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Organisational citizenship behaviour has been deemed crucially relevant for organisational effectiveness and success; thus, significant emphasis is laid upon enhancing and sustaining favourable workplace attitudes and behaviours by managements across organisations. Various models of organisational citizenship behaviour have been presented by researchers in the past; however, a meagre number of studies managed to establish a causal framework explaining employees’ drive towards citizenship behaviours. Therefore, the present study analysed the role of person-organisation fit in inspiring citizenship behaviours through affective commitment upon two backdrops i.e., Social Exchange Theory and Social Identity Theory. The study employed 290 valid responses; conveniently collected from the six major banking sector organisations operating in Pakistan, which were subjected to regression analysis through the Process Macro [Model-4] for SPSS v. 22. Subsequent to analysis, it was found that affective commitment partially mediates the relationship between person-organization fit and organisational citizenship behaviour; signifying that, values congruence elicits higher commitment from employees, eventually promoting citizenship behaviours; whereas, incongruence in employee-organisational values may hold adverse implications for commitment levels as well as the employees’ tendency to exhibit extra-role behaviours.
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INTRODUCTION

Owing to a multitude of competitive pressures in the contemporary volatile business landscape, organisations are driven towards transformation and restructuring. Coping with emergent competitive pressures requires organisations to adopt effective human resource (HR) practices (Arshad et al., 2021; Yousaf & Hadi, 2020; Latif et al., 2019; Ahmed & Islam 2011). For this purpose, on-boarding of good workers (citizens) is of paramount importance; even more so, assembling a committed workforce (Muhammad, 2012). Organisations therefore emphasise upon areas which can make way for a sustainable competitive advantage; whereby, citizenship behaviours are a phenomenon of particular interest (Alkahtani, 2015). In this context, person-organisation fit is a fundamental concept for recruiting such individuals who can most probably behave as citizens (Uggerslev et al., 2012). Theorists consider organisational success to be reliant upon continuous engagement of employees in organisational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) (Dirbeba Dinka, 2018). As per Podsakoff et al. (2014), citizenship behaviours significantly contribute to organisational effectiveness. However, Mushtaq and Umer (2015) posit that there are diverse views concerning OCB’s aligned with varying cultural settings; since, a factor stimulating citizenship behaviours in a specific cultural context might not hold similar influential strength in another context (Dirbeba Dinka, 2018). According to Lynn Stallworth (2003), an enhanced commitment is essential for retaining employees, thus is vital for instilling behaviours significantly associated with OCB.

Literature holds person-organisation fit to be predictive of turnover intention, job performance, and citizenship behaviours (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Oh et al., 2013). Kumari and Thapliyal (2018) posited that acknowledging employees’ voluntary actions holds favourable implications for organisational effectiveness. This attracts interest from academia and practitioners alike for comprehending theoretical as well as managerial outcomes of perceived values congruence (P-O fit) in wake of employees’ attitudinal and behavioural responses (Kim et al., 2013). From an academic standpoint, the research literature available on the subject pertains to different industries while the concepts under study have mainly been operationalised in diverse cultures (e.g. Cha et al., 2013; Demir et al., 2015; Kazemi, 2014; Maden & Kabasakal, 2013; Zhang, 2013). Scholars uphold that geographical and cultural differences lead to varying comprehensions of OCB (Dirbeba Dinka, 2018); therefore, the linkages between person-organisation fit and attitudinal as well as behavioural outcomes need to be cross validated from Pakistan’s perspective bearing unique cultural influences.

Moreover, strictly from Pakistan’s perspective; the available literature lacks harmony vis-à-vis causality amidst the involved concepts. The study aims at examining fit’s influence over citizenship behaviour augmented by commitment, for establishing a robust causal mechanism in Pakistan’s banking sector perspective. From a practical standpoint, the person-organisation fit framework holds critical implications for organisations because employees well-aligned with their organisations more often exhibit positive attitudes and behaviours (Suar & Khuntia, 2010; Verquer et al., 2003). Specifically, the financial sector of Pakistan faces incremental
turbulence with regard to turnover and low satisfaction levels experienced by employees (Hashmi & Naqvi, 2012; Khan et al., 2011). Therefore, the study aims at delineating a framework by which practitioners can institute a conducive environment for attracting and retaining citizens while encouraging and augmenting constructive behavioural responses by employees.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The social identity theory (SIT) by Tajfel and Turner (1979) and the social exchange theory (SET) by Blau (1964) have been utilised with an intent to explain employee attitudinal responses and ensuing behavioural outcomes predicted by person-organisation fit.

According to SIT, individuals associate themselves to various social categories in line with certain affiliations; such as, religious, ethnic, cultural, organisational or group membership etc. (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Ashforth and Mael (1989) maintain that by doing this, individuals define and classify themselves as well as others, in a social setting. This identification serves as a validation of their sense of self while allowing them to meaningfully distinguish themselves from others. It not only enhances the salience of their group and organisational membership but also stimulates an enhanced commitment to group and organisational values ensuring consistent attitudes and behaviours (Ashforth & Mael, 1989), enabling employees to make meaningful contributions towards organisational objectives. Social identity theorists advocate that employees feel an urge to engage in citizenship behaviours upon being able to identify with their organisations (Dutton et al., 1994). In this respect, van Dick and Wagner (2002); while viewing OCB from the social identity perspective suggested that normative controls hold a substantial influence over behaviours and denial from engaging in extra-role behaviours may lead to the members’ expulsion from their respective groups. Ras & Duyar (2012) considered extra-role behaviours to be driven by in-group membership demands. They criticized the voluntary classification conferred upon OCB and posited that citizenship behaviours are fostered distinctively under varying dynamics and contexts, rather than being standalone outcomes of innate perceptions.

In social perspective, reciprocity indicates an intrinsic commitment felt by individuals to repay the counterpart for a compassionate act (Blau, 1964). The institution of a positive social exchange relationship requires initial investment (e.g. trust, empathy) by a perpetrator, most likely the manager, supervisor or a co-worker thereby setting the social exchange process into motion, which subsequently draws out favourable attitudinal and behavioural responses from employees as a measure of reciprocation (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano et al., 2017). Shore et al. (2009) held “social exchange theory has gained prominence as a framework for understanding the employee-organisation relationship” (p. 289). Social exchange theory by Blau is “among the most influential conceptual paradigms for understanding workplace behaviours” (Dasgupta et al., 2013, p. 174). Organisational citizenship behaviour is conventionally seen as an outcome of social exchange processes in an employment relationship, for primarily being volitional
(Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Employees treated with care reciprocate to organisational inputs by exhibiting favourable responses i.e., both attitudinal and behavioural (Kim et al., 2013); therefore, it can be established that repeated favourable exchanges amidst employees and their organisations nurture affective commitment (Carmeli & Colakoglu, 2005).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)

Organ (1988) initially defined citizenship behaviour in his book “Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: The Good Soldier Syndrome” as an “individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognised by the formal reward system, and that in aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organisation” (p. 4). Organ et al. (2005) retained the same definition (p. 8). Organ (1988) conceptualised OCB through five dimensions i.e., courtesy, altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue. Later on, Podsakoff et al. (2000) came up with seven dimensions for conceptualising the concept of OCB i.e., helping behaviour, sportsmanship, organisational loyalty, organisational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue and self-development. Subsequently, Farh et al. (2004) studied the dimensions (forms) of organisational citizenship behaviour in Asian cultural settings, while suggesting “what is considered to be OCB may vary markedly across cultural boundaries” (p. 253), because; individuals’ perceptions regarding the behaviours contributing to effectiveness of organisations are mainly determined by culture.

OCB was conceptualised from a different perspective by Williams and Anderson (1991); whereby, two prominent dimensions were established i.e., OCB-O and OCB-I. They explained OCB-O to encompass behaviours such as; conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue i.e., the behaviours beneficial for organisations; while, OCB-I encompassed individual level behaviours e.g.; courtesy and altruism. Lee and Allen (2002) asserted, “OCBs are employee behaviours that, although not critical to the task or job, serve to facilitate organisational functioning” (p. 132). Likewise, the concept of OCB is suggested to encompass two forms by Fox et al. (2011); one that is supportive of the organisation and the other that is supportive of co-workers. Organisational citizenship behaviour “is considered vital to an organisation’s performance and long-term viability” (Takeuchi et al., 2015, p. 1239).

Person-Organisation Fit (P-O Fit)

Person-Organisation fit is “the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when (a) at-least one entity provides what the other needs, or (b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or (c) both” (Kristof, 1996, p. 4). Likewise, Bright (2007) defined P-O fit as “the congruence between the characteristics of individuals (i.e., goals, skills and values) and the characteristics of organizations (i.e., goals, values, resources and culture)” (p. 363). Person-organisation fit is a sub-component of the concept person-environment fit, defined as a
“statistical interaction between the person and environment” (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005, p. 283). Person-environment fit (P-E fit) originated from the proposition put forth by Lewin (1935) i.e., behaviour is jointly predicted by interactions between individuals’ personality and their environment i.e., \( B = f (P, E) \). Kristof-Brown et al. (2016) reiterated that behavioural outcomes depend on the interaction of persons with their environment.

Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) proposed that P-E fit encompasses four classifications i.e., a) Person-Job fit - “the relationship between a person’s characteristics and those of the job or tasks that are performed at work” (p. 284), b) Person-Organization fit - “the compatibility between people and entire organizations” (p. 285), c) Person-Group fit - “the interpersonal compatibility between individuals and their work groups” (p. 286), and d) Person-Supervisor fit - “the inherent compatibility in dyadic relationships among co-workers” (p. 287). P-O fit is defined by Cable and DeRue (2002) as, “the employees’ belief of congruence between their values and the values of the organization along-with other employees’ values” (p. 876). Literature suggests fit to inspire positive feelings of belongingness; while, misfit stimulates feelings of isolation.

**Affective Commitment (AC)**

Affective commitment represents “positive feelings of identification with, attachment to, and involvement in the work organisation” (Meyer & Allen, 1984, p. 375). AC, a sub-component of the broader concept organisational commitment, is considered “a psychological state that characterises the employees’ relationship with the organisation and has implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organisation” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67). Allen & Meyer (1990) and Meyer & Allen (1991) conceptualised OC from the perspective of three components i.e., a) Affective Commitment – commitment based on being emotionally attached to the employing organisation, b) Continuance Commitment – the commitment centred on acknowledgment of associated costs of departing an organisation, and c) Normative commitment - commitment derived from an innate sense of obligation. Affective commitment refers to “employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organisation” (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p.1).

Cropanzano et al. (2017) interpreted two dimensions of commitment through social exchange theory while classifying affective commitment as an embodiment of social exchange relationships; and, continuance commitment as representative of economic exchange relationships. This classification establishes that favourable initiating actions foster affective commitment. “Affective commitment is a psychological state that binds an individual to an organisation” (Alniaçik et al., 2013, p. 275). Affective commitment - the most cherished among the dimensions of commitment indicates an emotional connection between employees and their organisations and is supportive of OCB (Wasti, 2003). Employee behaviours are generally considered to be most significantly predicted by affective commitment – affectively committed employees hold a favourable predisposition towards OCB (Ueda, 2011).
**HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT**

**Person-Organisation Fit (P-O Fit) and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)**

P-O fit is considered to be favourably associated with employees’ attitudinal and behavioural outcomes - organisational identification (Cable & DeRue, 2002), and work behaviour (Yaniv & Farkas, 2005). In line with affinity & exchange mechanisms, Kristof-Brown et al. (2016) established that such employees who perceive a decent fit with their employing organisations display OCBs more often. OCBs and subjective values congruence as reported by supervisors were established to hold a positive correlation by Rich, et al. (2010). Likewise, self-reported OCBs and objective values congruence were reported to hold a positive relationship by Tsai et al. (2012). Contrary to the mainstream researchers however, Vigoda (2000); could not establish any relationship between P-O fit and OCB-I's. On the other hand, as per Kristof-Brown et al. (2016), a positively significant correlation was established between OCB-Os and perceived P-O fit by a multitude of researchers (e.g., Becker, 1992; Lemmon & Wayne, 2014; Wei, 2012).

Although OCB literature is mainly premised on SET, Spitzmuller et al. (2008) centering upon the SIT held that individuals proactively indulge in citizenship behaviours so as to satisfy their identity needs; driven by certain motivational tendencies. Blader and Tyler (2009) posit that the creation of firm social identities innately inspires employees to make dedicated efforts towards organisational success, ultimately driving them to exhibit citizenship behaviours. Empirical studies at large confirm a significant relationship amidst P-O fit and OCB (e.g. Afsar & Badir, 2016; Farzaneh et al., 2014; Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Zoghbi-Manrique de Lara, 2008). In line with the reviewed literature, we can infer that greater P-O fit entails higher commitment and embeddedness; ultimately inspiring employees to go the extra mile towards fulfilment of their duties; while indulging in and exhibiting citizenship behaviours.

\[ H_1: \text{Person-Organisation Fit positively influences Organisational Citizenship Behaviour.} \]

**Person-Organisation Fit (P-O Fit) and Affective Commitment (AC)**

‘Fit’ as a whole and person-organisation fit specifically, has been recognised to be vitally important in evolving and preserving employees’ commitment to organisations (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Employees’ perceptions of fit have attracted substantial consideration as probable indicators of attitudes (Cable & Judge, 1996). Alniaçik et al. (2013) on the basis of their study in Turkey upheld that a congruent interaction amidst individual and organisational values, is a powerful predictor of attitudes and behaviours exhibited by employees. A favourable relationship amidst organisational commitment and perceived fit was acknowledged by Khaola and Sebotsa (2015).
Similarly, person-organisation fit has been reflected to be a predictor of organisational commitment through empirical studies at large (Meyer et al., 2010; Mete et al., 2016). It can therefore be deduced that committed individuals can better identify with the goals and values of their organisations. The SIT framework also lends credence to the proposition that individuals classify themselves and others into numerous groups leading to an enhanced salience of their in-group as well as organisational memberships (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). The existence of a favourable association between person-organisation fit and organisational commitment was supported by Verquer et al. (2003) as well as Ng and Sarris (2009).

\[ H_2: \text{Person-Organisation Fit positively influences Affective Commitment.} \]

Affective Commitment (AC) and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)

OCB has been considered to be an outcome flowing from commitment by Meyer et al. (2002). In principle, employees who are emotionally and intrinsically involved and are able to identify with their employing organisations are likely to behave as citizens (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986). For an employee to be a good citizen of an organisation, affective commitment is a crucial component; since, individuals cannot be compelled to display citizenship behaviours in the absence of an emotional attachment to their organisations (Latif et al., 2019; Organ, 1988). Carmeli and Colakoglu (2005) on the contrary however; contend empirical evidence to be reflective of an inconsistent pattern of relationships amidst affective commitment and citizenship behaviours. However, behaviours are considered to be influenced by attitudes in general; therefore, affective commitment is likely to stimulate citizenship behaviour, as individuals perceiving a positive identity with their organisations more often go beyond expectations for the realisation of organisational objectives.

Allen et al. (2011) on the basis of their study conducted in USA recommended that organizations primarily ought to emphasize upon augmenting the affective component of commitment among employees in order to intensify citizenship behaviours. Literature further suggests commitment to be a prominent attitudinal indicator of an extraordinary exchange relationship of employees with their organisations (Lavelle et al., 2009). Zayas-Ortiz et al. (2015) established organisational commitment to be favourably related to OCB; with affective commitment as the fundamental indicator of commitment. Likewise, Danish et al. (2015) reflected a moderate relationship between extra-role behaviours and affective commitment. Commitment has been recognised to be directly correlated with citizenship behaviour (Liu & Cohen, 2010); and inversely related to turnover intentions (Pare & Tremblay, 2007). Conway and Briner (2012) held that organisations should focus on employees exhibiting elevated level of commitment; since, such employees are likely to display better performance. Empirical evidence suggests affective commitment, in contrast to continuance or normative commitment; to hold the most significant relationship with work outcomes; particularly, OCB (Meyer et al., 2002; Vilela et al., 2008).

Mediating Role of Affective Commitment

P-O fit is maintained to have been researched upon as a direct predictor of OCBs (Kristof-Brown et al., 2016). However, a multitude of researchers have made attempts to unearth probable mediators; while grappling with diverse concepts in order to establish causality. Perceived P-O fit and OCBs were reported to be indirectly associated by Netemeyer et al. (1997); whereby, job satisfaction explained the relationship. Perceived organisational politics mediates P-O fit and OCB relationship (Vigoda, 2000). P-O fit and OCB relationship is mediated by job satisfaction (Vilela et al., 2008). While making use of supervisor-rated scales for assessing OCBs, several other affective concepts which could potentially intervene between P-O fit and OCBs’ relationship were suggested by Rich et al. (2010); however, job engagement was established to be the most prominent among mediators from their hypothesised model. Values are suggested to indirectly influence behaviour through attitudes in line with the social psychology literature (Homer & Kahle, 1988); thus, we can reasonably expect person-organisation fit to hold a positive influence upon citizenship behaviours through affective commitment.

“The interaction of individual and organisational values, with respect to congruence between individual and organisation, is a meaningful predictor of work attitudes and behaviours” (Saraç et al., 2017, p. 1083). In line with the social exchange theory, employees who perceive a congruence amidst their personal and the organisational values are more likely to reciprocate with positive attitudes and behaviours; owing to an innate commitment for reciprocating to organisational inputs. In similar vein, employees tend to exhibit higher work environment adjustment levels; alongside superior adaptation to job requirements, upon perceptions of a decent fit with their employing organizations (Newton & Jimmieson, 2008). Consequently, employees experience an improved sense of identification with their organisations (Cable & DeRue, 2002), eventually nurturing CBs (Mayfield & Taber, 2010). A substantial volume of research literature however supports the influence of P-O fit upon OCBs through certain “social exchange quality” facets e.g., trust, perceived organisational support and commitment (Colquitt et al., 2013). The exact mode of influence of P-O fit upon OCBs is yet to be demonstrated through future empirical research (Farzaneh et al., 2014). Researchers have often utilised organisational commitment as a higher order construct as an explanatory mechanism amidst values congruence and citizenship behaviours relationship. It is however contested that citizenship behaviours being inherently positive can only be fostered if an emotional attachment (i.e., affective component of commitment) exists; whereas, continuance and normative commitment being compulsive in nature cannot meaningfully contribute to the fostering of OCBs.
H4: Affective Commitment mediates the relationship between Person-Organization Fit and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The methodology for the instant deductive study has been devised in line with the research onion as established by Saunders et al. (2007); while revolving around the positivist paradigm for observing and explaining the causality amidst the concepts involved, so as to examine the influence of predictors upon individuals’ behaviours.

Population and Sample

A sample of 400 subjects was considered appropriate based on Yamane’s (1967) formula and was collected using convenience sampling from a target population of 70,800 employees associated to the six major banking sector organisations of Pakistan. A total of 400 questionnaires were administered; whereby, 290 valid responses were received & utilised - response rate being 73% approx.

Measurement and Scales

A self-administered research questionnaire on seven-point scale encompassing twenty-seven items has been employed for data collection. For operationalising P-O fit, three items were adopted from ‘Subjective Fit Perceptions Scale’ by Cable and DeRue (2002); while, eight items from ‘Organisational Commitment Scale’ by Allen and Meyer (1990) were adopted for operationalizing AC. Moreover, ‘OCB Scale’ by Lee and Allen (2002) with sixteen items was adopted for operationalising OCB as a higher order construct.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Data analyses were conducted through SPSS v.22; whereby, the demographic characteristics’ summary in respect of the respondents is presented at Table 01.
Table 01: Demographic Characteristics’ Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Organisation</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Organisation</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>290</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Manager</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>290</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>290</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (Years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>290</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Phil or above</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>290</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demographics’ analysis revealed that 42.1% of the subjects were associated to public sector organisations, and 57.9% to private sector organisations, with a bulk of respondents being males holding master’s degrees, while functioning at initial levels of their respective careers.

**Descriptive, Reliability and Correlation Statistics**

The descriptive statistics reflected acceptable values primarily for skewness and kurtosis coefficients; whereas, reliability analysis in respect of the adopted measures reflected above par ‘α’ values as reflected at Table 02.
Table 02: Descriptive and Reliability Statistics for Study Variables (n = 290)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sigma</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POF</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>-0.791</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-0.347</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>-0.929</td>
<td>1.975</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inter-scale correlation matrix presented at Table 03 reflected a significant association amidst the concepts under study, while reflecting values < 0.80; in respect of the studied concepts; thereby, neither depicting any issues of multi-collinearity nor singularity.

Table 03: Correlation Statistics (n=290)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>POF</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>OCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>.616**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>.447**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypotheses Testing

The hypotheses testing was conducted by utilising ‘PROCESS’ macro [Model-4] (Hayes, 2013) through SPSS v. 22.

Table 04: Regression Coefficients Summary - Mediation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total Effect without Mediation) POF-OCB</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>7.317</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Direct Effect with Mediation) AC</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>4.968</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prime Path) POF</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>2.940</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Indirect Effect with Mediation)</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.0231</td>
<td>4.588</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control Variables: organisation type, functional position, gender, age, qualification

The data analyses (excerpts presented at Table 04 & detailed results at Appendix-I); reflected the total effect to be significant; thereby, signifying that P-O fit positively influences OCB. Upon introduction of the mediator in the prime path, Beta value reflecting the individual contribution of predictor towards the outcome variable significantly decreased from .208 to .102; whereas, R² reflecting the overall impact increased from .156 to .223 in contrast to total
effect, signifying that the tested model accounts for 22% variance in outcome variable i.e., organisational citizenship behaviour.

**Figure 02: Model with superimposed coefficients of regression**

\[ \beta = .451 \]
\[ \text{SE} = .0341 \]
\[ t = 13.25 \]
\[ p = .000 \]

**H2: YES**

\[ \beta = .235 \]
\[ \text{SE} = .0473 \]
\[ t = 4.968 \]
\[ p = .000 \]

**H3: YES**

\[ \beta = .102; \text{SE} = .0347; t = 2.94; p = .003 \]

In line with the recommendation by Hadi et al. (2016) and Hair et al. (2014), the magnitude of mediation was assessed through variance accounted for (VAF) index; owing to the direct path remaining significant even subsequent to the mediator’s introduction.

**Direct Effect**

0.102

**Indirect Effect (.451 * .235)**

0.105985

**Total Effect (.102 + 0.105985)**

0.207985

**VAF Indirect Effect = 50.95%**

**Total Effect**

The VAF value falls between 20-80% range; thus, the existence of a partial mediation is established. Kenny (2018) posited that complete mediation can only be claimed if the VAF is at-least 80%. Thus, the central hypothesis further expounds that affective commitment partially mediates P-O fit and OCB relationship.

**DISCUSSION**

The proposition put forth vide H1 was confirmed through data analyses; whereby, a Beta = .2083; Standard Error = .0285; t value = 7.317 and p value of .000 were extracted. The results were in line with those presented by Kristof-Brown et al. (2016); Farzaneh et al. (2014); and Wei (2012). The results also coincide with Ras and Duyar (2012) and Cropanzano et al. (2017). The proposition put forth vide H2 was confirmed which yielded a Beta = .4518; Standard Error = .0341; t value = 13.257 and p value of .000. Saraç et al. (2017) established work attitudes to be fundamentally predicted by person-organisation fit;
whereby, individuals with values congruent to those of their organisations’ exhibit higher commitment. They further established that person-organisation fit holds the most significant influence over affective component of commitment. The proposition put forth vide H3 was supported as well; whereby, a favourable association between AC and OCB was postulated. A Beta = .2351; Standard Error = .0473; t value = 4.968 and p value of .000 were extracted from the analyses. The results were in line with those presented by Zayas-Ortiz et al. (2015); who accentuated that moral and affective commitment among employees must be supported by organisations in order to inculcate sturdy citizenship behaviours. Organisations ought to attempt to enhance the affective component of commitment among employees in order to augment their disposition towards extra-role behaviours. The results further confirmed that affective commitment indirectly explains the relationship of person-organisation fit with organisational citizenship behaviours; with a Beta = .1021; Standard Error = .0347; t value = 2.940 and p value of .0035. The results are in contrast to Khaola and Sebotsa (2015) who contested that P-O fit-OCB relationship is not explained by organisational commitment, and Farzaneh et al. (2014) who contended that organisational commitment (OC) cumulatively, rather than the affective component serves as an intervening concept between P-O fit and OCB.

CONCLUSION

The results corroborated the hypothesised relationships upon testing in Pakistan’s banking sector context. The existence of a significantly favourable association among the studied variables was established. It can be deduced that values congruence plays a significant role in fostering citizenship behaviours and the influence is more prolific if employees feel affectively committed. Therefore, the perception of congruence between employees’ personal values and those of their employing organizations is more likely to elicit higher commitment levels; ultimately nurturing citizenship behaviours; whereas, incongruent pattern of values may have an adverse impact upon the employees’ level of commitment as well as their predisposition to indulge in and exhibit extra role (citizenship) behaviours.

THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

Comprehensively, the current study enhances the spectrum of knowledge by rendering evidence through empirical testing from distinct cultural settings, and recognises the significance of personal values of employees in assisting the comprehension and explanation of favourable attitudinal and behavioural outcomes. From the perspective of social exchange theory, it can be deduced that perceptions of congruence amidst the personal and organisational values influence the employees’ propensity to exhibit OCBs; indirectly, through emotionally instigated social exchange relationships. Concurrently, social identity theory, lends credence to the deduction that employees are inclined towards exhibiting higher work environment adjustments; alongside superior adaptation to job requirements, upon perceptions of a good fit with their organisations, ultimately instilling an improved sense of identification with their
employing organisations, leading to the fostering of citizenship behaviours. The social identity theory is the personification of an employee’s inspiration to be recognised while being identified with his/her organisation.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Management theories hold organisational success to be dependent upon the quality of human resources (HR) i.e., the people striving for the organisational objectives collectively; therefore, the institution of effective recruitment processes across organisations is imperative in order to be able to recruit, on-board and retain citizens. For this reason, due consideration may be accorded to behavioural interviews aimed at deciphering the applicants’ values so as to attain a better insight into the congruence amidst the individuals’ values and the organisational values. The relative significance of affective commitment for citizenship behaviours exhibited by organisationally fit employees is further accentuated by the instant study. Therefore, management must ensure adequate capacity building programs, so as to provide requisite feedback while reassuring the employees of their competencies. Organisations ought to revisit their HR policies periodically; while implementing robust HRM practices which can effectively foster citizenship behaviours.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The current study was conducted in a cross-sectional time horizon driven by the time and resource constraints. Future researchers may adopt a longitudinal design in order to be able to observe behavioural changes that may occur over time. Secondly, self-reported measures were utilised for the instant study that could have made way for common method bias issues. Kristof-Brown et al. (2016) have proposed that citizenship behaviours research necessitates the reporting of OCBs by others, particularly, the supervisors or managers for it to be consistent and influential vis-à-vis contemporary management practice. Moreover, the analyses for the instant study were conducted at the individual level. Podsakoff et al. (2014) have proposed that OCBs research with regard to P-E fit dimensions needs to move above individual level to group level of analysis in order to provide an accurate explanation of the mechanisms influencing the engagement in extra-role behaviours, if citizenship behaviours are volitional at all rather than being driven by in-group compulsions.
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APPENDIX-I - REGRESSION RESULTS – PROCESS MACRO [MODEL-4]

Run MATRIX procedure:

******************* PROCES Procedure for SPSS Release 2.16.3 ********************

Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D.  www.afhayes.com

Model = 4
Y = OCB
X = POF
M = AC

Sample size
290

Outcome: AC

Model Summary

\[ R \quad R^2 \quad MSB \quad F \quad df1 \quad df2 \quad p \]
\[ .6156 \quad .3790 \quad .8726 \quad 175.772 \quad 1.000 \quad 288 \quad .000 \]

Model

coef \quad se \quad t \quad p \quad LCLCI \quad UCLCI
constant \quad 2.5612 \quad .1427 \quad 17.9532 \quad .000 \quad 2.2804 \quad 2.8420
POF \quad .4518 \quad .0341 \quad 13.2579 \quad .000 \quad .3847 \quad .5189

Outcome: OCB

Model Summary

\[ R \quad R^2 \quad MSB \quad F \quad df1 \quad df2 \quad p \]
\[ .4728 \quad .2236 \quad .5628 \quad 41.3159 \quad 2.000 \quad 287 \quad .000 \]

Model

coef \quad se \quad t \quad p \quad LCLCI \quad UCLCI
constant \quad 3.8982 \quad .1668 \quad 23.3719 \quad .000 \quad 3.5699 \quad 4.2264
AC \quad .2351 \quad .0473 \quad 4.9683 \quad .000 \quad .1420 \quad .3283
POF \quad .1021 \quad .0347 \quad 2.9401 \quad .0035 \quad .0338 \quad .1705

*********************** TOTAL EFFECT MODEL **********************

Outcome: OCB

Model Summary

\[ R \quad R^2 \quad MSB \quad F \quad df1 \quad df2 \quad p \]
\[ .1995 \quad .1648 \quad .6341 \quad 53.8443 \quad 1.000 \quad 288 \quad .000 \]

Model

coef \quad se \quad t \quad p \quad LCLCI \quad UCLCI
constant \quad 4.5004 \quad .1192 \quad 37.7574 \quad .000 \quad 4.2658 \quad 4.7349
POF \quad .7083 \quad .0285 \quad 7.3174 \quad .000 \quad .5123 \quad .8644
**TOTAL, DIRECT, AND INDIRECT EFFECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LL_CI</th>
<th>UL_CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X on Y</td>
<td>.2083</td>
<td>.0285</td>
<td>7.3174</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DIRECT EFFECT OF X ON Y**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LL_CI</th>
<th>UL_CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X on Y</td>
<td>.1021</td>
<td>.0547</td>
<td>2.9491</td>
<td>.0035</td>
<td>.0338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDIRECT EFFECT OF X ON Y**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>.1062</td>
<td>.0231</td>
<td>.0625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTIALLY STANDARDIZED INDIRECT EFFECT OF X ON Y**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>.1282</td>
<td>.0980</td>
<td>.0786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPLETELY STANDARDIZED INDIRECT EFFECT OF X ON Y**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>.2019</td>
<td>.0452</td>
<td>.1153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIO OF INDIRECT TO TOTAL EFFECT OF X ON Y**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>.5099</td>
<td>.1387</td>
<td>.2142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIO OF INDIRECT TO DIRECT EFFECT OF X ON Y**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1.0403</td>
<td>114.4041</td>
<td>.3673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**R-SQUARED MEDIATION EFFECT SIZE (R-sq_med)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>.1334</td>
<td>.0292</td>
<td>.0789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NORMAL THEORY TESTS FOR INDIRECT EFFECT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>.1062</td>
<td>.0229</td>
<td>4.6408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS NOTES AND WARNINGS**

- **Number of bootstrap samples for bias corrected bootstrap confidence intervals:** 5000
- **Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output:** 95.00

**Note:** Kappa-squared is disabled from output as of version 2.16.