weeks of Fall 2021 semester on December 2, 2021, with a target of attracting at least 120 respondents. For people who failed to fill out the survey, the email/link was sent...
again in 10 days as a reminder. The collection of data stopped on February 22, 2022, and a total of 161 participants who completed the survey was recorded.

4.3.2 Data Analysis

A quantitative approach is adopted in analyzing the empirical data collected in this research. The software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) provides different options that assist in data analysis; for instance, descriptive statistics are used to tabulate the data in the form of tables or graphs, factor analysis and reliability coefficient help in determining the reliability and validity of the survey, and other analytical options are utilized to evaluate the relationships between the variables under study – JI, OCB, PsyCap and Grit.
Chapter Five

Data Analysis and Results

In this chapter, two statistical software packages – SPSS and Excel MegaStat – are used to report and interpret the data collected from the survey. Descriptive statistical analysis and MegaStat systems are deployed to analyze the demographics of participants. Factor analysis is used to measure scale reliability and instrument validity. Finally, regression and moderation analyses are used to evaluate the relationships between JI, OCB, PsyCap and Grit.

5.1 Descriptive Analysis

5.1.1 Demographics

The process of data collection commenced on December 2, 2021, and lasted till February 22, 2022. Using Excel MegaStat, it was found that the sample population of 161 participants consists of 97 females as shown in Figure 3 below, in comparison to 61 males, 1 non-binary and 2 respondents who preferred not to reveal their gender.

![Figure 3: Histogram Depicting Gender Distribution of Participants](image-url)
The majority of these participants were between 25 to 34 years old, representing 31.7% of the sample population. The rest are divided among four other age categories; 28.6% between 18 to 24 years, 21.1% between 35 to 44 years, 12.4% between 45 and 54 years, and lastly, 6.2% 55 years and above.

As shown in Figure 3, among the sample population, a total of 60.9% of participants had 1-5 years of experience, indicating that they are relatively new to their job position. This is in comparison to only 8.7% of participants who had over 20 years of experience, implying that they are more familiar with the organizational processes due to their long tenure. As for the rest of the sample population, their distribution among the other three categories of years of experience is reflected in Figure 4.

![Figure 4: Years of Experience Distribution of Participants](image)

Regarding the location of these participants, as shown in Figure 5, they are dispersed across different countries. Most of them are living in Lebanon (70.2%), UAE (8.7%), Australia (5.6%), KSA (5.6%), France (3.1%) and Canada (2.5%). The country location of the organization participants work in was also collected in order to compare the impact Covid-19 has had on employee behavior and performance in different countries. The majority of participants operate in organizations that are based in Lebanon (62.7%), UAE (8.7%), Australia (6.2%), USA (5.6%), and KSA (5%). The list of all the organization location is shown in Table 5.
Figure 5: Country Location of Participants

Table 5: Organization Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon/Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon/UAE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon/Iraq</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Scale Reliability

5.2.1 Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient

Reliability is an essential characteristic of a scale as it is an indicator of “consistency and precision” (Amirrudin et al., 2021). In order to assess the reliability of the scales used in this research, the Cronbach’s alpha ($\alpha$) of each of these four scales was computed. Alpha is a number ranging between 0 and 1, and is used to evaluate the internal consistency of a scale – whether its items are all coherent, correlated and reflect the same notion or concept (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). The value of Cronbach’s alpha ranges between 0.11 and 0.94, indicating low and excellent reliability respectively (Taber, 2018). Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), as cited in Iacobucci and Duhachek (2003), stated that a threshold or minimum of 0.7 is needed for a Cronbach’s alpha of a scale to be considered as reliable. The “acceptable” values of alpha extend between 0.7 and 0.95 (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011).

SPSS was used to compute the Cronbach’s alpha of the JI, OCB, PsyCap and Grit scales deployed in this study as well as that of their dimensions, all of which are depicted in Table 6 below. It can be deduced that all four scales are reliable as $\alpha > 0.7$. It can be noted that the PsyCap scale has the highest alpha (0.912), which indicates a strong reliability. The OCB and Grit scales have an alpha of 0.824 and 0.854 respectively, meaning that they are highly reliable. As for the JI scale, it has an alpha of 0.763, which is also fairly high and, hence, reliable.
Table 6: Reliability Statistics of Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha (α)</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity (JI)</td>
<td>Quantitative JI</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative JI</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JI Scale</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)</td>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civic Virtue</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCB Scale</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital (PsyCap)</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PsyCap CPC-12 Scale</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grit</td>
<td>Perseverance of Effort</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistency of Interest</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptability to Situations</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grit TMGS Scale</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis

In order to assess instrument validity, the SPSS software was used to conduct a Factor Analysis that evaluates each scale used and its dimensions. Table 7 below depicts the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measures (KMO) test of the adequacy and the Bartlett's Tests of Sphericity of each of the scales used. It can be noted that all KMO values are above the recommended 0.5, which indicates adequacy of the scales used. Also, the significance of the Barlett’s Test (p-value) is .000 < 0.05, which indicates high correlation of the data.
Table 7: Exploratory Factor Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>KMO</th>
<th>Barlett’s Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>449.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>1348.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>1183.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grit</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>1009.287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, Tables 8 through 11 detail the component matrix of each of the scales used among their dimensions.

Table 8: Component Matrix of Job Insecurity Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative JI</td>
<td>JI1</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JI2</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JI3</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative JI</td>
<td>JI4_RC</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JI5_RC</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JI6_RC</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JI7_RC</td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firstly, since the items of this scale scored above the recommended 0.6 level, this shows good factor loadings. In addition, the items of this scale are clearly divided into two categories that reflect the two dimensions of JI, quantitative and qualitative JI, which reflects the validity of this JI scale.
Table 9: Component Matrix of Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Altruism</strong></td>
<td>OCB1</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCB2</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCB3</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Courtesy</strong></td>
<td>OCB4</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCB5</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCB6</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic Virtue</strong></td>
<td>OCB7</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCB8</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCB9</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sportsmanship</strong></td>
<td>OCB10</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCB11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCB12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conscientiousness</strong></td>
<td>OCB13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCB14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCB15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, for OCB, it can be shown in Table 9 that almost all items scored above 0.6, which indicates good factor loadings. The factor analysis shows that this scale is divided into four categories, with “Altruism” and “Courtesy” combined into one dimension. While altruism refers to helping coworkers in carrying out their tasks in general, courtesy is exhibited when employees help their peers specifically in aims of preventing interpersonal problems at the workplace (Organ, 1997, 1990; cited in Tambe, 2014). According to a study done by Lievens and Ansel (2004), altruism and courtesy were united along with cheerleading under one dimension referred to as “Helping Behavior”. In this study, it was found that altruism and courtesy can be combined under one dimension as well.
Table 10: Component Matrix of Psychological Capital CPC-12 Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>PSYCAP1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSYCAP2</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSYCAP3</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>PSYCAP4</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSYCAP5</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSYCAP6</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>PSYCAP7</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSYCAP8</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSYCAP9</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>PSYCAP10</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSYCAP11</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSYCAP12</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 shows the factor loadings of the CPC-12 PsyCap scale, all above 0.5. However, contrary to the literature, PsyCap was divided into two categories, with “Hope” and “Optimism” in one dimension, and “Resilience” and “Self-Efficacy” in another. Wong and Lim (2009) mentioned that there are “conceptual and empirical similarities” shared between hope and optimism. Hutz-Midgett et al. (2012) found that there is a 40% variance between optimism and the “agency” component of hope, compared to the 8% variance between optimism and “pathways” component of hope. Moreover, according to Snyder et al. (1991), cited in Rand (2009), there is a correlation of .50 between hope and optimism, which indicates that there is a potential overlap between these two concepts. Rand (2009), Bryant and Cvengros (2004) stated that hope entails a person’s positive belief in themselves and the attainment of their personal goals, whereas optimism depicts a person’s positive belief in the world and future outcomes in general. Together, both these constructs can complement each other to form a positive perception of one’s self and the environment around them. Therefore, in this study, both hope and optimism are united under one dimension. The factor analysis of this scale also shows that “Resilience” and “Self-Efficacy” are combined under one dimension. According to Liu et al. (2018), self-efficacy is the “core of self-management”, and
refers to the person’s strong conviction in their abilities and actions that allow them to successfully overcome hardships. On the other hand, resilience is the person’s capability of recovering from misfortunes and maintaining a positive mind-set while facing obstacles (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017). As such, it is suggested in this study that self-efficacy can be a source of resilience, whereby a person’s confidence in their abilities (self-efficacy) will give them strength to overcome difficulties (resilience).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perseverance of Effort</strong></td>
<td>GRIT1</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRIT2</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRIT3</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistency of Interest</strong></td>
<td>GRIT4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRIT5</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRIT6</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adaptability to Situations</strong></td>
<td>GRIT7</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRIT8</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRIT9</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRIT10</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the factor analysis of grit’s TMGS scale, results are portrayed in Table 11, with all values high above 0.5 indicating good factor loadings. However, it is found that the TMGS scale in this research is divided into two categories, with “Perseverance of Effort” and “Adaptability to Situations” under one dimension, and “Consistency of Interest” as another dimension. In this study, it is suggested that individuals with “perseverance of effort” who are capable of sustaining their efforts and working vigorously when enduring obstacles (Nisar et al., 2020), are also capable of “adapting to situations” through finding alternatives to successfully cope with changing circumstances (Datu et al., 2017). As such, the perseverance of effort and adaptability to situations dimensions can be combined under one dimension in this research.
5.3 Regression Analysis

In order to assess the relationship between JI dimensions, OCB, PsyCap and grit, SPSS Regression Analysis was used.

Table 12: Regression Analysis of Quantitative JI and OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>48.040</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.186</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Regression Analysis of Qualitative JI and OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>4.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>46.892</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.186</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tables 12 and 13 above, OCB was the dependent variable, while Quantitative JI and Qualitative JI respectively were the independent variables. Table 12 lists the regression analysis of Quantitative JI and OCB, with a p-value of 0.488 is recorded. Since 0.488 > 0.05, this indicates that there is not a significant relationship between Quantitative JI and OCB. As for Table 13, it shows the regression analysis performed to evaluate the relationship between Qualitative JI and OCB. It can be deduced that there is a significant relationship between Qualitative JI and OCB as the p-value is 0.038 < 0.05.

Table 14: Regression Analysis of OCB and PsyCap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>21.488</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.488</td>
<td>127.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>26.698</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.186</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Regression Analysis of OCB and Grit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>23.572</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.572</td>
<td>152.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>24.615</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.186</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tables 14 and 15 cover the regression analysis performed to assess the relationship between OCB and the two moderators in this study, PsyCap and Grit, respectively. Both tables show a significance of \( p = .000 < 0.01 \), which indicates a very strong evidence that OCB has a significant relationship with both PsyCap and Grit.

5.4 Moderation Analysis

Andrew Hays Process Model in SPSS was utilized to conduct the moderation analysis for each of the two moderators in this study – PsyCap and Grit.

5.4.1 Moderator One: Psychological Capital

The first potential moderator in this study is PsyCap. JI dimensions represent the independent variable (Y), OCB is the “constant” or the dependent variable (X), and PsyCap is the moderator (M).

Figure 6 documents the moderation analysis of PsyCap in the relationship between Quantitative JI and OCB. This model has an R-square value of .5113, signifying that 51.13% of the variation of OCB can be determined by Quantitative JI and PsyCap. The p-value of OCB (constant) is .6544 > 0.05, supporting earlier findings that prove there is no significant relationship between Quantitative JI and OCB. Moreover, the path coefficient of PsyCap is .8867, with a p-value of .0000 < 0.05, which shows that PsyCap is significant in this model. The moderation test examines the relationship between the independent variables in this model; Quantitative JI (X) and PsyCap (W). With \( X*W \) resulting in a p-value of .0005 < 0.05, this shows that PsyCap indeed moderates the relationship between Quantitative JI and OCB. Furthermore, the lower limit confidence interval (LLCI) = -.2151 and the upper limit confidence interval (ULCI) = -.0606, which designates that there is an inverse relationship between Quantitative JI and PsyCap – as PsyCap levels increase, Quantitative JI levels decrease. Therefore, PsyCap mitigates the negative impact JI has on the employees’ OCB, hence moderating this relationship.
As for Figure 7, it shows the moderation of PsyCap in the relationship between Qualitative JI and OCB. The R-square of .4615, meaning that 46.15% of the variation in OCB can be determined by PsyCap and Qualitative JI. The p-value of OCB in this model is .0000 < 0.05, which is in line with what was previously stated; Qualitative JI is significantly related to OCB. The p-value of PsyCap in this model is .0935 > 0.05, meaning it is not significant. However, the interrelation of this model, which represents the moderation test between the two independent variables, Qualitative JI and PsyCap (X*W), has a p-value of .0374. Since this number is less than 0.05, then there is proof that PsyCap is a moderator in the relationship between Qualitative JI and OCB.
5.4.2 **Moderator Two: Grit Capital**

Another potential moderator in the JI-OCB relationship in this research is Grit. In parallel with the analysis of the relationship between JI and OCB with PsyCap as a moderator, in this part, OCB was again the dependent variable or constant (X), JI dimensions were the independent variable (Y) and grit was the moderator (M).

Firstly, the moderation analysis for the relationship between Quantitative JI, grit and OCB is portrayed in Figure 8 below. The model has an R-square value of .5844, which translates to 58.44% of the variation of OCB can be attributed to Quantitative JI and grit. In this model, OCB has a p-value of \( p = .0703 > 0.05 \), meaning that the relationship between Quantitative JI and grit is nonsignificant. In contrast, the p-value of grit is \( .0000 < 0.01 \), suggesting that this variable is significant in this model. Additionally, in the moderation test between Quantitative JI (X) and grit (W), a p-value resulting from \( X^*W \) \( p = .0000 < 0.01 \), indicating that there is a strong evidence that grit moderates the relationship between Quantitative JI and OCB. Additionally, with a negative LLCI and ULCI of -.3378 and -.1720 respectively, showing an inverse relationship between Quantitative JI and grit, so, as grit increases, Quantitative JI decreases. It can be inferred that grit moderates the relationship between Quantitative JI and
OCB by attenuating the negative feelings associated with JI and preventing them from affecting the employees’ OCB levels.

**Figure 8: Quantitative JI, Grit and OCB**

Secondly, for Qualitative JI, Figure 9 illustrates the moderation analysis between the latter, OCB and grit. An R-square of .5164 shows that 51.4% of the variation in OCB can be caused by Qualitative JI and grit. In this model, OCB is significant with a p-value of .0000, unlike grit which has a p-value of .1817 > 0.05. Nevertheless, the interrelation of the two independent variables – Qualitative JI and grit – in the moderation test result in p-value $p = .0115$; and since $0.01 < .0115 < 0.05$, then this shows that grit is considered a moderator in the relationship between Qualitative JI and OCB.
### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7186</td>
<td>0.5164</td>
<td>0.1484</td>
<td>55.8770</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>157.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Coef</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.2918</td>
<td>0.6096</td>
<td>5.4004</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>2.0878</td>
<td>4.4958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIP2Avg</td>
<td>-0.4899</td>
<td>0.1733</td>
<td>-2.8263</td>
<td>0.0053</td>
<td>-0.8323</td>
<td>-0.1475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grit Avg</td>
<td>0.2303</td>
<td>0.1717</td>
<td>1.3415</td>
<td>0.1817</td>
<td>-0.1088</td>
<td>0.5695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int_1</td>
<td>0.1250</td>
<td>0.0489</td>
<td>2.5576</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
<td>0.0285</td>
<td>0.2216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Product terms key:

Int_1 : JIP2Avg \times Grit_Avg

### Test(s) of highest order unconditional interaction(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>R2-chng</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X*W</td>
<td>0.0201</td>
<td>6.5412</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>157.0000</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Focal predict: JIP2Avg (X)

Mod var: Grit_Avg (W)

---

**Figure 9: Qualitative JI, Grit and OCB**
Chapter Six

Discussion, Implications, Recommendations and Conclusion

In this chapter, the results established in Chapter Five will be thoroughly discussed and compared to the findings of other researchers. Accordingly, this chapter will provide theoretical and practical implications for leaders and organizations based on the results found. The shortcoming (limitations) of this study are also recognized in this section, followed by recommendations for future studies and an overall conclusion for this research.

6.1 Discussion and Conclusion

This research is built on the notion that the human capital represents the foundation of any organization, and consequently, leaders and managers must prioritize their employees and understand how the workers’ feelings and attitudes affect their behavior and performance in the workplace. This is of great importance to managers today in particular, as the current changes taking place have various repercussions on employees’ emotions, triggering feelings of ambiguity and instability. This study targets two main objectives; firstly, to explore the impact JI triggered by Covid-19 had on the employees’ OCB, and secondly, to determine whether PsyCap and Grit can act as moderators in the JI-OCB relationship. Using COR and SET theories, these objectives were broken down into five main hypotheses about the nature of the relationships between these variables, where these hypotheses have to be tested to be validated. As such, a survey was developed to collect data from employees, with these findings demonstrated and tabulated in the latter chapter.

After analysing the correlation between the variables understudy, the results of the hypotheses set are displayed in Table 16 below.
Table 16: Results of Hypotheses Set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.1.a Qualitative Job Insecurity is negatively related to Organizational</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.1.b Quantitative Job Insecurity is negatively related to Organizational</td>
<td>Not Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.2.a Positive Psychological Capital reduces the negative outcomes of</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Job Insecurity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.2.b Positive Psychological Capital reduces the negative outcomes of</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Job Insecurity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.3.a Positive Psychological Capital moderates the relationship between</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Job Insecurity and Organizational Citizenship Behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.3.b Positive Psychological Capital moderates the relationship between</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Job Insecurity and Organizational Citizenship Behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.4.a Grit mitigates the negative outcomes of Qualitative Job Insecurity.</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.4.b Grit mitigates the negative outcomes of Quantitative Job Insecurity.</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.5.a Grit moderates the relationship between Qualitative Job Insecurity</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Organizational Citizenship Behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.5.b Grit moderates the relationship between Quantitative Job Insecurity</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Organizational Citizenship Behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To begin with, this study found that while Quantitative JI did not have a significant relationship with OCB, Qualitative JI did. This validates (H1a) but does not support (H1b). Qualitative JI, which represents the loss of certain features of the job, diminishes the employee’s feeling of independence and affiliation with the organization, which prevents the worker from voluntarily engaging in OCB (Stynen et al., 2015). This goes in line with the findings of other scholars who uncovered a negative relationship between JI and OCB, like that of Van Hootegem and De Witte (2019), who mentioned that different studies found that the qualitative dimension of JI is linked to decreased OCB and performance levels. Employees with qualitative JI particularly refrain from organizational citizenship behaviors,
and instead engage in unethical pro-organizational activities and counterproductive work behaviors, all of which hinder their job performance (Ghosh, 2017; Van Hootegem & De Witte, 2019). Stynen et al. (2015) found a direct negative relationship between qualitative JI and OCB, but its degree differs according to different age groups. Mahmoud et al. (2021a) also found that Generation X employees exhibit a rapid deterioration in OCB levels in the presence of JI, as they are denied of their “basic need” to have a stable employment status (Mahmoud et al., 2021a; Lee et al., 2017). On the other hand, Generations Y and Z (younger employees) are less susceptible to the negative impacts of JI as they have longer career time and more chances to find a new job, which is why they are less likely to show reduced levels of OCB.

In an attempt to assess potential personal resources that can mitigate the impact JI has on employee’s OCB, this study evaluated the role of PsyCap and Grit as possible moderators. Results show that PsyCap acts as a moderator in the relationship between both JI dimensions and OCB, thus validating the third hypotheses (H3a) and (H3b) set in this study. Specifically, PsyCap was found to have an inverse relationship between Quantitative JI and OCB, so as employees boost their PsyCap levels more, their Quantitative JI will decrease more. This also proves that PsyCap alleviates the negative impacts JI can have, which validates (H2a) and (H2b). Having high levels of PsyCap is especially crucial in ambiguous times such as Covid-19, which has led to unprecedented unemployment rates and economic downfalls. Such unstable conditions trigger employees’ worries and insecurities, and Costa and Neves (2017) found that employees with high levels of PsyCap were capable of controlling their insecurities, and did not engage in counterproductive work behaviors and attempted to search for new job opportunities or perform poorly. This demonstrates the importance of instilling PsyCap among employees when they are feeling unsure about their employment status, as it equips employees with adaptive and agile behaviors and attitudes in stressful times such as potential job loss (Cheng et al., 2012; Oglenksy, 2014; cited in Probst et al., 2017). Darvishmotevali and Ali (2020) explained how each of the four components of PsyCap assist employees in buffering the negative effects of JI. For instance, hope empowers employees, allowing them to believe they have control in such situations rather than feeling powerless. Thus, employees with high levels of hope are more capable of adapting to the subsequent stress of JI, in turn preventing JI from affecting their well-being and performance. Bouzari and Karatepe (2018) found that when employees work in an industry where JI is an inevitable constant, they must be hopeful to complete their tasks effectively and sustain their
performance. In other words, when these employees are faced with obstacles that hinder their original plan, hope enables them to seek substitutes that allow them to fulfill their goals successfully (Yavas et al., 2013; cited in Bouzari & Karatepe, 2018). Optimism also influences the employee’s perception of JI, as optimistic workers view it as a new challenge they can overcome. Not to mention, resilience helps employees in governing the damaging consequences of JI, and self-efficacy acts as a moderator between JI and work outcomes (Darvishmotevali & Ali, 2020). Employees with high levels of PsyCap perceive JI as an impermanent obstacle due to their hope and optimism, and will be able to seek alternatives to deal with JI successfully due to their resilience (Costa & Neves, 2017).

This research also found that there is a significant positive relationship between PsyCap and OCB. This supports the findings of other studies, such as that of Jabeen and Munir (2018), who mentioned that PsyCap is regarded as a significant part of organizational behavior studies due to its capacity of influencing employees’ behavior and attitude at the workplace (Jabeen & Munir, 2018). According to Shahnawaz and Jafri (2009), positive psychological resources such as PsyCap boost the employee’s OCBs. In fact, positive emotions act as a mediator between PsyCap and OCB (Yildiz, 2019). PsyCap is correlated with positive emotions, which in turn broaden the employees’ thinking and attention span, hence allowing them to be proactive and contributing to their organization through exhibiting OCBs (Norman et al., 2010; Avey et al., 2011; Yildiz, 2019). Moreover, a study by Dagher et al. (2015) found that high self-efficacy – a dimension of PsyCap – leads to increased employee engagement, and the latter has a direct and significant effect on OCB (Shams et al., 2020).

Overall, PsyCap as a moderator prevents JI from negatively affecting an employee’s behavior, such as OCB. As a result, PsyCap is considered a powerful resource that can assist organizations in fighting the destruction JI can cause among employees. Instead of exhibiting destructive behavior, dwelling on their concerns and considering searching for new jobs in other organizations, employees with high levels of PsyCap view JI as a temporary challenge they are eager to overcome. As such, they are more capable of remaining positive, exploring alternative approaches to reach their goals, and engaging in OCBs, even when they are enduring challenges.

Another personal resource that was examined in this research was grit. Grit is considered an antecedent of success, organizational behavior and employee well-being (Datu, 2021). Grit was found to moderate the relationship between both JI dimensions and OCB, thus validating
(H5a) and (H5b). Grit also has an inverse relationship with Quantitative JI, therefore, the grittier the employees, the less likely they will experience Quantitative JI. This shows that grit reduce the negative impacts of JI, hence confirming (H4a) and (H4b). Being high on perseverance of efforts, gritty employees are known to find working on achieving a goal for an extended period of time as delightful, so they are less likely to exhibit signs of turnover or surrender when they are experiencing difficulties such as JI (McGinley et al., 2020). This outcome supports the findings of McGinley & Mattila (2020), who discovered that when gritty employees are faced with high levels of JI, they are less likely to exhibit turnover or consider changing their careers. Instead, they usually resort to job preservation strategies rather than quitting (Shoss, 2017). While there is limited research linking these two variables together, this study confirms the importance of grit in combatting the destructive outcomes of JI. Gritty employees are willing to make necessary sacrifices when facing difficulties, and yet stay passionate about their job (Moen & Olsen, 2020). When facing Covid-19, along with the infinite other changes taking place, grit proves to be a vital characteristic that allows employees to persevere when facing their insecurities and ambiguity in the workplace, and still find time to perform successfully.

The results of this study also show that grit is positively correlated with OCB. This is supported by other researchers who viewed grit as a significant antecedent for OCB (Puteri & Arifin, 2020). Higher grit levels attribute to higher performance levels (Arifin & Puteri, 2019). Gritty employees are concerned for other’s well-being and are always willing to invest their efforts in assisting others in fulfilling their goals (Duckworth; cited in Choi et al., 2020). The contribution of employees in the organization is depended on their grit levels (Nisar et al., 2020); the grittier they are, the more willing they will be to invest additional efforts and sustain their interest in their tasks, ultimately leading to a better performance. Widodo and Chandrawaty (2021) also found that employees who score high on perseverance of effort and consistency of interest dimensions will more likely have higher levels of altruism, courtesy, civic virtue, sportsmanship and conscientiousness.

Similar to the effect of PsyCap, grit moderates this relationship by thwarting the harmful effects JI has on employees’ OCB, hence enabling them to engage in such desirable workplace behaviors regardless of their insecurities. This shows that grit is also another influential resource that can be used by employers to control the downturns of JI. Grit has proven to be constructive in regulating the anxiety and destruction that comes with JI and worsens the employees’ attitude, behavior, and job performance. This study shows that grit
allows employees to affirm their interest in their goals and pursue them consistently while adapting to JI triggered by Covid-19 and other changes taking place, while still being interested in carrying out OCBs.

6.2 Conclusion and Implications

6.2.1 Theoretical Implications

This research made multifarious contributions to the literature on JI and OCB. Firstly, there was a gap in the literature regarding the repercussions Covid-19 has had on employees’ attitudes and behavior (Lin et al., 2021). This study reflected on the impact JI has had on OCB in the midst of the pandemic, and found that while quantitative JI and OCB have a nonsignificant relationship, there was indeed a significant relationship between qualitative JI and OCB.

Secondly, the literature on JI and OCB lacked research on potential positive psychological resources that can attenuate the negative corollaries of JI (Duckworth & Quinn, 2009; Probst et al., 2017). In this study, this gap was addressed and the results indicated that both PsyCap and grit can act as separate moderators in the relationship between both JI dimensions and OCB by reducing the undesirable outcomes of JI and preventing them from affecting the employees’ OCB. This will permit employees to sustain their engagement in extra-role behaviors even when they are enduring difficulties and uncertainty in the workplace.

Finally, this research verified that the relationships between JI, OCB, PsyCap and grit can be based on the principles of both COR and SET theories. To start with, according to COR theory, JI, especially during Covid-19, has drained employee resources in an attempt to cope with the current situation (Hobfoll et al., 2018), leaving them with limited resources to engage in extra-role behaviors like OCB. Moreover, the “Desperation Principle” of COR supports the indirect relationship between JI and OCB found in this research, whereby employees experiencing resource loss such as the loss of a secure employment status can trigger defensive and counterproductive behaviors in the workplace, all of which reduce employee OCB. Not to mention, according to SET, JI reduces the employees’ sense of belonging to the organization (Khan & Ghufran, 2018), which demotivates them from engaging in behaviors that can benefit it such as OCB.
As for the moderation of the two psychological resources, both theories were also effective in building and validating the conceptual model of this study. In line with SET, Probst et al. (2021) suggested that when gritty employees undergo JI, they tend to be persistent in chasing their goals as a means of preserving a “positive exchange relationship” with managers despite their dilemma. This represents the employees’ attempt to maintain a healthy social exchange relationship with their employers even when the latter breach the psychological contract they share with the workers by failing to make them feel secure about their employment status. The employees’ effort in upholding the relationship between them and their employers can include their engagement in OCB, which is beneficial for the organization. Additionally, as suggested by the COR theory, grit is a valuable personal resource that equips employees with the tenacity to deal with JI effectively while also preserving enough resources to participate in OCB.

Regarding the moderation of PsyCap in the relationship between JI and OCB, according to the SET theory, PsyCap activates the “good soldier syndrome” in employees (Liaquat & Mehmood, 2017), allowing them to participate in extra-role behaviors like OCB. Regarding JI and PsyCap, the “Resource Investment” and “Gain Paradox” of the COR theory both emphasize the importance of investing and regaining resources post resource loss (Hobfoll et al., 2018). As such, with PsyCap as a personal resource, employees facing JI will be more immune to its adverse effects, and would rather reallocate their resources to better adjust to JI. Employees with high levels of PsyCap are also more capable of handling the stress accompanied with JI, as they have accumulated more resources (PsyCap) that enables them to perform better under such circumstances. This illustrates how PsyCap can mitigate the negative outcomes of JI while still allowing employees to engage in OCB.

6.2.2 Practical Implications

This research also has practical implications that can benefit managers in the workplace. As mentioned earlier, it is evident that JI has undesirable repercussions on the employees’ performance and behavior like OCB, and as such, managers should take certain measures to tackle this. For instance, managers can implement training programs and seminars that target the enhancement of employee skillsets and career development opportunities in the organization, as well as stress management and mindfulness techniques that strengthen employees psychologically and allow them to deal with the stress accompanied by their JI. Furthermore, employers can be empathetic to the employees’ feelings by applying interactive
strategies that consolidate their relationships with workers, determine the causes behind their concerns and attempt to address these worries and instill hope within them. Not to mention, managers can amend HRM practices to improve organizational communication and boost employee involvement and participation in decision-making processes, hence emboldening employees and reassuring them that their role and input in the organization are crucial.

In this research, PsyCap and grit were both established as moderators in the relationship between JI and OCB. Therefore, managers must strive to promote PsyCap and grit among their employees. Regarding PsyCap, there are several steps managers can take to promote each of the four dimensions of PsyCap. For instance, managers can improve employees’ self-efficacy through providing positive feedback and vicarious learning opportunities, whereby employees learn from the experiences of their peers and supervisors. Managers can also enhance resilience levels in their employees through implementing asset and risk-focused strategies that teach employees how to properly utilize their resources when facing risks. For optimism, managers can alter employees’ perception and thinking processes by teaching them how to embrace their past, present and future. Finally, for hope, managers can assist employees in contingency planning, pursuing challenging goals, and “regoaling” – how to maintain their focus on goals set when facing difficulties (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). As for advancing overall PsyCap levels in employees, leaders should aim to create a supportive and ethical environment that dissuades abusive supervision and encourages positive self-expression, all of which improves the followers’ PsyCap levels and their overall behavior at work. Moreover, organizations can nurture positivity through training and developing both employees and managers. Employees can also develop their own PsyCap levels by taking online training courses that are affordable, expedient and available for everyone at all times and in different locations.

In order to enhance grit levels in the organization, managers can give training courses about its benefits and how to develop it, and reward employees who exhibit high levels of grit by presenting them with merits or career advancement opportunities. Since having a growth mindset is considered as an antecedent of grit, leaders should create a “developmental organizational culture” that stimulates a growth mindset among employees (Motro et al., 2021). Grit is also related to goal-setting; thus, managers can assist employees in this process by explicitly communicating their realistic expectations of employees’ performance. Also, when employees are undergoing hardships, it is the managers’ responsibility to determine potential demotivators and provide coaching or peer-mentoring sessions that encourage
employees to invest their energy and sustain their pursuit of their goals even during difficult times. Lastly, grit can be incorporated within HRM’s performance management and evaluation systems, whereby employees can rate their own grit levels as well as their peers’, and HR personnel can in turn provide employees with feedback and guidance on how to improve their grit.

6.3 Limitations and Future Recommendations

Similar to other studies, this research has several limitations. Firstly, the sample population of 161 participants was relatively small, which hinders the generalization of the results found. Hence, should this study be duplicated, it is better to collect more responses and more information from participants that can assist in determining why employees at the same organization or country have different OCB levels.

Secondly, this is a cross-sectional study, whereby data was collected in a specific period of time, which prevents researchers from identifying how OCB on the long-term, and whether PsyCap and grit can keep on moderating this relationship over time. This can be amended through the use of a longitudinal study in future research to yield a more definite conclusion. Furthermore, the data was collected during Covid-19, which may have influenced the participants’ perception regarding OCB levels. As such, a longitudinal study is also beneficial in terms of reassessing OCB, PsyCap and grit levels, as well as their interrelationships post-Covid-19, thus identifying whether the respondents’ answers will differ. Moreover, future studies can also evaluate the relationship between OCB in different countries and compare the results to see the effect the country and its culture can have on this relationship, and how Covid-19 has affected diverse countries in a different manner.

Thirdly, the collection of data relied solely on self-reported surveys, which means that the data gathered is prone to various potential limitations/biases, such as the social desirability bias, where participants choose the answer that is considered more socially acceptable to others rather than reporting the true answer. Such individuals may report that they engage in OCB actions more than they actually do to show that they are devoted to their organization and its prosperity. Furthermore, participants may not know how to accurately assess their personal resources like PsyCap and grit, which leads to inaccurate data. As such, future
research that aims to duplicate this study should include another method for data collection – such as in-depth interviews – to tackle such biases and limitations.

Fourthly, as found in the results of the descriptive statistics performed, the majority of this study’s participants had 1 to 5 years of experience in their present job, designating that they are considerably new in their current position, which might impact their JI perception and OCB contributions to the organization. Hence, should this study be duplicated in the future, researchers must analyze the impact years of service might have on JI, OCB and their relationship, and this can be done by comparing the results between those who are new to the job, and those who have had a longer tenure and more time serving the organization.

Lastly, only personal resources – PsyCap and Grit – were incorporated as moderators for JI in this research. Future studies can explore other personal and non-personal resources that can act as moderators or mediators in the relationship between JI and its various outcomes. For instance, future research can explore the potential moderation effect of mindfulness, organizational politics, work-life balance or leadership style in the relationship between JI and OCB.
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Welcome to the survey/questionnaire and thank you for your attention.

I would like to invite you to contribute in the current research project by completing the following survey/questionnaire. I am a student at the Lebanese American University, carrying out this thesis as a part of my Master in Human Resource Management requirements. This survey/questionnaire intends to explore the impact of Job Insecurity resulting from the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic on Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and the potential moderating effects of Positive Psychological Capital and Grit.

This survey/questionnaire is confidential, none of your personal information will be released and there are no right or wrong answers. The data offered by you will only be utilized for this research to analyze the relationships between job insecurity, employee engagement, organizational citizenship behavior, positive psychological capital and grit. This survey/questionnaire will take 5-7 minutes of your time.

Kindly note that your participation is voluntary, and you can exit the survey/questionnaire at any point.

By resuming with this survey/questionnaire, you agree with the following:

1. I have been provided with the necessary information about this research.
2. I am aware that neither my replies nor any personal information regarding my identity will be revealed.
3. When the results of this research are released, no information regarding my personal identity will be reported or can be inferred by others. The information I provide to the researcher cannot be directly linked back to me.
4. I am aware that I can exit this research at any point if I feel I do not wish to participate, and my refusal to join this research will not cause any repercussions or loss of benefits to which I otherwise am entitled to.

5. I have been notified that this study conforms with the well-recognized ethical codes and has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at the Lebanese American University.

6. I have been informed that I can contact the research team listed below for additional inquiries.

7. I have read and comprehended all the statements on this form.

8. I willingly agree to participate in this research project by completing this survey/questionnaire.

If you have any inquiries, don’t hesitate to contact us at the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (PI)</th>
<th>Phone number</th>
<th>Email address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nataly Farroukh</td>
<td>+961 70859050</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nataly.farroukh@lau.edu">nataly.farroukh@lau.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have additional questions about your rights as a participant in this study, or you want to communicate with someone outside the research, kindly contact the:

Institutional Review Board Office,

Lebanese American University

3rd Floor, Dorm A, Byblos Campus

Tel: 00 961 1 786456 ext. (2546)

irb@lau.edu.lb
Demographic Information

1. Gender *
   - Female
   - Male
   - Non-Binary
   - Prefer not to say

2. Age *
   - 18-24
   - 25-34
   - 35-44
   - 45-54
   - 55+

3. Current country location *

4. Country location where the organization is based *

5. Years of service in current organization *
   - 1-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - 20+
**Part One: Job Insecurity Scale**

1 = *Strongly Disagree*; 2 = *Disagree*; 3 = *Neutral*; 4 = *Agree*; 5 = *Strongly Agree*

From 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), please rate how you feel about your current employment status at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I'm worried about having to leave my job before I would like to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a risk that I will have to leave my present job in the year to come</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel uneasy about losing my job in the near future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My career development opportunities in the organization are favorable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the organization can provide me with a stimulating job content in the near future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the organization will need my competence also in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pay development in this organization is promising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm worried about having to leave my job before I would like to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part Two: Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale**

1 = *Strongly Disagree*; 2 = *Disagree*; 3 = *Neutral*; 4 = *Agree*; 5 = *Strongly Agree*

From 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), please rate how you feel at your workplace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I willingly help fellow professionals when they have work-related problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I willingly help newcomers to get oriented towards job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm always ready to lend a helping hand to those around me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always try to avoid creating problems for co-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm mindful of how my behavior affects other people’s jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t abuse the rights of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always keep myself abreast (up-to-date) of changes in the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I keep myself updated with organizational announcements and memos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend meetings that aren't compulsory but help my department anyway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always require frequent doses of motivation to get the work done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually find fault with what my organization is doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually focus on what is wrong rather than positive side of the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I obey organizational rules even when no one is watching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t take extra or long breaks while on duty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My attendance at work is above the norm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part Three: Positive Psychological Capital (CPC-12) Scale**

1 = *Strongly Disagree*; 2 = *Disagree*; 3 = *Neutral*; 4 = *Agree*; 5 = *Strongly Agree*

From 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with these statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I should find myself in a jam, I could think of many ways to get out of it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right now, I see myself as being pretty successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can think of many ways to reach my current goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm looking forward to the life ahead of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe the future holds a lot of good in store for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I expect more good things to happen to me than bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes, I make myself do things whether I want to or not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I'm in a difficult situation, I can usually find my way out of it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's okay if there are people who don’t like me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort
I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a hard worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I finish whatever I begin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am diligent (I never give up)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New ideas and projects sometimes distract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been obsessed with a certain idea of project for a short time, but later lost interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often set a goal but later choose to pursue a different one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate new opportunities that come into my life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing plans or strategies is important to achieve my long-term goals in life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in life motivate me to work harder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to cope with the changing circumstances in life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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