

The Influence Of Morality On Employees Job Performance

M.Ramarajan*¹, Dr. S.Saravana Kumar²

¹Ph.D Research Scholar Dept. Of Business Administration

E-Mail: Ramarajan.M6960@Gmail.Com Roll No: 1911130094

²Research Supervisors Assistant Professor Dept. Of Business Administration Annamalai University. E-Mail: Sensara79@Gmail.Com

Hardworking behaviour, one of the significant dimensions of work ethic, is among the most anticipated behaviours of employees working at all organizations. However, the research on the relation of hardworking with other variables is limited. In this study, it was intended to examine the influence of morality and religiosity on employees' hardworking behaviours. For this purpose, the data were collected from the employees working in manufacturing, service organizations located in Chennai, Tamil Nadu. Findings of this research indicate that morality and religiosity are factors that both have positive impact on hardworking behaviour. In addition, it was found out that hardworking, religiosity and morality differs according to gender, marital status and education level of participants. It is suggested that this study. The results of the analysis show that moral leadership is consistently positively related to employee performance through mediation such as employee involvement and organizational citizenship behavior.

Keywords: Moral, Ethical Leadership, Employee Performance, Human Resource Management.

INTRODUCTION

The world is facing challenges and increasing demands for better delivery of public services, hence, the manufacturing and service sector plays a significant role. The Protestant Work Ethic also known as the Puritan work ethic or just "work ethic" is based on the necessity for hard work, perfection and the virtue of labor. Protestant Work Ethic is said to represent the degree to which individuals place work at or near the center of their lives. Research on Protestant Work Ethic has a long history; its' roots depend on the work of Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. This study had been an influential part of the sociology literature for just over 100 years. While Weber(1992) is considered by most to be a sociologist, his prolific works in economics specifically addressing questions related to the impact of religious values and culture on the advent and evolution of economic systems, places him at the confluence of economics and sociology, a field that Weber described as social economics. Developed from this literature, Protestant Work Ethic and its effects on the organizational outcomes got the attention of many researchers and developed to be an important field of study.

Protestant Work Ethic emphasizes necessity of constant labor and diligent work in order to attain grace and salvation. Individuals with a high work ethic tend to work very hard and seek to be as diligent as possible in all aspects of their careers; they will therefore be very productive workers. Protestant Work Ethic adherents clearly regard hard work as meaningful,

worthwhile and rewarding. People without a strong work ethic, on the other hand, will possibly be lazy, unethical and suffer from a weakness of character. When considered at the macro level, it is anticipated that an absence of hard work will result in social problem.

It seems that the Protestant Work Ethic construct as it is operationalized today seems to be different from what Weber(1992) proposed earlier. Recently, Miller, Woehr and Hudspeth (2002) presented a historical and conceptual review of the ‘work ethic’ construct. Drawing on the large body of literature stemming from Weber’s original work, they posit that work ethic is not a single unitary construct but a constellation of attitudes and beliefs pertaining to work behavior. They suggest that work ethic: (a) is multidimensional, (b) pertains to work and work-related activity in general, not specific to any particular job (yet may generalize to domains other than work - school, hobbies, etc.), (c) is learned, (d) refers to attitudes and beliefs, (e) is a motivational construct reflected in behavior, and (f) is secular, not necessarily tied to any one set of religious beliefs.

Based on previous literature as well as original empirical research, Miller et al. (2002) identify seven dimensions that they argue to comprise the work ethic construct. These dimensions are centrality of work, self-reliance, hard work, leisure, morality/ethics, delay of gratification, and wasted time. The many scales that attempt to measure Protestant Work Ethic seem to be tapping largely into one main dimension, which is commitment to hard work”. This formed the motivation of this study. Apart from the working life, hardworking is also emphasized mostly in Turkish social life. It can be said that, one of the most important dimensions of Turkish culture is hardworking, which is expected to reflect to working life. Therefore, hardworking behavior emerges as an important area of study. In this study, since morality and religiosity variables were thought to be the most important variables to affect the hardworking behavior; it was concentrated on the relation of morality and religiosity with the hardworking behavior.

Employees must be equipped with the right values and work behavior considering the importance of the organization’s strategic direction and financial capital to support the implementation of the vision and mission. Work ethics of employees are given priority because they can affect the effectiveness and performance of the organization. This is proven by many studies like that of Caelian (2021), and Banister (2017). All these researches suggest that management needs to establish policies and practices that guide the employee’s work behavior. Failing to inculcate the right work values in the employees can greatly affect the organization’s productivity and performance.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of study are to measure the Influence of morality on employees Job Performance. more specifically this research has four objectives:

- To explore the influence of integrity on employee’s job performance
- To explore the influence of responsibility on employee’s job performance
- To explore the effect of equality on employee’s job performance
- To explore the effect of self-discipline on employee’s job performance.

Literature Review

Sunanda (2018), emphasizes where ethics refers to the principles that define behavior as true, good and proper. Such principles do not always determine a single "moral" action, but provide a means of evaluating and deciding among competing options. Values involve ethics when they relate to beliefs about what is right and wrong. Ethics is one of the most critical problems in organizations and especially in the management of human resources. A good ethical culture in an organization will provide direction and guidance in various areas to build employees who are united, harmonious and ethical shows four areas where ethics are usually conceptualized: Actions, actions (right, wrong, permissive), Consequences (good, bad, indifferent), Character (virtuous, malignant) and Motives (good intentions, intentions evil).

Sapada, Modding, Gani, and Nujum (2017), work ethic is employees who have a high commitment to the organization and then are more likely to make changes where the changes do not have the potential to change the basic values and goals of the organization and are considered beneficial to the organization, compared with work ethic employees who are less supportive and less committed to their organizations who are more likely to make changes. Ethics are shaped by habits, cultural influences and the value system that is believed. This ethics evaluates the work both morally and normatively that is felt. Working is good and virtuous in the moral sense is an element of life that is desirable and central in the normative sense, but not necessarily in a moral sense (eg, assuming good).

Muchhal (2014), performance is important for organizations because employee performance leads to business success. Also, performance is important for individuals, because achieving tasks can be a source of satisfaction. However, several factors can affect employee performance such as equipment, physical work environment, meaningful work, standard operating procedures, rewards for good or bad systems, performance expectations, feedback on performance, in addition to the knowledge, skills and attitudes that are indispensable in self employee.

Motowidlo (1993), suggest that performance achievements can be divided into two parts, tasks and contextual performance. Task Performance. Task performance involves the effectiveness in which employees carry out activities that formally become part of their work and contribute to the organization's technical core and learn that appropriate performance refers to behaviors that maintain the broad social environment in which the technical core must function. That includes unrestricted behavior that helps organizations function.

Research and Methodology

This study will test four hypotheses using a quantitative approach in which data collection tools use a psychological scale, research respondents are employees in manufacturing and service companies in Chennai, Tamil Nadu. The data analysis technique in this study uses path analysis.

Dependent Variable

Job performance was assessed by the employees of the manufacturing and service companies in Chennai, Tamil Nadu, which consisted of six items. Examples include: The company determines the performance standards for each employee according to the nature of his work, Employees participate in work problems to improve performance, Performance

standards are periodically reviewed in order to raise/ lower them in line with work ethics etc. The Cronbach α test showed the construct had good reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.891$).

Independent Variables

Work ethics was based on assessments of employees of the manufacturing and service companies in Chennai, Tamil Nadu through four main elements: integrity, responsibility, equality and self-discipline. Integrity was assessed by the employees, which consisted of five items. Examples include: Business procedures are carried out with integrity, The company provides the necessary information to all auditors frankly, etc. The Cronbach α test showed the construct had good reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.824$). Responsibility was assessed by the employees, which consisted of five items. Examples include: Managers Authorize responsibility to employees, The employees assume the responsibility assigned to them, etc. The Cronbach α test showed the construct had good reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.791$). Equality was assessed by the employees, which consisted of five items. Examples include: Management treats all employees fairly, Business and work assignments are distributed in a fair manner to workers, etc. The Cronbach α test showed the construct had good reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.687$). Self-discipline was assessed by the employees, which consisted of five items. Examples include: The workers carry out the tasks assigned to them by self-monitoring, The tasks are accomplished by self-working teams, etc. The Cronbach test showed the construct had good reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.807$).

Correlations among Study Variables

Table 1, shows the means, standard deviations and zero-order correlation for all variables, with regard to our hypothesis based on the rationale that work ethics on employee's job performance, we found that integrity has moderate significantly and positively correlated with job performance ($r = 0.39$, $P < 0.01$). thereby more interested in increased the integrity at all employees in the companies. Also, responsibility with job performance was high significantly and positively correlated ($r = 0.48$, $P < 0.01$). Similarly, equality with job performance was high significantly and positively correlated ($r = 0.51$, $P < 0.01$). Also, self-discipline with job performance was low significant and positive correlated ($r = 0.29$, $P < 0.01$). Finally, there were significant and positive correlated between hypothesis 1 with hypothesis 2, 3 and 4 ($r > 0.38$, $P < 0.01$).

Table1: Means, standard deviations and correlations

Variables	Mean	Std.	1	2	3	4	5
Integrity	4.34	0.61	--				
Responsibility	4.17	0.73	0.47**	--			
Equality	3.92	0.62	0.53**	0.41**	--		
Self-discipline	4.57	0.59	0.38**	0.52**	0.48*	--	
Job performance	3.98	0.78	0.39**	0.48**	0.51**	0.29**	--
n=92. *P<0.05; **P<0.01 (two-tailed test)							

To test the convergent validity, we calculated composite reliability of the variables, A high value of composite reliability, ranging from (0.29 to 0.52) that suggests reasonable convergent validity of the variables, while the mean, standard

deviation and reliability of variables are shown in Table 1. The higher mean was (4.57) for hypothesis (4). While the lower mean (3.92) for hypothesis (3).

ANOVA and Linear Regression Analysis

In order to examine the study hypotheses and reach conclusions and recommendations that achieve the goals of this study, we used the appropriate statistical methods to test the hypotheses, such as ANOVA and linear regression analysis, to test the main hypothesis and sub-hypotheses using SPSS (Bougie and Sekaran, 2016). Table 2 shows the results of ANOVA and linear regression analysis of the effect of work ethics on employee job performance.

Table 2: The results of ANOVA and linear regression analysis of the effect of work ethics on employee job performance

Independent variables	Model summary		F	ANOVA DF	Sig. F	B	Coefficients		Sig. t
	R	R ²					SD	t	
Integrity	0.834	0.696	739.147	1	0.000	0.819	0.017	25.781	0.000
Responsibility	0.798	0.637	687.357	1	0.000	0.769	0.029	22.764	0.000
Equality	0.897	0.805	759.475	1	0.000	0.834	0.031	26.783	0.000
Self-discipline	0.687	0.472	578.542	1	0.000	0.614	0.027	17.517	0.000

From Table 2, the results indicate that there is a statistically significant effect of integrity on job performance, where the correlation coefficient ($R = 0.834$), which indicates a statistically significant correlation relationship between the independent variable (integrity) and the dependent variable (job performance). Moreover, it has been shown that the value of the determining coefficient ($R^2 = 0.696$) indicates that the visionary leadership has explained 69.6% of the variation in job performance, while the rest is due to other variables that were not included in this model. Also, it can be seen that the variable ($F = 739.147$) at ($\text{sig.} = 0.000$), this confirms the significance of the regression at the significance level ($\alpha < 0.05$). Moreover, the table shows that ($B = 0.819$) and ($t = 25.781$) at ($\text{sig.} = 0.000$) for integrity, which indicates that the effect of this dimension is significant and this means that an increase in integrity by one unit leads to increase in job performance by (0.819).

This result agrees with (Palanski and Yammarino, 2011) study that indicates that leader behavioural integrity was not directly related to follower job performance, but was related indirectly via trust in the leader and follower satisfaction with the leader.

Also, the results indicate that there is a statistically significant effect of responsibility on job performance, where the correlation coefficient ($R = 0.798$), which indicates a statistically significant correlation relationship between the independent variable (responsibility) and the dependent variable (job performance). Moreover, it has been shown that the value of the determining coefficient ($R^2 = 0.637$) indicates that the responsibility has explained 63.7% of the variation in job performance, while the rest is due to other variables

that were not included in this model. Also, it can be seen that the variable ($F = 687.357$) at ($\text{sig.} = 0.000$), this confirms the significance of the regression at the significance level ($\alpha < 0.05$). Moreover, the table shows that ($B = 0.769$) and ($t = 22.764$) at ($\text{sig.} = 0.000$) for responsibility, which indicates that the effect of this dimension is significant and this means that an increase in responsibility by one unit leads to increase in job performance by (0.769). This results agrees with (Yang and Kim, 2018) study which suggest that corporate social responsibility activities not only enhanced the performance of the members, but also confirmed the importance of the authentic leadership. Moreover, (Doorewaard et al., 2002) shows that shared- responsibility teams are thought to contribute more substantially to team performance. Also, the results indicate that there is a statistically significant effect of equality on job performance, where the correlation coefficient ($R = 0.897$), which indicates a statistically significant correlation relationship between the independent variable (equality) and the dependent variable (job performance). Moreover, it has been shown that the value of the determining coefficient ($R^2 = 0.805$) indicates that the equality has explained 80.5% of the variation in job performance, while the rest is due to other variables that were not included in this model. Also, it can be seen that the variable ($F = 759.475$) at ($\text{sig.} = 0.000$), this confirms the significance of the regression at the significance level ($\alpha < 0.05$). Moreover, the table shows that ($B = 0.834$) and ($t = 26.783$) at ($\text{sig.} = 0.000$) for equality, which indicates that the effect of this dimension is significant and this means that an increase in equality by one unit leads to increase in job performance by (0.834). This result agrees with (Armstrong et al., 2010) study which confirms a positive business performance and finds specifically that diversity and equality management system practices are positively associated with higher labor productivity and workforce innovation and lower voluntary employee turnover. Moreover, (Smith et al., 2017) study shows that male subordinates score higher on Problem Solving and Collaboration across Departments, while female subordinates score higher on the variable Drive to Learn.

Finally, the results indicate that there is a statistically significant effect of self-discipline on job performance, where the correlation coefficient ($R = 0.687$), which indicates a statistically significant correlation relationship between the independent variable (self-discipline) and the dependent variable (job performance). Moreover, it has been shown that the value of the determining coefficient ($R^2 = 0.472$) indicates that the self-discipline has explained 47.2% of the variation in job performance, while the rest is due to other variables that were not included in this model. Also, it can be seen that the variable ($F = 578.542$) at ($\text{sig.} = 0.000$), this confirms the significance of the regression at the significance level ($\alpha < 0.05$). Moreover, the table shows that ($B = 0.614$) and ($t = 17.517$) at ($\text{sig.} = 0.000$) for self-discipline, which indicates that the effect of this dimension is significant and this means that an increase in self-discipline by one unit leads to increase in job performance by (0.614). This result agrees with (Luo et al., 2008) study that confirm a positive effect of self-discipline on job performance.

Conclusions

The role of adversity quotient can provide a good and positive contribution for any organization that wants to continue to develop and pay particular attention to the development of each of its employees. Also for practitioners in the field of industrial psychology and organizations. Certainly every organization wants to have resources that maximize performance by being able to balance itself in facing every problem that exists, both in person and professionally.

Our study has been conducted with the influence of international work ethics on employee's job performance in manufacturing and service companies in Chennai. First, our study suggests that morality improved employee's job performance. However, employees should be participated in work problems to improve performance.

Second, the employee's job performance is improved by the elements of work ethics(morality) (integrity, responsibility, equality and self-discipline). Moreover, the company should be provided the necessary information to all auditors frankly, the managers should be authorized responsibility to employees, managers should be treated all employees fairly, and the workers should be carried out the tasks assigned to them by self-monitoring.

References

1. Aldrin, N., Yunanto, K.T. (2019), Job satisfaction as a mediator for the influence of transformational leadership and organizational culture on organizational citizenship behavior. *The Open Psychology Journal*, 12(1), 126-134.
2. Aluko, M. (2003), The impact of culture on organizational performance in selected textile firms in Nigeria. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 12(2), 16.
3. Armstrong, C., Flood, P.C., Guthrie, J.P., Liu, W., MacCurtain, S., Mkamwa, T. (2010), The impact of diversity and equality management on firm performance: Beyond high performance work systems. *Human Resource Management*, 49(6), 977-998.
4. Armstrong, J.S., Overton, T.S. (1977), Estimating nonresponse bias in mail surveys. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14(3), 396-402.
5. Babin, B.J., Boles, J.S. (1998), Employee behavior in a service environment: A model and test of potential differences between men and women. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(2), 77-91.
6. Barclay, W. (1980), *Ethics in a Permissive Society*. Australia: HarperCollins.
7. Borman, W.C., Motowidlo, S.J. (1997), Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 99-109.
8. Bougie, R., Sekaran, U. (2016), *Research Methods For Business: A Skill Building*. 7th ed. United States: Wiley.
9. Cascio, W.F. (2012), Methodological issues in international HR management research. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(12), 2532-2545.
10. DeCenzo, D.A., Robbins, S.P., Verhulst, S.L. (2016), *Fundamentals of Human Resource Management*. United States: John Wiley & Sons. Doorewaard, H., Van Hootegeem, G., Huys, R. (2002), Team responsibility.
11. Miller MJ, Woehr DJ, Hudspeth N. Monography: The Meaning and Measurement of Work Ethic: Construction and Initial Validation of a Multidimensional Inventory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 2002; 60: 451–89.
12. Weber M. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Scribner's (Originally Published 1904-1905); 1958.
13. Weber M. *The Protestant Ethic and Spirit of Capitalism* (Translated by Talcott Parsons, with and introduction by Anthony Giddens. London and New York: Routledge (Originally Published 1904-1905); 1992.