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ABSTRACT

Citizenship as expressed by the employee is a most sought after behavioural outcome; apart from enhanced relationships contained in the place of work, citizenship is an expression of emotional engagement and further improving performance. This paper examines the function of psychological empowerments as a predictor and the subsequent outcome on organizational-citizenship behaviour. The paper focused on seven selected banks and data was generated using structure questionnaire copies from 226 employees of selected banks within Port Harcourt. The Taro Yamen formula was applied to verify the sample-size. Using the Spearman Rank order Coefficient; a test for nine bivariate null hypotheses were carried out at a 95% confidence interval and result showed significant associations between the variables thereby necessitating a rejection of the previously stated hypothetical assumptions of no relationship.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Contemporarily, there is increasing complexity associated with business environment and this has also made increasingly difficult, the task of managing organizations. Improved strategies resulting from change in businesses, concepts and ideologies is affecting the way business institutes such as bank operates (Lee and Koh, 2000; Spreither, 2003; Robert, 2006). Nigerian banks cannot be successful in the global competitive environment, unless they can break through the traditional pattern of business operation, develop “psychological empowerment and encourage organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) simultaneously”. Organisation citizenship behaviour's significance lies-on receiving-extensive attention from-organisation in-diverse industries. The service section (Bank) has been a key-contributor to-the growth and improvement of Nigerian economy.

The banking-sector is a service commerce where-its performances evaluation is based on-the number-of customers it's competent of-retaining. This is achievable due to the provision of superior-service to-its customers. Consequently, the desk-officers function majorly in-achieving this. Begum (2005) pointed-out those employees who-represent a-key facilitators in implementation of relationship banking strategy are in a higher chance for-these achievements.

In Organ (2006), organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) comprises divers of forms which-including altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, civic virtue and consciousness. Seeing that organisation citizenship behaviours (OCB) are unlikely to be rewarded officially than the obligatory job behaviours, they are presumably performed by intrinsic motivation mechanism - Chompokum (2004)".
Conger and Kanugo (2008) describes “empowerment as a condition in which foster powerlessness’s are noted and rewarded by providing efficacy information, thus adding to an employee’s self-efficacy”. In Spreitzer (2009), it is observed that psychological empowerment refers to an “individual's experience of intrinsic motivation” that is based on cognitions regarding himself-or-herself in relation to his or her work responsibility. Wong (2006) states that it is sensible to anticipate empowering workplace that fosters a-shape among the employees’ expectations and working-conditions, they (employees) would be more concern with doing little extras (OCB). In existing researches, the studies concerning psychological empowerment manly include the influences of organisational commitment and work performance”. This means that if the employees are psychologically empowered, the citizenship behavior will be positively influenced towards greater performance.

Jason (2005) research has it that the psychological empowerment is much correlated with organizational citizenship behavior. Chen (2005) research opined that “the psychological empowerment and employee performance has spiral relationship”. Hence, researchers have been finding out effects of intrinsic-motivation on outcomes. Psychological empowerment and organisational citizenship behavior (OCB) is seen as contributors to the successful growth, survival and growth of the organization and the individual as well. Therefore it is seen as-one of the most significant aspect of organisational environment (Sosik et al, 1999). Redmond et al (1993) reported that “psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior” would add value to the firm. Hence, it is imperative that the Nigerian banking sector should welcome the concept and give mere attention to it.

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The purpose of this paper is to examine the relationship among psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour. Particularly, this study seeks to:

- Examine the correlation among meaningfulness and Altruism.
- Examine the correlation among meaningfulness and courtesy.
- Examine the correlation among meaningfulness and civic-virtue.
- Examine the correlation among competence and Altruism.
- Examine the correlation among competence and courtesy.
- Examine the correlation among competence and Civic-Virtue.
- Examine the correlation among self-determination and Altruism.
- Examine the correlation among self-determination and Courtesy.
- Examine the correlation among self-determination and Civic-Virtue.

Ascertain whether corporate culture will moderate “the influence of psychological empowerment on organizational citizenship behavior.”
3. LITERATURE REVIEW

Sequel to having a better understanding of any social thought, it is imperative to first locate its philosophical origin. Every thought in social philosophy is rooted in some fundamental theories (Pfeffer, 1982). Ahauzu (2011), argued that an important theoretical issue that contemporarily social science researchers seek to clarify the socio-economic perspective that underpins their research. This is achieved via the context of established intellectual tradition that reflect the appropriate view of social reality. There are some baselines theories, however, for the purpose of our study; we shall focus our discussion on the important aspect of our study.

“Psychological empowerment is correlated with the exchange theory also known as the social exchange theory which is classified under the corporative strategy or sociological theories”. This link is most appropriate in the “sense that psychological empowerment been-a motivational-construct deals on intrinsic task motivations manifested on-four cognitive dimensions in relations to an individual work role. However, this chapter gives a widespread review on “psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship” behavior it dimensions measures and the contextual factor (moderating factor).

Spreitzer (1995) model of multidimensional measure of psychological empowerment at-work place serves presents theoretical structure for this study. Momentarily, this representation recommends psychological empowerment as improved intrinsic task inspiration manifested in-four set of cognitions reflecting an individual’s perception about his or her-work function: “Meaning, competence, impact and autonomy”

“Conger and Kanungo (1988) describe empowerment as the motivational concept of self-efficacy”. After reviewing relevant research, Thomas and Velthouse (1990) argued that empowerment is multifaceted and that its essence cannot be captured by a single concept.

Spreitzer (1995) came up with a confirmatory-factor-analyses conducted with two complementary samples to demonstrate the convergent and discriminate validity of four-dimensions of empowerment and their assistance to the overall construct of psychological-empowerment. Structure equations modeling were applied to examine a “nomological network of psychological empowerment at-the workplace”. Tested hypotheses concerned key “antecedents and consequences of the construct”. Initial maintenance for the structural-validity of psychological empowerment was noted. After reviewing relevant research, Spreitzer proposes “psychological empowerment theory”. To ensure that these four-dimension truly captured the essence-of empowerment, Spreitzer-(1997) distilled the interdisciplinary-literature-on-empowerment, drawing on psychology, sociology, social work, and education. She found wide support for these four dimensions of empowerment across these disparate literatures. Sequel to these-results, she further refined these four dimensions as follows: Meaning comprises a fit among the requirements of an individual’s job-function and beliefs, value, and behaviors; Competence describes a self-efficacy toward one’s work, or-belief of his or her capability to perform job-duties with skills; “self-determination which is synonymous to autonomy is a sense of choice in initiating and
regulating one’s action, it reflects a sense of autonomy or choice over the initiation and continuation of work behavior and processes”. “Impact is the degree to which an individual can influence strategic, administrative, or operating outcomes at work”. Spreitzer (1995) argued that the four cognitions can be combined to form an overall structure of psychological empowerment where lack of one dimension will reduce, the overall extent of empowerment.

In today’s business circles, empowerment is often discussed as a new managerial approach among business leaders (Lulhanus, 2000; Kanter 1983). Research has noted that interest in empowerment has spread as global competition requires employee initiatives and behavior (Ducker, 1998; Ezzamu et al, 1995). Recent studies Conger and Kanungo, 1998; “Thomas and Velthouse, 2000”; Keller, 1992; Spreitzer, 2007) have tried to define empowerment to make it useful in managerial practice, the academic discussion about the exact nature and meaning of empowerment have only recently begun (Spreintzer, 2003). Empowerment is one of the most effective ways to enabling every level of the employee is use their capabilities to advance the functionality of their organisation, as well as the quality of their own working standards. Employee empowerment pose a kind of risk management practice in which a culture of empowerment is developed into information in the form of a “shared vision, clear goals, boundaries for decision making, and the results of efforts and their impact on the whole-is shared competency in the form of training and experienced is developed; resources, or the competency to attain in them when needed to be effective in their jobs, are provided; and support in the form of mentioning cultural support, and encouragement of risk-taking is provided” (Chatuvedi, 2008).

The intellectual origin of this construct dates back to McGregor’s (1960) theory of leadership, Likert’s (1967) “classification of managerial styles, and other seminal contribution to the Human relation’s movement in organizational theory (Herrenkohl, Judson, and Heffher, 1999)”. Uptil 1990, “the tendency among scholars adopting the managerial perspective was to compare empowerment exclusively with delegating or allotment of decision-making-authority with frontline employees via various participative management techniques such as management by objectives (MBO), quality circles and employee involvement in goal-setting and strategic decision-making”.

In Grieves (2003). The “strategy of empowerment, is not noteworthy in attempting such that the arguments of the Excellence Movement-is only seeking to solve the problems of alienation”. “Strategies of empowerment may perhaps comprise redefining the nature of supervision or management such as reward systems, job design, or even changing the atmosphere of working environment”. “The critical determinant, is however, the capability in taking control of one’s own situation”. This perceived control over one’s own situation has been considered as psychological empowerment.

Studies by Thomas and Velthouse (1990) explained cognitive model of empowerment. “Empowerment has conceptualized in view of changes in cognitive variables (task assessment), which establish the motivation of
individuals”. Which state that an individual’s assessment of feelings are positively correlated to the feelings of empowerment. Psychological empowerment—has three sub-variables of meaningfulness, competence and self-determination, which the study of Sprectzer (1995) looks at, taking a cue from the study of “Thomas and Velthouse 11990)”. “Thomas and Velthouse (1990) and Sprentzer (1995) describe psychological empowerment as improved task motivation noticeable in employee’s cognitions about—their work-function”. “These cognitions are thought to consist meaning or the fit among individuals’ values and their work mole, competence or belief in one’s ability to perform the job, self-determination, or a sense of autonomy on the job”. Together, these perceptions should result in an active rather than passive orientation to a work role (Spreitzer, 1995).

The three-dimensions are ambiguously combined to generate a general construct of psychological empowerment. Subsequently, the deficient in of a single-dimension will reduce, without eliminating the general degree of felt empowerment completely. Thus the three dimensions specify “a nearly-complete or sufficient-set of cognitions” for the understanding of psychological empowerment (Thomas and Velthouse, 1990).

Boren (1994) describe empowerment as various skills to promote subordinate’s capabilities and potentials based on trust; the supervisor does something in [Keren's definition. Harari (2004) regard empowerment as giving freedom. According to Ugboro and Obeny (2004), empowerment implies given power to weak people in an organization. Person and Chatterjee (1996) opined—empowerment is expanding the administrative liability regarding all-the places in the organisation. Empowerment assumes more “authority to employees in organization in management of work”. Kocel (2003) says, “it is to bring employees to the position of owners of work. According to Hanold (1997), it is a process of bringing an individual or group to a position of which he/she can effect events and the result”. Hyman (1999) defined empowerment not as increasing power of Subordinates, but a supervisor's helping them show their capabilities at work”.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

The methodology gives a details explanation of the methods the researcher will adopt in gathering, collecting analyzing the data which is—be used for the study with the aim of achieving the research objective. This section includes a description of the research explanation of:

- Research design
- Population of the study
- Sample and sampling techniques
- Method of data collection
- Operational measures of variables
- Validity reliability of instrument
- Instruments validation
The population of this study was drawn from senior and junior staff of selected banks in Port Harcourt, Rivers state. In conducting this study, employees of the seven branches were chosen using the simple random sampling techniques from which respondents were selected being 519 (report from human resource manager office; 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>SELECTED BANKS</th>
<th>EMPLOYEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ZENITH BANKS PLC PH</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GUARANTEE TRUST BANK PLC PH</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FIRST BANK PLC PH</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UNITED BANK FOR AFRICA PLC</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ACCESS BANK PLC PH</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>WEMA BANK PLC PH</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UNION BANK PLC PH</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 519

Table 1 Target Population of employees of selected Banks in Rivers state

In this study, the sample size of employees of selected banks under study was determined using the Yaro Yarnen’s formula, due to the fact that the population is finite. The Yaro’s Yame’s formula according to Okeke et al (2001) is

\[ n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2} \]

Where:
- \( n \) = Sample
- \( N \) = Population Size
- \( e \) = Error Margin

\[ \therefore n = \frac{519}{1+519(0.05)^2} \]

\[ n = \frac{519}{2.2975} \]

\[ n = 226 \]

4.1 DATA COLLECTION METHOD

Two methods of data collection are adopted in this study.

A well-structured questionnaire was prepared and administered to selected banks in Port Harcourt. These questionnaires were in four sections (sections one, two, three and four). There were five(5) questions in section one, which consist of the respondent’s bio-data, section two was subdivided into different facets of psychological empowerment with twelve different options. These were strongly agree, agree, moderate, disagree and strongly disagree. The calibrations were as follows: strongly agree = 1, agree = 2, moderate = 3, disagree = 4 and strongly disagree = 5. this section is psychological empowerment scale measured with the 8 items adapted from Spreitzer (1995) 5-point Likert scale. Section three consists of six(6) questions on organizational citizenship behavior.
Section four was adapted from Denison (1990) there are sixteen (16) questions divided into different facets of corporate culture. Each part consist of questions with four different options. These are as follows: strongly agree = 1, agree = 2, moderate = 3, disagree 4 and strongly disagree = 5.

Secondary Sources

This aspect involves the collection of secondary data from journals and textbooks, and on-line articles. Sources of secondary data were fully acknowledge in the references.

4.2 OPERATIONAL MEASURES OF THE VARIABLES

The independent variable in this study id Psychological Empowerment. The dimensions of psychological empowerment used in this study are; meaningfulness competency and self-determination, these dimensions was measured using the Spreiter’s (1995) evaluation scale. This instrument consists of 8 items. Responses to these items was recorded on five point type likert scales (1 = strongly disagree, disagree = 2, neutral = 3, agree = 4 and 5 = strongly agree).

Meaningfulness
- We are energized to work because our work task makes meaning towards achieving the overall goals.
- We are willing to give my input because it is considered when taking decisions.
- We are always delighted to carry out extra=role behavior because the work is enriched.
- The work we do is very important to us.

Competence
- Our confidence to do our job is owed to our uncommon skill
- We are self assured about our capabilities to perform assigned work tasks or extra-role
- Employees have mastered the skills necessary for their job
- Employees do not have enough confident in their ability to do their job.

Self- determination
- We are allowed to alter work processes that may hinder timely attainment of objectives
- We are allowed to partake in decision relating to our job design and assignment
- The opportunity I have to take decision that positively affect the job is part of motivation
- Employees have considerable opportunity for independent and freedom in how to do their job.

Dependent variable

The dependent variable in this study is organizational citizenship behavior. The measures used are; Altruism, Courtesy, Civic virtue. Responses to these items was recorded on 5-point type likert scales (1=strongly disagree disagree=2, neutral=3, agree = 4 and 5 = strongly-agree).
Altruism
- We are eager to assist others with work related difficulties in the organisation
- We are eager to assist others with heavy workloads in the organisation

Courtesy
- We are careful of how our behavior affect other peoples work in the organization.
- Our extra role behavior contribute to the success and growth of the organization.

Civic virtue
- We concentrate roles which are not necessary but assist the organisation to grow
- Our read and keep up with organizational announcement, memos and so on.

Moderating Variable:

The moderating variable in this study is corporate culture. The dimensions of this variable as suggested by Dennison (1990) include: involvement index, consistency index, adaptability index, and mission index. The instrument is indicated below.

5. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

Gender Distribution of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: showing the gender distribution of respondents

From the above table 2 the male in the study exceed the number of female respondents in the firms by 119 (55%) to 99 (45%). This shows a greater number of men participated and make up the respondents for the study compared to their female counterparts.

Management Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Level Management</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Showing the Management Level Distribution of Respondents

Table 3 illustrates that more of the respondents fall into the first level management category (62%), followed by middle management category (33%) and then the top management category (5%).

Educational Qualification
Table 4: showing the distribution of respondents’ qualification

Table 4 also indicates that most of the respondents have obtained First degrees (15%), and then followed by those with Diploma/NCE/OND (30%) then those with master degrees (15%) and then finally those with doctoral degrees (8%). This shows most of the workers within the industry are educated, even to the level of a master’s degree, an obvious trend of development and emphasis on educational qualification within same industry.

Number of Years the Firm has been in Operation

Table 5: Showing distribution according to firm existence

Table 5 indicates that most of the target firms have been in existence and have been operational between 11 – 15 years (60%) followed by those that have been in existence for more than 16 years (23%) then those that have been in existence between 16 – 10 years (20%) and finally those that have been there for less than a years (1%).

Estimated Number of Employees in the Firm

Table 6: Distribution according to number of employees

Table 6 indicates that most of the target firms have staff numbers less than 50 (51%), followed by those between 50 - 100 (30%), then those between 100 – 150 (14%) and then those with staff numbers ranging between 150 - 200 (5%).

5.1 PRIMARY ANALYSIS

For the primary analysis; the data distribution of individual variables are analyzed. It includes the use of frequency tables, mean scores, and standard deviation. The study variables which include: Psychological Empowerment dependent) and its measures; Meaningfulness, Competence and Self-determination; Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (dependent) and its measures; Altruism, Courtesy, and Civic Virtue and finally the contextual variable which is organizational culture.
Table 7: showing the descriptive statistics for measures of Psychological Empowerment

Table 7 illustrates the descriptive statistics for the measures of the independent variable which is Psychological Empowerment, scaled on a 5-point Likert scale, the mean scores show a tendency for agreement and low levels of response value dispersions based on the standard deviation coefficients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.1344</td>
<td>78854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.1315</td>
<td>75661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.1137</td>
<td>80455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: showing the descriptive statistics for measures of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.

Table 8 illustrates the descriptive statistics for the measures of the dependent variable which is Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, scaled on a 5-point Likert scale, the mean scores show a tendency for agreement and low levels of response value dispersions based on the standard deviation coefficients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.1445</td>
<td>66486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.1523</td>
<td>84196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.1250</td>
<td>75229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: showing the summary statistics for the study variables

Table 9 is used to illustrate the summary descriptive statistics for the study variables; Psychological Empowerment (Independent variable), scaled on a 5-point Likert scale, the mean scores show a tendency for agreement and low levels of response value dispersions based on the standard deviation coefficients.

5.2 SECONDARY ANALYSIS

For the secondary analysis; assumed bivariate relationships are tested at a 95% confidence interval therefore a significance level of 0.05 in the acceptance or rejection of previously stated hypotheses. Analysis is carried out to test previously hypothesized relationships and bivariate correlations. Based on the previously illustrated characteristics of our data distribution, the spearman’s rank order correlational statistical tool, a non-parametric statistical test tool, is adopted in the test for correlations and strength of relations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Correlations Coefficient</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>Altruism</th>
<th>750**</th>
<th>Courtesy</th>
<th>754**</th>
<th>Civic</th>
<th>697**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>750**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>701**</td>
<td>723**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>754**</td>
<td>701**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>669**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10: showing the test for hypotheses one, two and three

Hypothesis HO₁: there is no significant relationship between meaningfulness and altruism (rho: .750; p: 0.000 where confidence is at 99% implying a 0.01 level of significance)

As depicted in table 4.10; the relationship between meaningfulness and altruism appears to be significant; therefore based on the p<0.05 criterion adopted for the rejection of statements of null hypothetical assumptions, we reject the previously stated null hypothesis and restate that there is a significant relationship between meaningfulness and altruism.

Hypothesis HO₂: there is no significant relationship between meaningfulness and courtesy (rho: .754; p: 0.000 where confidence is at 99% implying a 0.01 level of significance)

As depicted in table 4.10; the relationship between meaningfulness and courtesy appears to be significant; therefore based on the p<0.05 criterion adopted for the rejection of statements of null hypothetical assumptions, we reject the previously stated null hypothesis and restate that there is a significant relationship between meaningfulness and courtesy.

Hypothesis HO₃: there is no significant relationship between meaningfulness and civic virtue (rho: .697; p: 0.000 where confidence is at 99% implying a 0.01 level of significance)

As depicted in table 4.10; the relationship between meaningfulness and civic virtue appears to be significant; therefore based on the p<0.05 criterion adopted for the rejection of statements of null hypothetical assumptions, we reject the previously stated null hypothesis and restate that there is a significant relationship between meaningfulness and civic virtue.

Table 11: showing the test for hypotheses four, five and six

Hypothesis HO₄: there is no significant relationship between Competence and altruism (rho: .858; p: 0.000 where confidence is at 99% implying a 0.01 level of significance)
As depicted in table 11; the relationship between competence and altruism appears to be significant; therefore based on the p<0.05 criterion adopted for the rejection of statements of null hypothetical assumptions, we reject the previously stated null hypothesis and restate that there is a significant relationship between competence and altruism.

Hypothesis HO5: there is no significant relationship between competence and courtesy (rho: .771; p: 0.000 where confidence is at 99% implying a 0.01 level of significance)

As depicted in table 4.11; the relationship between competence and courtesy appears to be significant; therefore based on the p<0.05 criterion adopted for the rejection of statements of null hypothetical assumptions, we reject the previously stated null hypothesis and restate that there is a significant relationship between competence and courtesy.

Hypothesis HO6: there is no significant relationship between competence and civic virtue (rho: .738; p: 0.000 where confidence is at 99% implying a 0.01 level of significance)

As depicted in table 4.11; the relationship between competence and civic virtue appears to be significant; therefore based on the p<0.05 criterion adopted for the rejection of statements of null hypothetical assumptions, we reject the previously stated null hypothesis and restate that there is a significant relationship between competence and civic virtue.

### Table 12: showing the test for hypotheses seven, eight and nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman’s rho</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Correlations Coefficient</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>798**</th>
<th>631**</th>
<th>702**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>798**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>701**</td>
<td>723**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>631**</td>
<td>701**</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td>669**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>702**</td>
<td>723**</td>
<td>669**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis HO7: there is no significant relationship between Self-determination and altruism (rho: .798; p: 0.000 where confidence is at 99% implying a 0.01 level of significance)

As depicted in table 12; the relationship between self-determination and altruism appears to be significant; therefore based on the p<0.05 criterion adopted for the rejection of statements of null hypothetical assumptions, we reject the previously stated null hypothesis and restate that there is a significant relationship between self-determination and altruism.

Hypothesis HO8: there is no significant relationship between Self-determination and courtesy (rho: .631; p: 0.000 where confidence is at 99% implying a 0.01 level of significance)
As depicted in table 4.12; the relationship between self-determination and courtesy appeals to be significant; therefore based on the p<0.05 criterion adopted for the rejection of statements of null hypothetical assumptions, we reject the previously stated null hypothesis and restate that there is a significant relationship between self-determination and courtesy.

Hypothesis H05: there is no significant relationship between Self-termination and civic virtue (rho: .702; p: 0.000 where confidence is at % implying a 0.01 level of significance)

As depicted in table 4.12; the relationship between self-determination and civic virtue appears to be significant; therefore based on the p<0.00.05 criterion adopted for the rejection of statements of null hypothetical assumptions, we reject the previously stated null hypothesis and restate that there is a significant relationship between self-determination and civic virtue.

In this section, the tertiary analysis examines the moderating effect of organizational culture on the relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour. The study adopts the partial correlation tool in the test for the moderating effect of organizational culture.

**Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>984**</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>984**</td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: showing the relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour

Correlation = 0.984

P value = 0.000 where is P<0.05 level of significance at a 95% confidence interval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variable</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Empowerment Correlation (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Empowerment df</th>
<th>Citizenship Correlation (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Citizenship df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: showing the control for the moderating effect of organizational culture

Hypothesis H010: The culture of the organization does not significantly moderate the relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour (where R1: .984>112: .790)

As depicted in table 13 and 14; the relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour appears to be significantly moderated by organizational culture; therefore based on the R1>R2 criterion adopted for the rejection of statements of null hypothetical assumptions, we reject the previously stated null hypothesis and restate that the culture of the organization significantly moderates the relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour.
6. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

We had presented the data generated from our field exercise and thereafter analyzed them. This was done with a view to unfolding the inherent meaning thereof. Some findings were eventually made which were vividly discussed and importantly expressed the nature of the relation with the examined predictor and criterion variables and by extension the role of the moderating variables on the relationship. The discussion was done with strong consideration for existing theoretical positions on the phenomenon investigated.

Meaningfulness has a significant relationship with organizational citizenship behavior through the relationship as expressed by Haron’ (2004) work is an increased expression of the behavioral perspective in relation with handling assigned tasks, it connotes the importance of the value oriented commitment hat is attracted when tasks are assigned. Importantly, the empowerment discourse has centrally located meaningfulness as core in the employee quest hr increased involvement and motivation in all work place actions. From the empirical results, the valued assignment of enhancing standard of living for the citizenship was a motivation for organizational citizenship behavior.

We have noted a strong theoretical concurrence which points to the fact that employee empowerment which correlates with the discretionary behavior of the work force has meaningfulness as a latent factor which is an intrinsic motivational element in relation to psychological perspective of empowerment. This study means that employees require a high sense of ascribing value to the assigned tasks and intended goals. Consequently such value attachment to intended goals and tasks is a primary reason that investigates discretionary behavior of the employees in the organization. Exceedingly, the implementation aspect of meaningful practices is further facilitated by the value oriented strategic actions that are themselves engine to firm success.

Positive relationship exist between competence as a dimension of Psychological empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Competence is imperatively a requisite element that is needed for all work tasks. This finding is in line with Quin and Spreitzer (1997) work on Psychological empowerment which espoused that competently empowered employees radiates extra role behaviour that is required for tasks accomplishment. They look at old problems from new approaches and render extra activities in the workplace. What this means for the employee is that though there may exist other intrinsic workplace incentives; there is high regard for the intrinsic cognitive capabilities that are endowed in the employee that enables him have a sense of belonging.

According to Spreitzer (1995) they are more satisfied with their job and less likely to experience stress than those who do not feel competent. Indeed, Conger and Kanungo (1995) are of the view that competence captures the idea that an individual feels capable of successfully performing a particular task or activity therefore a Psychologically empowered workforce is that which is impliedly prepared with competitive skills that in the thinking of Bandura (1986) are stimulants of self-efficacy or personal mastery.
The banking sector from our findings has conformity with existing literature on the relationship between competence and an intrinsically motivated workforce. We strongly believe from our study results that employees are bolder in attending to work tasks if they have a high competence profile that results from the extent to which empowerment is allowed. They are put at a point where they are quick at perceiving a link between their action and envisaged outcomes from their work input.

**Self-determination strongly relates with Organizational Citizenship Behaviour**

The discourse on employee empowerment no doubt is anchored on the need to expand the authority latitude of employee in terms of all relational, operational and administrative areas of work. In accordance with literature by Conger and Kanungo (1990), work self-determination is to stimulate employee innate commitment which reflects the intellectual origins of the behavioural thoughts. The findings of the study agrees with that of Bowen (2003) where he noted that empowerment practices through authority sharing constitutes the competitive capacity of service firms.

Moderating influence of corporate culture on the relationship between Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Our findings on the moderating role of corporate culture on the relationship between Psychological empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour are quite assertive of the aggregated actions that represent culture in work organizations. In Hofstede’s (1980) thinking, it is the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes one organization from the other. The implication of these definitions is that corporate culture is central to whatever outcome that are expected since the collective action that distinguishes the organization are ultimately targeted at goals. In this instance, the study outcome shows that the corporate culture stems over behavioural actions that will in turn stimulate discretionary behaviour of work members.

Our findings agrees with the works of Schneider et al(1998) when they posited that culture of work organization have a holistic influence on the overall performance of organization due to its ability to set the platform for driving the overall vision.

The study findings have substantiated the work of Pratt and Ashfort (2003). Their works showed that corporate culture strongly correlates with performance of employees in workplace and does not necessarily take a secondary role in ensuring performance. The result from the partial analysis expressed an outcome that significantly shows the implication of work culture on the behaviour of employees in the sector.

This study has successfully evoked the fact that corporate culture is also required as incentive to stimulate psychological actions that are also expected to engender extra role behaviour among work members which lend support to the work of Hambrick (2007).
7. CONCLUSION

As shown from the data output, evidence reveals that psychological empowerment through its measures does significantly correlate with organizational citizenship behaviour. A high incidence of psychological empowerment would invariably impact and improve on organizational citizenship behaviour. Factors such as meaningfulness, competence and self-determination at the workplace would only serve to stabilize the workplace, improve communications, encourage trust and create an atmosphere of cooperation and collaboration. Based on the findings from the study, we conclude that:

- Meaningfulness significantly correlates with organizational citizenship behaviour: tested at a 95% confidence interval, the results show that meaningfulness is significantly correlated to the three measures of organizational citizenship behaviour identified and adopted in this study, namely; altruism, courtesy and civic virtue.

- Competence significantly correlates with organizational citizenship behaviour: tested at a 95% confidence interval, the results show that competence is significantly correlated to the three measures of organizational citizenship behaviour identified and adopted in this study, namely; altruism, courtesy and civic virtue.

- Self-determination significantly correlates with organizational citizenship behaviour: tested at a 95% confidence interval, the results show that self-determination is significantly correlated to the three measures of organizational citizenship behaviour identified and adopted in this study, namely; altruism, courtesy and civic virtue.

The culture of the organization significantly moderates the relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviour: tested at a 95% confidence interval, the results show that organizational culture significantly through a comparison of correlation values; moderation is significant at an $R_1 > R_2$ value.
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