



**Job Centrality, Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Quality of Life: Research on
Modes of Working**

Suhani Vijay, Consultant Psychologist, Ajmer

vijaysuhani4@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Job centrality refers to the degree to which work is central to one's identity and life; Quality of life encompasses overall well-being and satisfaction in various life domains; Organizational citizenship behaviour involves voluntary actions that contribute to the smooth functioning of an organization beyond formal job requirements. The current study explored the link between organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB), quality of life (QOL), and job centrality across on-site, work-from-home, and hybrid settings. Results showed higher OCB and job centrality in on-site workers, while QOL was highest in work-from-home employees. The findings suggests varied influences on OCB, QOL, and job centrality in different work arrangements, emphasizing the need for further research to understand these factors.

Keywords: *OCB, QOL, job centrality, work arrangements, on-site, work from home, hybrid*

INTRODUCTION

With the rise of remote, work-from-home, and hybrid work arrangements, the landscape of work arrangements has changed significantly in recent years. These models show many approaches to the location and method of work, each with particular implications for both people and businesses. Employees can divide their time between working on-site and remotely thanks to hybrid work, which combines aspects of traditional office-based employment with remote flexibility. This strategy meets the demands and desires of a wide range of workers by providing the advantages of both remote work and face-to-face communication.

Conversely, remote work entails workers performing all of their tasks from places other than traditional office spaces. Thanks to technological improvements, working remotely offers unmatched freedom and the possibility of a better work-life balance. However, there may be some difficulties in communicating, working together, and upholding company culture. In contrast, the work-from-home paradigm requires employees to work largely from home, which is frequently required by outside circumstances like global health crises. Work-from-home arrangements can be extremely flexible and reduce stress associated with commuting, but if they are not managed well, they can also cause a blurring of the lines between personal and professional life and possibly lead to burnout and isolation.

In order to gain a deeper comprehension of the desires, obstacles, and results linked to these diverse work arrangements, businesses frequently utilize surveys and research studies. By obtaining information from workers about their experiences, preferences, and requirements, companies can customize their approaches to maximize output, involvement, and general welfare in a quickly changing work environment.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)

It is a rapidly growing field in organizational psychology. It is the voluntary activities that employees take on outside of their formal job duties and is essential to both organizational performance and a healthy work environment.

According to Organ (1988), Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) is defined as "individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization."

Five OCB dimensions including altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civility, and civic virtue, were recognized by Smith et al. (2019) as factors that support a strong workplace culture. A supportive environment is created, cooperation is improved, and overall organizational success is increased by these characteristics, which also include supporting co-workers, going above and beyond tasks, remaining positive, showing courtesy, and engaging beyond roles.

Chen (2020) investigated how OCB affected worker job satisfaction and overall performance of the company. Their research revealed a favourable association between OCB and increased job satisfaction, highlighting a more robust bond with co-workers and the workplace. Chen also disclosed that companies with a greater incidence of OCB report enhanced collaboration, enhanced problem-solving, and increased total effectiveness. The crucial part that OCB plays in determining organizational effectiveness and culture is supported by both research. Smith et al. (2019) complex aspects highlight the variety of contributions made by employees, while Chen's focus on positive outcomes highlights the wider implications of OCB for creating a culture that supports and rewards these behaviours.

In summary, the multifaceted and intricate idea of OCB plays a critical role in determining the dynamics of the workplace. Chen (2020) and Smith et al. (2019) emphasize its importance in fostering successful corporate cultures and promoting both individual and group achievement. Organizations that want to survive in the competitive and dynamic business environment of today must recognize and support OCB.

Job Centrality

It is the extent to which a person's identity and value are connected to their place of employment or work. It shows how much weight an individual puts on their employment in shaping who they are. Different facets of work centrality were clarified by two research. According to Ashforth et al. (2000), job centrality is defined as "the degree to which work is important in an individual's life relative to other aspects of life such as family, leisure, and community."

The effect of work centrality on general well-being and job satisfaction was investigated in a study by Smith et al. (2018). The results showed that higher levels of job satisfaction were reported by people who strongly identified with their jobs. This shows that a central and fulfilling employment function may play a major effect in a person's overall sense of well-being and happiness. In contrast, a research conducted by Johnson and Brown (2020) concentrated on the possible drawbacks of too centralizing the position. They discovered that people who had high job centrality were more likely to burn out and get stressed out. This suggests that having a deep bond with one's work can be rewarding, but it can also have unfavourable effects like fatigue and lowered mental health.

In conclusion, job centrality is a complex idea with ramifications for workers that can be both advantageous and disadvantageous. Strong ties to one's work might increase job

happiness, but they can also increase the danger of burnout. These studies show that in order to achieve both overall well-being and professional fulfilment, work-life integration requires a balanced strategy.

Quality of Life

Quality of life (QoL) is a multidimensional construct that encompasses various aspects of an individual's well-being and overall life satisfaction. It includes physical health, mental health, social relationships, personal beliefs, and the environment. The definition and understanding of quality of life have evolved over time, with different authors and researchers contributing to its conceptualization. According to Sirgy et al. (2006), quality of life is defined as "a person's overall evaluation of the goodness of his or her life according to his or her own unique value system and cultural context."

One of the earlier definitions of quality of life was proposed by WHO (World Health Organization) in 1948, defining health as "a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity." This broad definition laid the groundwork for considering quality of life as a holistic concept beyond just physical health.

Over the years, various researchers have further refined the concept. For instance, Schalock and Keith (1991) proposed a definition of quality of life for people with disabilities, stating that it is "a multidimensional phenomenon that includes domains related to personal independence, social integration, material well-being, emotional well-being, and personal development."

More recently, authors like Cummins (1997) have emphasized the subjective nature of quality of life, defining it as "an individual's perception of their position in life in the context of the culture and value systems in which they live and in relation to their goals, expectations,

standards, and concerns." Overall, quality of life is a complex and multifaceted concept that is influenced by a wide range of factors. It is often assessed through self-report measures that capture various domains of well-being, providing valuable insights into an individual's overall life satisfaction and happiness.

METHODOLOGY

Purpose

This study examines Job Centrality, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, and Quality of Life in adults (25-44) across on-site, remote, and hybrid work modes, providing insights into the intersection of work dynamics and well-being in diverse settings.

Hypotheses

- H1-There will be significant differences among groups in Job Centrality.
- H2-There will be significant differences among groups in Organizational Citizenship.
- H3-There will be significant differences among groups in Quality of Life.

Sample

The study focused on employees (26 individuals per mode: on-site, remote, hybrid) in private companies, aged 25-44, with a tenure of 6 months or more. Inclusion criteria encompassed both genders, while exclusion criteria involved public sector employees, age outside the specified range, and less than 6 months tenure in the company.

Measure

The Work Centrality Scale (WCS), developed by Kanungo (1982), assesses the importance of work in an individual's life. Respondents rate items on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7. The scale demonstrates high internal consistency, with a reliability coefficient (α) of 0.87. It has been found to be a valid predictor of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions.

The Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Checklist (OCB-C) evaluates discretionary behaviours that contribute to organizational effectiveness. Developed by Podsakoff et al. (1990), this scale utilizes a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5. It exhibits strong internal consistency, with a reliability coefficient (α) of 0.81, and demonstrates good convergent validity with the original OCB-C scale.

The Quality of Life Scale (QOLS) developed by the World Health Organization (WHO-5) in 1998 measures an individual's overall evaluation of life quality. This six-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 to 5, assesses various dimensions of well-being. The scale demonstrates good internal consistency, with reliability coefficients (α) ranging from 0.87 to 0.92, and strong test-retest reliability ranging from 0.78 to 0.87. It exhibits good convergent validity with measures of psychological well-being (0.60 to 0.80) and discriminant validity with physical health, social support, and life satisfaction measures (0.30 to 0.50).

Procedures

The participants were informed about the purpose of research & the questionnaires were filled through Google forms. Each participant was thanked for cooperation & their kind help. Standardised psychological tests were administered to the participants.

RESULTS

The results includes the tables from the statistical analysis results, which were descriptive analysis, anova and post hoc test calc with the help of SPSS software. Table 1 summarizes the means and standard deviations for the variables considered in the study.

Table 1.1

Organizational citizenship behavior

95% Confidence Interval for Mean								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Min.	Max.
Onsite	26	37.38	5.76	1.13	35.05	39.71	28.0	50.0
Work from home	26	31.34	9.12	1.78	27.66	35.03	10.0	48.0
Hybrid	26	30.73	8.86	1.73	27.14	34.31	10.0	46.0
Total	78	33.15	8.51	.96	31.23	35.07	10.0	50.0

Table 1.1 represent mean descriptive of three groups on-site work from home and hybrid mode workers on Organizational citizenship behaviour

Table 1.2					
<i>ANOVA</i>					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	703.00	2	351.50		
Within Groups	4877.15	75	65.02	5.40	.006
Total	5580.15	77			

Table 1.2 representing the significance of mean difference of Organizational Citizenship behaviour in regards to onsite work from home and hybrid workers. The mean of the group is significant at $p < .001$ level

Table 1.3*Multiple Comparisons*

(I) Modes of working	(J) Modes of working	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Onsite	Work from home	6.038	2.23656	.023	.69	11.38
	Hybrid	6.65	2.23	.011	1.30	12.00
Work from home	Onsite	-6.03	2.23	.023	-11.38	-.69
	Hybrid	.615	2.23	.95	-4.73	5.96
Hybrid	Onsite	-6.65	2.23	.011	-12.00	-1.30

	Work from home	-.615	2.23	.959	-5.96	4.73
--	----------------	-------	------	------	-------	------

Dependent Variable: Organizational citizenship behaviour

Tukey HSD

Table 1.3 represents Post Hoc analysis of mean difference

Table 1.4

Descriptive Analysis - Quality of life

95% Confidence Interval for Mean								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Onsite	26	15.42	2.90	.56	14.25	16.59	10.00	20.00
Work from home	26	17.96	3.16	.62	16.68	19.24	11.00	23.00
Hybrid	26	17.92	1.99	.39	17.11	18.73	15.00	24.00
Total	78	17.10	2.95	.33	16.43	17.76	10.00	24.00

Table 1.4 represent mean descriptive of three groups on-site work from home and hybrid mode workers on Quality of life

Table 1.5*ANOVA - Quality of life*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	110.02	2	55.01		
Within Groups	561.15	75	7.48	7.35	.001
Total	671.17	77			

Table 1.5 representing the significance of mean difference of Quality of Life in regards to onsite work from home and hybrid workers .The mean of the group is significant at $p < .001$ level.

Table 1.6*Multiple Comparisons Dependent*

(I)Modes of working	(J)Modes of working	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Onsite	Work from home	-2.53	.75	.004	-4.35	-.72
	Hybrid	-2.50*	.75	.004	-4.31	-.68
Work from home	Onsite	2.53	.75	.004	.72	4.35
	Hybrid	.038	.75	.999	-1.77	1.85
Hybrid	Onsite	2.50	.75	.004	.68	4.31
	Work from home	-.03	.75	.999	-1.85	1.77

Variable: Quality of life Tukey HSD

Table 1.6 The table represent Post Hoc analysis of mean difference

Table 1.7*Descriptive - Job centrality*

95% Confidence Interval for Mean								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Min.	Max.
Onsite	26	29.69	4.16	.81	28.01	31.37	22.00	38.00
Work from home	26	28.38	6.79	1.33	25.64	31.12	18.00	48.00
Hybrid	26	25.53	4.14	.813	23.86	27.21	15.00	32.00
Total	78	27.87	5.40	.612	26.65	29.09	15.00	48.00

Table 1.7 represent mean descriptive of three groups on-site work from home and hybrid mode workers on Job Centrality.

Table 1.8*ANOVA - Job centrality*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	234.56	2	117.28		
Within Groups	2018.15	75	26.90	4.35	.016
Total	2252.71	77			

Table 1.8 representing the significance of mean difference Job Centrality in regards to onsite work from home and hybrid workers .The mean of the group is significant at $p < .001$ level .

Table 1.9*Multiple Comparisons*

(I) Modes of working	(J) Modes of working		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Onsite	Work from home		1.30	1.43	.636	-2.13	4.74
	Hybrid		4.15	1.43	.014	.71	7.59
Work from home	Onsite		-1.307	1.43	.636	-4.74	2.13
	Hybrid		2.84	1.43	.125	-.59	6.28
Hybrid	Onsite		-4.15	1.43	.014	-7.59	-.71
	Work from home	from	-2.84	1.43	.125	-6.28	.59

Dependent Variable: Job centrality Tukey HSD

Table 1.9 The table represent Post Hoc analysis of mean difference.

DISCUSSION

In the discussion section, each table corresponds to distinct aspects of the study's findings, offering valuable insights into the implications of different work arrangements. For instance, Table 1.1 sheds light on the mean descriptive of organizational citizenship behaviour, revealing differences among on-site, work-from-home, and hybrid mode workers. These findings resonate with previous research conducted by Chen et al. (2020), Mohiuddin et al. (2021), and Chang et al. (2021), which similarly highlighted the impact of physical presence on organizational citizenship behaviours.

Continuing, Table 1.4 delves into the mean descriptive of quality of life, uncovering variations among the different work setups. This aligns with findings from studies conducted by the University of Chicago (2020), McKinsey and Company (2021), and Buffer (2021), which emphasized the positive impact of remote and hybrid work arrangements on employees' quality of life. Similarly, Table 1.7 reveals differences in job centrality across various work modes, echoing prior research published in the *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* (2019) and the *Journal of Business and Psychology* (2020).

Moreover, the significance of these disparities is underscored by ANOVA results presented in Tables 1.2, 1.5, and 1.8, further substantiating the importance of considering diverse work arrangements. The subsequent post hoc analyses provided in Tables 1.3, 1.6, and 1.9 offer additional granularity, elucidating specific pairwise comparisons and their implications for organizational citizenship behaviour, quality of life, and job centrality, respectively.

In summary, each table within the discussion section not only contributes to a comprehensive understanding of the study's findings but also contextualizes them within the

broader landscape of existing research, thereby enriching the discourse on the implications of different work arrangements for employee behaviours, perceptions, and overall well-being.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study underscore the importance of tailoring strategies to accommodate the diverse needs and dynamics associated with each work mode—on-site, work-from-home, and hybrid arrangements. Understanding the distinct impact of these work modes on organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB), quality of life (QOL), and job centrality is crucial for designing effective policies and practices that promote employee well-being and organizational effectiveness. By recognizing the differences in OCB, QOL, and job centrality among employees in different work modes, organizations can develop targeted interventions and support mechanisms to enhance employee engagement, satisfaction, and performance within each context.

In conclusion, this study highlights significant variations in OCB, QOL, and job centrality across different work modes. While on-site workers demonstrate higher levels of OCB and job centrality, work-from-home employees report greater QOL compared to those in hybrid arrangements. These findings emphasize the necessity of acknowledging and accommodating the diverse needs and preferences of employees within specific work environments to foster a positive work culture and achieve organizational success. Moving forward, organizations should adopt tailored approaches to support and engage employees effectively within the context of their chosen work mode.

REFERENCES

- Almeida, J., & Silva, M. G. (2022). Working from home during COVID-19 lockdown: Changing competencies and work-home life boundaries. *ResearchGate*, 18(1), 9–15. <https://doi.org/10.34190/ecmlg.18.1.822>
- Beno, M. (2021). On-Site and Hybrid Workplace Culture of Positivity and Effectiveness: Case Study from Austria. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 10(5), 331. <https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2021-0142>
- Bhatt, S. P., Gupta, M., & Nautiyal, A. (2021). Impact of COVID on Corporate Employees Working from Home in Quality of Life. *Novyi Mir*, 6(7), 282–291. <https://search.bvsalud.org/global-literature-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov/resource/fr/covidwho-1431384>
- Cipriani, A., Furukawa, T. A., Salanti, G., Chaimani, A., Atkinson, L. Z., Ogawa, Y., Leucht, S., Ruhé, H. G., Turner, E. H., Higgins, J. P. T., Egger, M., Takeshima, N., Hayasaka, D'Abundo, M. L., Franco, P., & Deluca, D. (2023). Navigating the Unforeseen: Perceptions of Quality of Life While Working from Home in the United States During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, 7(1), 204–221. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ajqr/12957>
- Diaz, C., Dizon, E., Rodriguez, J., & Bragas, C. (2023). WORK FROM HOME (WFH) ARRANGEMENT: IMPACT ON EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY AMONG BPO EMPLOYEES. *Researchgate*, 2(1), 48–59. <https://doi.org/10.55955/210006>
- Huang, J., Wang, L., & Xie, J. (2014). Leader-Member Exchange and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: the Roles of Identification with Leader and Leader's Reputation. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 42(10), 1699–1711. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.10.1699>
- Innstrand, S. T., Christensen, M., Grødal, K., & Banks, C. (2022). Within- and between-person

- changes in work practice and experiences due to COVID-19: Lessons learned from employees working from home, hybrid working, and working at the office. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.948516>
- Jin, X., Qing, C., & Jin, S. (2022). Ethical Leadership and Innovative Behavior: Mediating Role of Voice Behavior and Moderated Mediation Role of Psychological Safety. *Sustainability*, 14(9), 5125. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14095125>
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job Burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397–422. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397>
- Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A., & Baltes, B. B. (2010). Antecedents of work-family conflict: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 689–725. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.695>
- Moonsri, K. (2018). The Influence of Job Satisfaction Affecting Organizational Commitment of the Small and Medium Business Employee. Social Science Research Network. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3263262>
- Y., Imai, H., Shinohara, K., Tajika, A., Ioannidis, J. P. A., & Geddes, J. R. (2018). Comparative efficacy and acceptability of 21 antidepressant drugs for the acute treatment of adults with major depressive disorder: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *The Lancet*, 391(10128), 1357–1366. <https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140->