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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to examine the direct effects of psychological empowerment on psychological capital, employees’ job attitudes and behaviors and the direct effects of psychological capital and employees’ job attitudes and behaviors. This study further examined the mediating role of psychological capital between psychological empowerment and employees’ job attitudes and behaviors. In addition, the study also examined the moderating role of Core-self-evaluation on the relationship between psychological empowerment and psychological capital, whereas psychological contract types (relational and transactional contract) were moderators between psychological capital and employees’ attitudes and behaviors. Longitudinal research design was used in the current study and data were collected from employees working in different telecom sector organization. The data on psychological capital, psychological empowerment and psychological contract types (relational and transactional contract) were collected at time 1, after approximately two months data on CSE, employees’ attitudes and behaviors were collected at time 2 and whereas supervisory based employees performance data was also collected at time 2. The total sample size for analysis was 411. The findings revealed that psychological empowerment had a positive effect on psychological capital, employees’ attitudes, employees’ behavior and employees’ performance. However, psychological capital were also found to be positively related to employees attitudes, employees behaviors and employees performance.
In addition, psychological capital mediated the relationship between psychological empowerment and employees satisfaction, employees commitment, employees turnover intention, counterwork productive behaviors, organization citizenship behavior and in-role performance. The result further shows that core-self-evaluation moderated the relationship between psychological empowerment and psychological capital. The results revealed that psychological contract types (Relational Contract and Transactional Contract) moderated the relationship between psychological capital and turnover intention, counterproductive work behavior and commitment of employees, whereas their as non-significant relationship of interactive effect psychological contract types (Relational Contract and Transactional Contract) and psychological capital was found with OCB, employees’ satisfaction and in-role performance.

Future direction and implication of the study are also discussed.
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Chapter No. 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background:
Organizational success is dependent upon various factors and ultimate positive results for organizational success are attributed to the employees’ struggle and efforts as well as to achieve that strong relationship needed to be established among workers. Nature of this relationship functions in two directions as contribution of employees to their organizations depends upon how much organization is oriented towards their benefit and well being. Fulfillment of various demand of employees and their legal rights, results in creating positive organizational attitudes and behaviors like satisfaction, involvement and their performance in each role emerge resulting in employees’ sincere efforts to achieve organizational objectives. The significance of these positive behaviors has been highlighted by a number of studies. For instance, positive impact of extra-role performance as well as organizational performance on individual has been empirically supported by different studies (Netemeyer et al., 1997; Organ, 1988; Barksdale and Werner, 2001), which shows that it increases productivity, product quality (Podsakoff et al., 1997), and service quality (Bell & Menguc, 2002).

On the other hand, empirical evidences also show that when organizations fail to inculcate positive attitudes and behavior in employees, they may reciprocate in the shape of negative and even counter-productive behavior like high absent rate, low commitment level, damage, destruction and stealing acts, all of which are against the organizational interest (Harper, 1990; McGurn, 1988). In these circumstances, ultimate results for organizations cause the collapse of those organizations due to the reason that organizational success is dependent on devoted long term efforts of employees and in case when organizations fail to develop good relations with employees, it results in developing work behavior which is destructive and harmful for organizations (Hollinger
& Clark, 1983; Spector & Fox, 2005). To avoid emergence of negative attitudes and to develop positive organizational behavior (POB), organizational psychologists have been advocating importance of positive psychology of individuals, which speaks about positive psychological resources. These are individuals’ strengths, capabilities and virtues that can be nourished and developed. Having satisfied individuals’ psychological needs through social and environmental factors, organizations can develop more advanced and strong psychological resources such as autonomy, sense of competence, relatedness, self-efficacy etc. that lead towards POB such as in-role performance, extra-role performance, satisfaction, commitment (Shahnawaz and Jafri, 2009; Hurter, 2008; Luthans et al, 2007; Avey et al, 2010). These psychological resources also help reduce negative emotions such as counter-work behavior and turnover intentions (Bressler, 2006; Luthans, Avolio, et al., 2007), which according to many studies cause greater damage to organizational cause.

One of these psychological needs is employees’ sense of empowerment, which when inculcated helps organizations motivate positive organizational behaviors. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) contend that positive workers outcomes are determined by the workers’ personal perceptions of empowerment i.e., psychological empowerment. Ackfeldt & Coote (2005) empirically supported that empowering employees through ensuring their participation in decision making and providing opportunities for career development motivate employees for extra-role performance. According to Thomas and Velthouse (1990) in order to develop and grow psychological empowerment, a psychological empowerment is regarded and viewed as important element. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) and Spreitzer (1995a; 1995b) explored that empowered people have a sense of impact and have influence on their work unit. According to Bogler & Somech (2004) and Rinehart & Short (1994), psychological empowered individuals tends to be more resilient,
more creative and initiative takers in their task performance. They are usually more committed and loyal to their jobs and they show more frequent organizational citizenship behavior. Usually they are having positive state of mind.

The level of psychological resources acquired by an individual and their impact on attitude and behavior may also vary from individual to individual, depending upon personality disposition. This aspect however has been found missing in current stream of research in the areas of psychological empowerment and psychological capital means how development of psychological empowerment and its impact on psychological capital varies from individual to individual. This has been attempted to explore through incorporation of a variable termed as ‘Core Self Evaluation (CSE)’. It has been introduced by Judge et al. (1997) and explained it as ultimate outcome evaluations made by individuals about their self and it is consisted of various components like their self-respect, self-efficacy, high internal locus of control and emotional stability. Core Self Evaluation attributed in shaping ones perception about the world. Perceptions impact attitudes and evoke certain behaviors (Locke, McClear, & Knight, 1996). According to cognitive social view (Mischel and Shoda, 1973), responding to a situation depends upon personality dispositions. Identifying this gap in the extant literature of psychological empowerment and psychological capital, the present study attempts to find out the role played by psychological empowerment in creating psychological capital and how this relationship varies with respect to personality disposition.

Second part of the research model deals with construct such as PsyCap and psychological contract type and their impact on individuals’ attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. PsyCap is defined as a person’s positive state of mind consisting four important components: hope, optimism, resilience and self-efficacy (Luthans et al., 2007), originated from positive organizational behavior (POB) research, which is referred as
study and use of “positive human strengths and psychological capacities” which are measurable and can be “developed and managed” which resulted in enhanced positive performance of employees in organizations (Luthans et al., 2007a). Psychological contract theory states that level of employees’ effort and contribution to achieve organizational goals is dependent to the extent that organization assumes that employees increase their efforts carried out on behalf of the organization to the degree that the organization is viewed as able to and willing in reciprocating with impersonal as well as emotional resources. In situation of having resources which are highly valued by employees from organizations, like rise in their increments and providing opportunities of training contributing to their development, they would feel highly obligated, having based on reciprocate norms, they will be helpful to assist in achieving organizational goals and objectives by developing such behavior as enhancing their role performance (Aselage, and Eisenberger, 2003). Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler (2003) in a large cross-sectional study (with 5,709 respondents) conducted in the public sector in the United Kingdom, examined influence of psychological contract fulfillment on employee commitment and citizenship behavior. Their results indicated, transactional contracts and organization citizenship behavior have negative relationship and a positive relationship was found among relational contract and organization citizenship behavior.

The impact of PsyCap and psychological contract type in generating positive attitude and behavior is viewed and supported by a number of vast studies (Peterson et. al., 2011, Luthans et. al., 2007, Chien & Lie, 2013, Norman et. al., 2010, Raja et. al., 2004 & Kiewitz et. al., 2011). However, the extant literature is silent in guiding how impact of PsyCap on individual attitudes and behavior varies with respect to psychological contract type. Identifying this gap, the present study also aims to explore the moderating impact of
psychological contract types on the relationship between PsyCap and individuals’ attitudes and behavior.

1.2 Problem Statement:

According to the theory underlying Positive Organizational Behavior (POB), in order to attain and achieve good working environment and high performance, there is a need to develop enhanced positive human strengths, capabilities and psychological capacities (Luthans et al., 2007a). The positive attitude and behavior of employees can be developed from the state-like construct-PsyCap, being originated from POB which is necessary for organizational success and improved employees performance. Research has identified different factors that yield POB. One of those important factors is Psychological empowerment which can be researched by a researcher to find that perceptions of a psychological empowerment may create positive conditions are necessary for PsyCap to grow and develop (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Moreover, following the Social Cognitive view of individuals (Mischel, 1973; Shoda & Mischel, 1993) which emphasizes upon person-situation interaction, this research is also going to explore, that individual may differ in their PsyCap profile depending upon their personality traits. This aspect has also been asserted by (Deci & Ryan, 2000), according to which attitude and behavior of individuals depend upon the situation being faced. This aspect has been addressed by incorporating the construct of Core Self Evaluation as moderator to investigate the impact of Core Self Evaluation on the relationship between psychological empowerment and PsyCap. Social exchange theory speaks that employees exert their efforts to achieve organizational objectives to the extent they perceive the organization reciprocates accordingly. “Employees who receive highly valued resources (e.g., pay raises, developmental training opportunities) would feel obligated, based on the reciprocity norm to help the organization reach its objective through such behaviors as
increased in-role and extra-role performance” (Aselage, and Eisenberger, 2003). Millward and Hopkins (1998) state that employees with relational contract are more likely to be committed to organizational goals and exhibit organization citizenship behavior more than those with transactional contract. Therefore, people with a relational contract will be more engaged in their work, and less likely to look for another job.

Having identified the overall gap in the area of psychological empowerment and psychological capital, recognizing the importance of social cognitive view and social exchange theory in the context of present research, this study tries to explore the relationship between psychological empowerment and psychological capital as well as the positive attitudinal and behavioral outcomes that can be generated through PsyCap. Besides, the study would also explore the moderating impact of Core Self Evaluation on the relationship between psychological empowerment and PsyCap as well as moderating impact of psychological contract type on the relationship of PsyCap with attitudinal and behavioral outcomes.

1.3 **Objectives of the Study:**

- To investigate the relationship of psychological empowerment with workplace attitudes (satisfaction, commitment, turnover Intension)

- To investigate the relationship of psychological empowerment with workplace behavior (in-role performance, extra-role performance, counterproductive work behavior)

- To investigate the relationship of Psychological Capital with employees’ attitudes (satisfaction, commitment and turnover Intension)
To investigate the relationship of Psychological Capital with employees’
behaviors (in role performance, extra role performance and counterproductive
work behavior).

To investigate the impact of employees’ psychological empowerment on
psychological capital

To investigate the mediating effect of psychological capital on the relationship
between psychological capital and employees’ attitude (satisfaction, commitment,
turnover Intension)

To investigate the mediating effect of psychological capital on the relationship
between psychological capital and employees’ behavior (in-role performance,
extra-role performance, counterproductive work behavior)

To investigate the moderating role of Core Self Evaluation on the relationship
between psychological empowerment and psychological capital

To explore the moderating impact of Psychological Contract Type (relational
contract and transactional contract) on the relationship between psychological
capital and employees’ attitude (satisfaction, commitment, turnover Intension)

To explore the moderating impact of Psychological Contract Type (relational
contract and transactional contract) on the relationship between psychological
capital and behavior (in-role performance, extra-role performance,
counterproductive work behavior)
1.4 Research Questions:

This study will address the following research questions:

**Question No.1:** How psychological capital is related with employees’ attitude (satisfaction, commitment, turnover Intension)?

**Question No.2:** How psychological capital is related with employees’ behavior (in-role performance, extra-role performance, counterproductive work behavior)?

**Question No.3:** How psychological empowerment is related with employees’ attitude (satisfaction, commitment and turnover Intension)?

**Question No.4:** How psychological empowerment is related with employees’ behavior (in-role performance, extra-role performance and counterproductive work behavior)?

**Question No.5:** To what extent psychological empowerment has the influence/impact on psychological capital?

**Question No.6:** To what extent core self-evaluation moderate the relationship between psychological capital and positive psychological capital of employees?

**Question No.7:** To what extent psychological contract type (relational and transactional contract) moderate the relationship between Employees’ psychological capital and employees’ behaviors (In role performance, extra role performance and counterproductive work behavior)?

**Question No.8:** To what extent psychological contract type (relational and transactional contract) moderate the relationship between Employees’ psychological capital and employees’ attitudes (satisfaction, commitment and turnover Intension)?

**Question No.9:** Whether employees’ psychological capital mediates the relationships between psychological empowerment and employees’ attitude (satisfaction, commitment and turnover Intension)?
Question No.10: Whether employees’ psychological capital mediates the relationships between psychological empowerment and employees’ behavior (in-role performance, extra-role performance and counterproductive work behavior)?

1.5 Contribution to Knowledge:

1.5.1 Contextual Contribution: According to contingency theory perspective, two factors environment and context impacts individuals’ attitude and behavior. Its demonstration may be found in organizations where certain norms and values are mutually shared and this creates organizational culture which helps in shaping organizational overall environment. Organizations that succeed in developing such a working setting which recognizes employees’ competencies and empower them with work autonomy can create value and meaning of the job for employees, which in return reciprocate the organization with positive attitudes and behavior. Context gets even more important in countries like Pakistan with collectivism orientation. People in collectivist societies work together having mutual goals, shared responsibilities and extending mutual assistance. People with this orientation may have different attitudinal and behavioral responses to organizational settings as compared to societies with individualistic orientations. Increased mutual interaction also makes them more sensitive to the feelings of each other. In such situations, utmost care is required to provide them with environment that fosters shared job’s value and meaningfulness. As beauty of collectivism is a feeling of shared success and failure, therefore, employees also require enough room to do their way to accomplish the tasks. This would provide employees position to influence others in directing their efforts towards achievement of goals. Overall, such a working environment helps organizations strengthen employees with psychological
empowerment, which further generates psychological capital, one of the factors that aspires positive attitude and behavior necessary for organizational survival and success. Keeping the contextual perspective in view, the study would contribute the research literature by highlighting significance of psychological empowerment and psychological capital in generating positive attitude and behavior in countries having collectivism cultures like Pakistan as no such study has been conducted in Pakistan.

1.5.2 Theoretical Contribution:
The present study contributes to theoretical stream of knowledge in the fields of organizational behavior by exploring the interplay between psychological empowerment, psychological capital and attitudinal as well as behavioral exhibitions by employees. By studying the impact of personality through the construct such as ‘self-core evaluation’ on the dynamics of the relationship between psychological empowerment and psychological capital, this study would further enrich the theoretical base in understanding the underlying phenomenon of the impact of psychological empowerment on psychological capital as well as moderating impact of ‘self-core evaluation’ on the relationship between psychological empowerment on psychological capital. The study further contributes to theoretical stream of knowledge by examining the impact of psychological contract types on attitudinal and behavioral responses of employees by incorporating the construct ‘psychological contract type’ as moderator between psychological capital and attitudinal (job satisfaction, employees commitment, turnover intentions) relationship as well behavioral (in role performance, extra role performance, counterproductive work behavior) consequences. The study is a novel of its form as no such research has been found in existing knowledge base.
1.5.3 Applied Contribution:
Fostering psychological empowerment and psychological capital among employees is at the core of organizational success. Organizations have to understand the positive impact of psychological empowerment, psychological capital and consequences of breach of the same on employees’ attitude and behavior. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) contend that positive workers outcomes are determined by the workers’ personal perceptions of empowerment i.e., psychological empowerment. Ackfeldt & Coote (2005) empirically supported that empowering employees through ensuring their participation in decision making and providing opportunities for career development motivate employees for extra-role performance. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) also states that in order to grow and develop PsyCap, a positive situations is created by perception of psychological empowerment. Thomas and Velhouse (1990) and Spreitzer (1995a; 1995b) explored that empowered people have a sense of impact and have influence on their work unit. According to Bogler & Somech (2004) and Rinehart & Short (1994), psychological empowered individuals tend to be more resilient, creative and take initiative in their work. These individuals tend to be more committed to and are more satisfied with their jobs, exhibit more frequent organizational citizenship behavior and having a healthier mental state. The level of psychological resources acquired by an individual and their impact on attitude and behaviour may also vary from individual to individual depending upon personality disposition as advocated through cognitive social view (Mischel and Shoda, 19730). Moreover, the reciprocal demonstration of employees’ attitude and behaviour also depends upon organizational policies as posited by advocates of social exchange theory. Having incorporated the constructs of CSE and Psychological contract type, this study would help organizations understand the significance of creating psychological empowerment and psychological capital and how these phenomenon
are influenced by personality (CSE) and organizational policies (Psychological contract type) as breach of these sentiments may result in lack of job satisfaction, loss of commitment, counterproductive work behaviour and turnover. The study would also contribute applied research by underlying importance of psychological empowerment and psychological capital in inculcating positive behaviour such as in-role performance and role performance and extra-role performance.

1.6 Significance of the Study:
Human capital is the most important resource that organizations have to mobilize and utilize to excel in the market for which organizations need positive and sound relationship with their employees. Employees also reciprocate the organizations’ well-being and concerns. In situations, where needs and demands of employees are fulfilled, positive organizational attitudes and behaviors like satisfaction, commitment, and their role performance emerge resulting in employees’ sincere efforts to achieve organizational objectives. On the other hand, empirical evidences also show that when organizations fail to inculcate positive attitudes and behavior in employees, they may reciprocate in the shape of negative and even counter-productive behavior such as damage and destruction, high absenteeism rate, act of stealing and theft considered as counter to the organizational legitimate interests (Harper, 1990; McGurn, 1988). Positive human strengths and psychological capacities, according to Positive Organizational Behavior (POB) can be developed and managed for nourishing positive workplace attitude and behavior (Luthans et al., 2007a, p. 59). Organizations have to recognize employees’ psychological capacities and competencies so that they can be motivated to exhibit positive attitude and behavior. Research has identified different factors as human psychological capacities such as psychological empowerment, psychological capital etc., that help yield positive organizational behavior. Research has been vocal on the importance of psychological...
empowerment and psychological capital in generating positive workplace attitudes (satisfaction, commitment, negative turnover intentions) and behavior (in-role performance, extra-role performance and negative counterproductive work behavior). However, the dynamics of the phenomenon needs more enriched investigation. For instance, extant literature is silent on the subject whether psychological capital can be developed through psychological empowerment or otherwise. Moreover, according to cognitive social view, attitudinal and behavioral outcomes may vary from individual to individual on the basis of personality characteristics. By incorporating CSE as moderator in the relationship between psychological empowerment and psychological capital, the present study is novel of its form and would significantly contribute to existing knowledge base. To enhance the significance of the study and enrich the underlying phenomenon with further details, nature of organizational offers in terms of monetary and non-monetary benefits have also been made part of the investigation. This has been done by incorporating psychological contract type as moderator between psychological capital and attitudinal and behavioral outcomes relationships. No such study has been reported in the extant literature. The study would help managers to take measures that may create psychological empowerment in subordinates. Psychological empowerment being the level of employees’ perceived power in workplace would attach value and meaningfulness of the job, which would help create affiliation and fitness with the job. This in turn would yield positive attitude and behavior. Employees would psychologically be empowered, which means they have autonomy and decision making space, which would help them attain performance and enhance extra-role behavior because they would own their decisions and want subordinates to implement them to achieve required performance and organizational objectives. The study by highlighting the significance of psychological capital would help managers to inculcate required level of hope, psychological strength
and capability to conceive and achieve organizational goals, competency and psychological power to pave ways in times of tough competition and work under pressure to meet organizational targets. This would make employees more satisfied and committed to organizational aim resulting in enhanced in-role and extra-role performance. The results of the study would also help managers know employees’ perception towards organizational offers in terms of short-term (transactional) and long-term (relational) benefits. The present study is also important as being conducted in developing countries like Pakistan with collectivism orientation. People in collectivism societies prefer to work collectively in teams by sharing responsibilities and extending assistance to each other. People with this orientation may have different attitudinal and behavioral responses to organizational settings as compared to societies with individualistic orientations.
2.1 Psychological Capital:
Psychological Capital (PsyCap) is attributed to a person’s positive state of mind comprising of four important components: optimism, resilience, self-efficacy and hope as explained by Luthans et al (2007) and the concept is originated from positive organizational behavior (POB) research, which as to examine and to avail the use of “psychological capacities” and influential human state which is positive and measurable, and could be “managed and developed” for better employee performance at workplace (Luthans et al., 2007a). Psychological capital has been originated from positive organizational behavior theory. It is basically a positive significant person’s mental capacity, performing work efficiently in certain situations and great deal of accomplishment and achievements. It can be positively related to the individual mental processes, his/her level of satisfaction and accomplishments. Psychological capital laid stress upon individual initiative, and point of attention is basically mental state of individuals.

For a construct to be considered as part of POB, Luthans (2002) argued that in contrast to trait-like characteristics, individuals should engage in state-like characteristics. On the basis of contextual situations, these state-like characteristics includes human moods and emotions which are flexible and inclined to change, such as happiness and pleasure, while trait-like characteristics like capabilities and level of intellect are stable and bringing change in them is difficult as explained by (Luthans, 2002; Luthans et al., 2007a). PsyCap state-like Characteristics are supported by workplace intervening factors as one result in bringing change and are economical because state transformation takes low exertion and duration comparative to traits transformation (Luthans et al., 2007a).
In past research significantly contributing to POB concepts are comprised of individuals characteristics like subjective well-being and emotional intelligence as narrated by Luthans, (2002b) and among all, those capturing attention POB researchers are self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience. All those components which can enhance, manage employees and organizational success are considered as positive human state of PsyCap (Luthans et al., 2007b). Self-efficacy refers to one’s own assurance on his abilities to perform tasks as explained by Luthans et al (2007b) adopted from work of Bandura’s (1997) work. Self-efficacy is considered as synonymous with confidence, in which five behaviors are involved: openness to challenging tasks, high self-motivation, high goal setting, perseverance through adversity and necessary effort for accomplishment of goals (Luthans et al., 2007b). Workplace self-efficacy can be supported by various ways which result in enhancing employees moral and motivate them to provide their best with such compliments as “you are going very good” or “You can do it” according to (Luthans et al. 2007b).

According to Snyder’s (1995), Hope defined is from an individual inducement to attain his goals should not be align of his own as stated by Luthans et al. 2007b. This is good way to create sense of self motivation and inspiration in creation of realistic ways and to get into where an individual desires to reach; despite of the hardships, tries to achieve the goal (Luthans & Youssef, 2004). There are different ways that contribute to workplace hope like provision of clear communication path and sort “bottom-up” decision making style as explained by Luthans et al., 2007b, which is characterized by active involvement of employees in decisions and decision making is delegated to them (Luthans et al. 2007b).

Optimism is a situation in which it is perceived that negative outcomes are resulted by situational, external and very brief sources, while internal, lasting and pervasive cause
results in positive situations (Luthans & Youssef, 2004). People with high optimism credit themselves for the positive events of life, uplifting self-respect and separate themselves from unfavorable circumstances negativity and by doing so they provide protection from sadness and state of holding responsible for and hopelessness (Luthans & Youssef, 2004). Optimism can be supported morally and ethically in workplace by participating in organizational decision making (Luthans et al. 2007b).

Resiliency includes capacity to hold and overcome “adversity, uncertainty, failure or overwhelming changes” (Luthans & Youssef, 2004). Those having characteristic of resilience are having the elasticity to face and overcome challenges and having ability of performing well even after the setbacks (Luthans & Youssef, 2004). Resiliency leads to the strong beliefs development, reality acceptance, viewing life meaningfulness and flexibility development for adaptation of substantial changes (Luthans & Youssef, 2004). Environment supporting resiliency is characterized by reducing stress in organizations which can be achieved by enhanced organizational resources as well as personal resources (Luthans, Vogelgesang, & Lester, 2006). This can be done by designing Strategies which aim at focusing and developing skills and abilities of employees, their knowledge enhancing programs like educational courses with assistance of financial aid, encouraging their participation in workshops and providing incentive to those who are self improved (Luthans et al. 2006).

Psychological capital is important structure which can be used to enhance accomplishment levels of organizations by applying it. Based on human capital and social capital theories, which treated knowledge and networking as currencies, psychological capital give emphasis to individuals’ possible selves, rather than their own selves, for example, development of individuals from “who they are” to “who they are becoming” (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007).
PsyCap is viewed as multidimensional, latent cores construct (Law, Wong & Mobley, 1998), and it can be drawn from psychological resource capacity from both inside and across as well. PsyCap representing evaluation of situation which is positive, at hand resources both personal and physical and having high chances of success attributed to effort put into and consistent strive and maintenance (Luthans et al., in press). Luthans, Avey, Clapp-Smith & Li, (2008) explained that upcoming phase is taken by verifying with experience or through experiment these constructive abilities in the form of a second-order and basic idea of psychological capital can build through short web-based training interference. Extant literature states that psychological empowerment works as a predictor of PsyCap development as discussed in the next section.

2.2 **Psychological Empowerment and Psychological Capital:**
According to positive psychology, positive psychological resources are individual’s strengths, capabilities and virtues that can be nourished and developed. Having satisfied their psychological needs through social and environmental factors, organizations can develop more advance/strong psychological resources. One of such resources is psychological empowerment, which can theoretically be explained and defined as “one’s perception that he or she has control over their environment and feels congruence between his or her values and those of the organization” (Spreitzer, 1995b; Zimmerman, 1995). This is a four dimensional construct consisting of (a) meaning, the value of the work to the individual (b) competence, the ability to perform the work (c) self-determination, autonomy and (d) impact, the ability to influence outcomes (Spreitzer, 1995b).
2.3 Psychological Empowerment and Psychological Capital:
On the basis of positive psychology assumption, Self Determination Theory (SDT) asserts that basic psychological needs such as satisfaction, autonomy, and competence are considered as a well understood means of creating maximum development and accurate functioning. According to SDT, once your basic psychological needs are meet, it constitutes the main mental process which facilitates the integrative tendency, intrinsic motivation and intrinsic goals pursuits, which result in optimal development and well-being (Deci & Vansteenkiste, 2004), which further develops in individuals more resilience, creativity, commitment, greater level of satisfaction and initiative approach towards work, organizational citizenship behavior (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Rinehart & Short, 1994).

Extending the concept of self-determination theory in perspective of workplace environment, research shows that the need for competence is concerned with people’s inherent aspiration being effective while dealing with the environment (White, 1959). The need for relatedness is concerned with the universal tendency being connected; experiencing, caring for others, and interacting with people (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Various activities in life involve others and are directed at experiencing the feelings of belongingness. Lastly, the need for autonomy is concerned with individual’s universal need of becoming causal agents, experiencing volition, to act in accordance with the integrated sense of self and endorsement of those actions at high level of reflective capacity. Since, these needs are vital, people tend to move towards those situations which result in need satisfaction.

Following assumptions of STD, it is theorized that psychological resources are of different levels and have the characteristics to be enhanced and further developed to more strong psychological resources. The nature of work that gives meaning and value to an individual motivates him to acquire competencies capable of drawing control over
responsibilities securing the sense of autonomy that leads to development of these psychological resources to a higher level in a sense that meaningfulness of work motivates individual to equip with required capabilities to achieve organizational goals. They are more likely to be hopeful in trying to unproven or to accomplish tasks within the organizational context.

In the context of positive psychology and SDT, different dimensions of psychological empowerment may help furthering psychological resources. Deci, Connell and Ryan (1989), studied that people can be more optimistic in difficult situations, can work with more interest and dedication due to the element of self-determination. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) and Spreitzer (1995a; 1995b) explored that empowered people will be having high influence over others in their work environment and they will be having sense of impact and will be regarded by others at workplace and they can accomplish goals, which make a significant difference in their work environment. Similarly, the attributes of resilient individuals are identified by clinical practices. Attributes include autonomy, social competence, a sense of purpose, problem-solving skills; all these can be used for enhancement of resiliency as psychological capital (Luthans, Luthans, & Luthans, 2004). Psychological empowered individuals are more creative, resilient and take more job initiatives. They have high commitment and satisfaction to their jobs and frequently exhibit organizational citizenship behavior and have a healthy mental state (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Rinehart &Short, 1994). Efficacy is developed through the belief that individual can complete the tasks and is physically fit. (Luthans et al, 2008). Psychological research shows that perceptions of psychological empowerment may create the necessary positive conditions to flourish PsyCap.

**Hypothesis No. 1:** Psychological empowerment will be positively related to PsyCap.
2.4 Psychological Capital and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors:

PsyCap is considered as a composite variable and potential valuable contributor. It is derived from the blend of self-efficacy, hope, resilience and optimism. It is to believe that desirable work behaviors are related to PsyCap which in turn supports the workplace with those job behaviors which are not specified. Hence, there is a possibility of relationship between positive PsyCap and desirable work behaviors, which are not incorporated in job description, but they are voluntarily offered to support organization itself by the individual employees.

Former research by Staw and colleagues (Staw & Barsade, 1993; Staw et al., 1994; Wright & Staw, 1999) came up with a conclusion that employees who are more socially coordinated in organization reported high levels of positive emotions, and in return leading to high level of commitment and citizenship as compared to those with low level of positive emotions. OCBs are work-related behaviors that ones are able to be used as one chooses and these are not related to organizational reward system which is formal and in totality leads to the efficient organizational function.

The current study proposes that the positive PsyCap’s level of employees is related to the chances of employee engagement in Organization Citizenship Behavior due to the following reasons. PsyCap as a positive individual construct is generally goal oriented and aims that only by a person’ capabilities success can be achieved. It can be done if individual is creative, resilient and persistent where they are necessary to accomplish goals, to develop trust in employees capabilities, to try new procedures and future optimistic approach for the purpose of maintaining a positive orientation. A practical and logical relationship exists among the qualities, extra role behaviors and in combination of these qualities as well to help in achievement of that success, both at individual and organizational level. In fact, earlier researches such as (Avey, Luthans, & Youssef, 2010)
resulted in treating PsyCap as composite variable that leads to high positive effects in relation to individual variables of self-efficacy, resilience, optimism and hope related to desirable employee behaviors.

Individuals with higher PsyCap are more likely to be engaged in organization citizenship behaviors than the individuals having low PsyCap for various reasons. Generally, the employees who tend to be positive showed greater OCBs, as compared to those who tend to be negative. For the conceptualization of this relationship support can be provided by several relevant mechanisms. Fredrickson’s (2003) model supported that individuals who exhibit positive emotions utilize wider thought–action repertoires and contributes to increase the potential for proactive extra-role behaviors like suggestions for improvement and sharing of creative ideas. These specific attributes of the positive psychological resources comprised PsyCap—namely, optimism, efficacy, hope and resilience may, we propose, leads to more frequent involvement in OCBs.

Furthermore, positive psychological researches supported the association between broader thought–action repertoires & positivity as narrated by Fredrickson (2001), which can provide supplementary favor to this anticipated relationship. Fredrickson’s (1998, 2001) broaden-and-build theory suggested that orientations and positive emotions resulted in wider people’s focus and attention, their behavior as well as their patterns of thinking which empirically had been supported by Kahn and Isen (1993). These main forms of behaviors can also be manifested in the form of OCBOs. Likewise, the possibility that positive emotions related to PsyCap which are discussed by Fredrickson may provide direction to influences expressed as OCBOs. To make it more precise, Fredrickson (2003) taken into account the share of employees voluntary behaviors as positive emotions which are normally not the component of job description. Such behaviors include helping co-workers, bringing improvement in organization etc.
Norman, et al (2010) investigated that existence of association between psychological capital (PsyCap) and both organizational citizenship behaviors and employee deviance is moderated by organizational identity. In organizations, those employees having highest PsyCap are recognized positively and comparatively having least degree of deviant behaviors. Based on theory and previous researches, individuals with high score in PsyCap are expected to put more perseverance and efforts on the basis of their confidence (efficacy), more energy and willpower to generate several solutions to goal blockages or problems (hope), optimistic i.e., expecting positive outcomes, react favorably to setbacks and adversity. To make it more explicit, high level of psychological capital can facilitate a strong force of motivation for successful completion of tasks and goals that leads to desired performance outcomes.

Thus, it is expected that psychological capital is comprised of hope, efficacy, resilience and optimism, which can improve performance of follower by improving an individual’s overall perseverance & motivation.

**Hypothesis No. 2:** PsyCap will be positively related to OCB.

### 2.5 Psychological Capital and In Role Performance:

Till date, research on performance had been mostly used as an outcome variable of PsyCap; which include several types of performance (such as sales, creative tasks, supervisor rated referrals, quantity and quality of manufacturing) and several sample characteristics (like manufacturing, highly educated, cross-sectional and service). In each case, it was consistently advanced theoretically that mechanism in facets of PsyCap acts as an inspiring propensity for individuals and peruses them to put more effort to increase the output. In order to understand the impact on performance in a wider context, Campbell et al. (Campbell, Oppler, McCloy & Sager, 1993), proposes an extensive model consisting of eight components that contribute to performance. They include: 1- oral and
written communications, 2- non job specific task proficiencies, 3- job specific task proficiencies 4- demonstrate effort, 5- maintain personal discipline, 6- facilitate team and peer performance, 7- supervision or leadership, and 8- administration. For this case, PsyCap is primarily related to employee performance by demonstrating effort dimension. When an employee tries harder for success, it is general that he/she gives better performance. According to Luthans et al (2010) short training interventions not only develops participants’ mental wealth, but it also leads to their improved on job performance.

Psychological capital can be largely overlooked and an important resource to impact employee job performance positively. More precisely, psychological capital can be proved more useful to performance management and human resource developmental processes (Peterson et al, 2011).

Campbell and colleagues (1993) argued that motivated effort is very important but not the only predictor of performance. Individuals having higher PsyCap are more likely to put extra effort and are more energized in obtaining high performance since prolonged time. This is due to the fact that individuals having high efficacy can put greater effort towards the achievement of those goals which they believe they have ability to achieve. Furthermore, they possess more willpower and are capable of generating numerous solutions for the problems (hope), they have positive expectations and can make internal attributions for results (optimism), can positively respond and persevere in the time of setbacks and adversity (resilience). Generally, PsyCap should accelerate the motivation for intentional agents' behavior towards the successful achievement of the objectives and tasks that lead to better performance than those with low PsyCap. The composite of four facets of PsyCap has positive significant relationship with satisfaction & performance (Luthans et al, 2007).
In recent years the supportive climate of organizations has been given value, still the need exists to understand this values relation with outcomes of employees. The current study explores recent evolving trend positive psychological capital (including efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience) in relation to their mediating role for supportive organization environment with outcome of the employees. Using three different samples, the results show that psychological capital is in a positive relation with performance of the employee, commitment, satisfaction and a supportive environment relates with employee commitment and satisfaction (Luthans et al, 2008).

Other authors suggested that an important way for leaders to influence their employees’ performance is lying in understanding their psychological capital (Avolio et al., 2004; Avolio & Luthans, 2006). These studies hypothesized that the positivity training helped managers to increase their productivity; their employees also witnessed the difference in their manager’s style which in turn increased employees’ productivity as well (Luthans et al., 2007, p. 550). In light of the above theory and practice following hypothesis is derived.

**Hypothesis No. 3:** PsyCap will be positively related to in-role performance.

### 2.6 Psychological Capital and Counterproductive Work Behaviors (CWB):

Counterproductive Work Behaviors can be defined as “voluntary behavior of organizational members that violates significant organizational norms, and in doing so, threatens the well-being of the organization and/or its members” (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). By definition, CBWs are often time, detrimental for organization and its members and include behaviors such as harassing coworkers, sabotaging the work or key projects of other individuals or intentionally failing to follow the instructions and spreading negative rumors.
Actions like ignoring to disseminate important information, failing to help a coworker, or withholding things which can be helpful for the organization and its members in achieving related goals, intentional limiting of the organizational goals are all considered as passive workplace behaviors. Traditionally, counterproductive work behaviors are reflected distinctly as organizational oriented or individual oriented, similar to OCBs. Therefore, the aim of CWB is to be unique either directed towards coworker or organization. However, Berry, Ones, and Sackett (2007) had found a strong correlation between interpersonal and organizational deviance. Therefore, a specific instant negative behavior or deviance is positively related with counter work behaviors.

The question arises here is that, what are the causes of organizational behaviors to deviate. According to Fox and Spector (1999), certain behavioral limitations which are confronted by individuals result in stressor because of their violation and opposition to those can be reason of CWBs, line employee facing pressure for more and more output can deliberately damage the muster line for slowing it, for allowing others to catch up. Another interesting aspect is that individuals having high PsyCap are capable of resisting pressure for more and more output by recognizing that this pressure is temporary and with the passage of time this pressure will decrease. Literature shows that positive psychological capital increases positive outcomes and decreases less productive behaviors towards work (Avey, Luthans, & Youssef, 2009; Luthans et al., 2007; Walumbwa et al., 2009).

Positive PsyCap is proposed to have negative relationship with workplace deviance in the various ways. First, naturally positively oriented PsyCap as component is aiming, to succeed and achieve. Thus, negative behavior orientation is inherently counterproductive to accomplishment of goals, which leads to encouragement of an individual to pursue
those behaviors which directs and helps the person to succeed, rather than becoming
hindrance to success.

The components of PsyCap specifically can be individually contrasted with counter
productive work behaviors or deviance. Snyder (2000, 2002) suggested that benefits
obtained from hope are not only the attainment of organizational goals but along
searching path for organizational as well as individual goals. Thus, these behaviors are in
contrary to the goals and therefore are normally shown by the individuals with high hope.
Adversity is faced positively by adopting resilience. Therefore, the individuals high in
resilience look for positive reactions and adaptations rather than negative cynicism and
emotions. Hence, CWBs are not adopted by the individuals who are highly resilient.
Self-efficacy gathers the needed confidence and motivation towards success of a given
task. In contrast, CWBs are those behaviors which are aimed at demonization of an
individual relative to organizational goals. Therefore, individuals who are fostering to
succeed in a given task do not display such behaviors clearly. Finally, optimists generally
have a positive orientation towards the future. CWBs are naturally geared toward a
negative result; optimistic individuals normally do not exhibit such negative behaviors
like CBWs.

For understanding negative relation between CWBs and PsyCap, the researchers point out
to the origin of CWBs. Particularly, some researchers believe that workplace limits are
the primary stress factors of CWBs (Fox and Spector, 1999). Other process highlights
some employees who have been depending on less skillful colleagues may give response
with CWBs because of factors like (co-workers work sabotage due to failure in help). It
means that individuals with high PsyCap have less chance to reach CWB according to
Fox and Spector’s process model.
In addition to this, if employees have high level of hope, it may enable them to come up with other ways for overcoming these barriers. Even then if stressors are creating more stress, the employees with higher level of optimism will come up with better and positive expectation for future work and events. Furthermore, they will expect that the situation will improve for them with passage of time. Hypothesis is derived from the above literature.

**Hypothesis No. 4:** PsyCap will be negatively related to CWBs.

### 2.7 Psychological Capital and Job Satisfaction:

The PsyCap definition mentioned in introduction section is termed as an essential component; it is proposed in the study that PsyCap will have a solid association with job satisfaction and performance as compared to the four individual components of PsyCap. By considering resilience, optimism, hope, self-efficacy as important facets of PsyCap, it is expected that their combined motivational effects will be more influential and broader than the individual effects of these components; For example, optimistic self-efficacy is comprehensive and more impactful than the individual impact of both self-efficacy and optimism. Each facet includes both common and unique motivational processes and cognitive, which are helpful in enabling performance. However, by combing these individual facets, their motivational and cognitive processes are more likely to be enhanced. Hence, hypothetically considering and processing every construct as features of whole PsyCap (self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience) permits bigger and possibly more impactful intellectual and motivating procedure for work performance. PsyCap can be used as a positive resource to enhance employees positive work behaviors and well-being as expected to have reciprocal effects on outcomes like job satisfaction (Avey et al, 2010).
To illustrate example of above discussion, Bandura (1997) stated that an efficacious employee who performs better due to his challenges accepting nature and putting the required efforts in order to achieve goals should perform much better and show higher satisfaction towards his job. Primarily aiming at improving the performance, employees who have high level of PsyCap are highly satisfied with their leaders and jobs. For example, the exploratory study conducted in past at the small factory of production employees found a relationship of job satisfaction with their score on PsyCap (Larson & Luthans, 2006). Generally, employees with higher levels of hope were found to be more satisfied because they had opportunities to get best out of the situations and got motivation through their job as well (Youssef & Luthans, in press). Yet, it is proposed in this study that even higher satisfaction may also occur when self-efficacy is accompanied by hope, resilience to respond favorably to the setbacks and optimism. Due to projected high order nature for these four components while taken together, PsyCap would be in relation with satisfaction and performance of employees. PsyCap affects employees’ behaviors in a way that employees with high level of PsyCap would usually expect better things happening at workplace (optimism). They would believe that they can produce a successful work (efficacy and hope). They have more resistance for holdups (resilience).

In light of above discussed literature we put forth the hypothesis:

**Hypothesis No. 5:** PsyCap will be positively related to job satisfaction.

### 2.8 Psychological Capital and Employee’s Commitment:

The relationship of organizational commitment and self-efficacy in literature supports the fact that organizational commitment is determined by Self-efficacy. Sinha, Talwar, and Rajpal (2002) conducted research in Tata Engineering and Locomotive Company in India, taking sample of 167 managers and studied the link between self-efficacy and organizational commitment. Study results showed positive relationship between
organizational commitment and self-efficacy. Likewise, positive relation between self-efficacy and professional commitment was investigated by Hurter (2008). Bressler (2006) investigated association between hope, turnover intentions, organizational commitment and optimism between United States army reserve soldiers. His study leads to the finding that the two variables i.e, hope and optimism were associated positively with commitment. Shahnawaz and Jafri (2009) investigation leads to the conclusion that psychological capital (i.e hope, self-efficacy, resilience and optimism) are determinant of organizational commitment between private and public sector organizations.

Organizational commitment is defined by Allen & Mayer (1991) as that state which connects employees to the organization to which they contribute. Three types of commitment are usually discussed in literature by researchers: affective commitment which is emotional association, belongingness and employees attachment with organizational and personal goals (Mowday et al., 1997; & Meyer & Allen, 1993); continuance commitment that state where employees are being willing to being part of organization (Reichers, 1985); and normative commitment which is state of having feeling of bind to one’s organization as explained by Bolon (1993).

Luthans and Youssef (2007) investigated the positive association between commitment and hope, optimism, and resilience (Luthans & Youssef, 2007). While on the other hand Hurter (2008) and Sinha, Talwar, and Rajpal (2002) find out the positive association between self-efficacy and organizational commitment. Saleem (2012), in his research examined that those employees who were professionally trained were having high degree of organizational commitment comparative to those who were not trained. Akbar Etebarian (2012) study revealed that two variables i.e. organizational commitment and hope are positively correlated with one another while negative relationship existed between organizational commitment and resilience. Hence, we propose the hypothesis.
Hypothesis No. 6: PsyCap will be negatively related to employee’s commitment.

2.9 Psychological Capital and Turnover Intention:
Individuals with high PsyCap are expected to have low turnover intentions because of different reasons for example, when they are having high degree of optimism and their capabilities make them able to build their destiny and high level of success in their organization (Seligman, 1998); in that case they are involved even in more challenging dares and risks as studied by Bandura (1997), in that situation they are eager to exert more energy and efforts and even they are ready to face the hurdles contrary to stop putting an effort to overcome it (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). Their study also revealed that high level of resilience, a situation where employees experienced negative circumstances and situations during their work, employees which are having high PsyCap will be hoping to positively correspond rather than developing feelings to stop putting efforts. At last those employees who are having high capacity to hope are able to develop and select different ways to succeed in their job rather than developing feeling to quit the organization.

Though for some individuals, switching jobs can be a feasible pathway (turnover), in approaching goals high hope can be a motivator, where an individual opts to pursue positive outcomes, instead of avoiding the goals, by doing so threatening and negative situations are simply avoided. In addition intention to quit from job is viewed as component of job satisfaction and future expectation of evaluation of job with various available options which depends upon economic and labor conditions prevailing in market (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979). Luthans, et al., (2007) work provide support to relationship between PsyCap and job satisfaction which is positive and lead to finding that individual with high degree of PsyCap tends to be more negative than positive, leads to high turnover intentions specially in situation of prevailing negative
economic environment. The study results give an insight that PsyCap is negatively associated to those attitudes considered as not desirable for example, employees intention to quit, their level of stress and pressure during job as well as distrustful. This idea develops thought that employees with high PsyCap will tend to be least likely to have turnover intentions. For instance employees having high optimism level tend to trust their organization, they will be able to achieve their goals which will impel them to perform their tasks efficiently (Seligman, 1998), helping them in engaging in those tasks that are challenging (Bandura, 1997), helping them to put high level of efforts and struggle and having sustained efforts rather than quitting such situation (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998b). These finding leads to develop hypothesis for study.

**Hypothesis No. 7**: PsyCap will be positively related to turnover intentions.

**2.10 Behavioral Consequences of Psychological Empowerment:**

**2.10.1 In-Role-Performance:**
Theorists argued that employees who are empowered psychologically realize their problems easily and they are having ability to do things, not influenced by others in uncertain situations, influencing the goals and methods of doing tasks in order to provide results which are efficient and to show stability in phases of hurdles to complete their work goals successfully (Spreitzer, 1995b, 2008). There are two parts of psychological empowerment, one is meaning and the other is one’s own determination and both of these affects job performance significantly though they are having less impact as explained by Fried & Ferris, (1987) and Humphrey et al., (2007), which is explained in job characteristics theory (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Possession of required knowledge is determined by Psychological empowerment and also influence along with meaning and one’s own determination. Results of empirical study showed performance level of employees’ increases because of that required
knowledge possession and i.e, self-efficacy and belief of its influence due to increased level of struggle and stability (e.g., Bandura & Locke, 2003; Sadri & Robertson, 1993; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998; Vancouver & Kendall, 2006). All these findings lead to conclusion that psychological empowerment is correlated positively with performance of tasks.

2.10.2 Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB):
Theory of psychological empowerment states that employees who are having feeling of empowerment, they are usually very active in their work performance and they go for more than required level of expected performance (Spreitzer, 2008). Individual having power to decide according to their own judgment and having sense of work which is meaningful will direct towards organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) due to reason it promotes feeling of acceptance and engagement within organization, beyond explaining ones responsibilities during job. The two elements i.e, Competence and impact will promote OCBs due to fact that employees will be having sense of positive results for which they will strive and therefore psychological empowerment is having relationship with OCBs.

2.10.3 Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB):
These are behaviors which are identified by different researchers in different ways and amongst them, one is deviant behavior during work (Bennett and Robinson, 2003), counterproductive behavior (Mangione and Quinn, 1975), and hostile behavior (Giacolone and Greenberg, 1997). Overall any behavior will be considered as deviant when organizational rules, regulations and its procedures are not being followed either by any person or by any group. Deviant behavior is characterized by violation of organization’s rules and regulations and internal policies by its employees which
results in creating hurdles in organizational welfare and concern (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). CWBs management in organizational setup is now receiving great interest because these can be detrimental to financial well-being. Counterproductive Work behaviors incorporated employee’s resistance to follow manager instructions, willingly enhancing work cycles, coming late to work and showing disrespect for other employees (Galperin, 2002). On the basis of above discussed theoretical and empirical evidences the following hypothesis is developed.

**Hypothesis 8:** Psychological empowerment is positively associated with employee work behaviors of (a) in role performance, (b) OCB and (c) negativity associated to CWB.

### 2.11 Attitudinal Consequences of Psychological Empowerment:

#### 2.11.1 Job Satisfaction:
Job satisfaction is explained as the degree to which employees’ needs are fulfilled at job (Locke, 1976). Whenever employees will be having purposeful sense during their job and having feeling of one’s own determination their required needs for growth will be fulfilled and it will happen through self-freedom, possession of required knowledge and one’s own control during job (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Moreover, whenever there will be feeling of possession of required knowledge and extent to which their needs are fulfilled, they will experience favorable outcomes and autonomy at job. So it can be concluded that employees who are psychologically empowered will be more likely to have practice of their needs fulfillment during their work and it will lead them to high level of job satisfaction. Whenever the level of empowerment is high, it will result in great motivation for work, which in turns, reported great job satisfaction and low level of stress and
anxiety and impel individuals positively towards their tasks accomplishment. Therefore, they are more likely to involve in their job and lastly contribute positively towards job commitment. According to Spritzers et al. (1997), empowerment four different attributes and their impacts on satisfaction as well as stress on job, competency and self-determination affected satisfaction at job. Due to empowerment, satisfaction of employees during job increases and thus resulted in cost efficiency. Hechanova (2006) conducted another study on empowerment. The results showed that psychologically empowered employees reported high level of satisfaction as well as their performance was high. As opposed to their hypothesis, intrinsic motivation was not moderating variable of satisfaction and performance. In addition, under controlled job level and performance, levels of empowerment by men were high in contrasts to women.

2.11.2 Employee’s Commitment:
Meyer, Becker, and Vandenberghe (2004) examined a positive association between motivation intrinsic form and affective commitment. Affective organizational commitment provokes due to psychological empowerment meaning dimension due to reason that realizes the relation between work role demands and employees own needs and values (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Spreitzer, 1995b). Furthermore feeling of freedom, possession of required knowledge will be positively associated with employees’ commitment to their job and organization; they will be having feeling to freely express their interests and values during their job. Lastly, employees who were physiologically empowered reported high level of continuance commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Number of articles named with “employee empowerment” as significant factor burst since 1990, because this term reflects both aspects for example, individual as well as
organizational. A complex part of explaining empowerment of employees’ factor is that each organization need to establish and required to define to make empowerment successful. They need to create culture where they can assess employee needs otherwise empowerment will not create expected results in absence of ownership feeling.

High level of empowerment will lead to positive internal motivation and greater job satisfaction, greater job involvement and results in increased commitment. Study revealed that employee empowerment resulted in more satisfaction and employee commitment.

2.11.3 Turnover Intentions:
As a result of environment created by organization where there is feeling of psychological empowerment, employees will consider it as unique and powerful resource which may result in higher loyalty with job and organization and stable employment (Blau, 1964). They perceived it difficult to create such arrangements with other organization and therefore their intention to remain part of such organization increases and resulted in low involvement in finding other jobs opportunities (Griffeth, Hom, &Gaertner, 2000). Research by Cole (1995) conducted in United States in more than 35 mini steel mills revealed that in order to manage human resource successfully; organization must develop strategy regarding their turnover intentions and unit performance. According to her study, turnover was very high and this high rate is attributed to control approach which was rule oriented. Moreover nature of tasks performed in those mini mill was relatively simple and cost associated with hiring and firing of employees was low. Research findings showed that organizations having high psychological empowerment will result in lower
absenteeism and turnover. So, it is expected that psychological empowerment will lead to low turnover, hence we propose;

**Hypothesis 9:** Psychological empowerment is positively associated with employees work attitudes of (a) job satisfaction and (b) employee’s commitment and negatively associated with (c) turnover intentions.

### 2.12 **Moderating Role of Core Self Evaluation:**
The concept of core self-evaluation was presented for first time by Judge et al. (1997) while theorizing satisfaction dispositional bases. According to them Core Self Evolution (CSE) is crucial evaluations as they are made by individuals about them. Three factors were used by Judge et al. (1997) in order to explain already presented literature about used CSE: (a) evaluation-focus which is degree to which one made evaluation about himself contrary to his description; (b) fundamentality the degree to which focus is on source trait rather than surface trait as explained by Cattell (1965); and (c) breadth of scope according to which cardinal traits are having wider scope than secondary ones as explained by Allport (1961). Four traits are recognized by Judge et al. (1997, 1998) meeting such inclusion criteria according to which firstly self-esteem is very basic and important evaluation because it shows the basic value one put on his self (Locke, McClear, & Knight, 1996). Secondly, self-efficacy is that sort of evaluation which deals with how one can face threats and challenges of life (Smith, 1989). Thirdly, locus of control which is internal provides important evaluation which deals with how one is able to control his outcomes of life. Lastly, stable person trait which is emotional stability deals with how a person is able to overcome negative feelings as stress and anxiety and how he will be free from such emotions. All together these traits help in explaining ones personality and having wider scope.
Individual’s perception towards life events is directed by CSE. These perception impacts attitudes of a person and his reactions which constitute his behavior which in turn impact satisfaction level of employees regarding their job. So, high self-esteem workers will take job challenges as a way to improve their performance rather than path to failure and criticism (Locke, McClear, & Knight, 1996).

Reviving personality research leads scholars to come up with idea that both types of self-esteem i.e., general as well as global are significant traits in narrating ones’ attitude towards motivation so it highlighted differences between individuals in respect of their contribution to organization, their competency and their level of learning (e.g., Chen, Gully, Whiteman, & Kilcullen, 2000; Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997). According to research individuals with high self-esteem will be more optimistic in situations of having uncertainty and will view positive aspects rather than negative which generate positive results (Dodgson & Wood, 1998). Tharenou (1979) elicited that individuals with high level of self-esteem will experience broad array of behaviors and thoughts that will highlighted their concept of self. High self-esteem people will view negative and uncertain things as timely and focus on positive aspects relating to their job in contrast to individuals with low self-esteem (Srivastava, Locke, Judge & Adams, 2010).

CSE is narrated by Judge et al. (1997) as basic premises holding by people about themselves and their worth and value. CSE positively constitutes four important traits: high self-esteem, high generalized self-efficacy, internal locus of control, and low neuroticism. Later on many studies showed that CSE lead to job satisfaction positively through, subsequently several studies demonstrated that CSE were related positively to job satisfaction through goal self-concordance (Judge, Bono, Erez, & Locke, 2005), work family facilitation (Boyar & Mosley, 2007).
Theory of core self-evaluations explained by Judge et al.’s (1997) suggested that generalized self-esteem and self-esteem are two main characteristics of self-evaluation that constitutes people behavior, how to react to different situations and people who are having high generalized self-efficacy will have ability to deal with different hurdles and problems more efficiently so they are more resilient (Gist & Mitchell, 1992), able to attain favorable results. Individuals are needed to be self-confident and assertive in order to produce change which is positive and favorable for organization. CSE helps individuals to better understand about themselves and studies also presented findings focused on learning how association leads to motivation, progress in career and performance.

Social cognitive view opinion (Deci& Ryan, 2000) suggested how individuals who are having high core self-evaluations respond more favorably towards life situations and outcomes and how they will be able to develop and manage positive aspects of situations and positive thoughts. Applying these concepts, people who will be having high CSE, they will be induced more towards their goal attainment viewing in line with their values (Judge et al., 2005), they will be able to achieve their goals efficiently (Erez & Judge, 2001), and will be more optimistic by focusing positive aspects of situations (Judge & Hurst, 2007).

According to Judge et al. (1997) generalized self-efficacy is predictor of job performance as it should contribute to satisfaction level of employees regarding their jobs. Individuals who are having high self-efficacy are able to face uncertain situations and hurdles of life efficiently and persistently (Gist & Mitchell, 1992), they will be satisfied with their jobs and will help in attaining positive outcomes as well. So higher core self-evaluations were assumed to relate positively with internal job success level.

Above discussed theory results in conceptualizing hypothesis.
Hypothesis 10: Relationship between Psychological empowerment and PsyCap is moderated by CSE such that the relationship is strong when CSE is high.

2.13 Moderating Role of Psychological Contract Types:

2.13.1 Psychological Capital, Psychological Contract Types and In Role Performance:
Psychological capital is very significant factor although somehow ignored in literature; it can affect strongly and can lead to high performance level of employees. Psychological capital can be positively utilized in developing human resource of organizations as well as in managing performance of employees (Peterson et al, 2011). PsyCap impels the individuals’ intentional behavior for the successful accomplishment of their tasks and improved performance. The composite of four facets of PsyCap will lead to good performance levels according to Luthans et al, (2007). Campbell and colleagues (1993) argued that employees with high PsyCap will be highly motivated which results in their good performance along with time.

A study was conducted in United States in order to find out whether there is any kind of association between positive psychological capital and organizational identity on employee deviance and organizational citizenship behaviors. It was found that Organizational identity was moderating variable between employee deviance and organizational citizenship behaviors in a way that workers who were having high PsyCap were having strong identification within workplace while they were having low involvement in deviant behavior.

Psychological contract is also an intensively explored area in terms of boosting employees’ in-role performance. Empirical studies show that psychological contract positively affect employees’ job performance (Robinson and Rousseau, 1994; Aselage and Eisenberger, 2003). Keeping in view Expectancy Theory of Vroom (1964),
individuals who are in relational contract with their employers are more likely to identify themselves with their respective organizations and in turn they become more committed and satisfied employees. The theory further posits that satisfied employees will perform better because they perceive that they are in long term contract with their organizations and they perceive the organizational and their personal objectives as the same. So it is less likely those individuals who are in relational contract with their organization will go for organizational deviance and are more likely that they will go for high organization performance, commitment and job satisfaction. Extended studies relating to psychological contract hold the idea that security of job at workplace in long term enhances employees’ organizational identification which in turn leads towards relational contracts (Cavanaugh & Noe, 1999; Lester et al., 2002; Robinson et al., 1994; Rousseau, 1990; Turnley & Feldman, 1999). On the other hand insecurity related with job will negatively influence trust factor in workplace which is counterproductive in the long run as explored by many researchers (Ashford et al., 1989; Boselie, Hesselink, Paauwe, & van der Wiele, 2000). Therefore, in situations where employees perceived high level of security in job will lead to relational psychological contract which positively influence trust for both employees and organization and thus result in good organizational performance. A meta-analysis conducted with 70 studies where focused was on insecurity related to job which includes sample of 38,000, explored that job insecurity will lead to negative work and workplace and will provide environment which doesn't promote organizational performance (Sverke, Hellgren, and Näswall, 2002). Thus it is inferred that, employees with lower job security (having a transactional contract with their organization) will be more likely to react towards negative circumstances and thus will affect negatively their task performance. Those employees
who are having high security relating their jobs, their performance will not suffer in such situation because of their belief that such situation will not impact them.

Individuals having Low level of PsyCap are unlikely to view relationship with their organizations through long-term lens (i.e., relational) because of having a poor P-J fit. Research shows that a relational psychological contract promotes such organizationally valued behaviors as task and contextual performance (Shore et al., 2006; Uen, Chien, & Yen, 2009). Alternatively, transactional or economic exchanges focus only on tangible portion of interaction (as work for compensation) which is negatively associated with organizational practices aimed to build highly committed workforce (Uen et al., 2009).

Turnley (2015) studied the connection among psychological contract fulfillment and employee behavior in all of its types i.e., in-role performance, organizational citizenship behavior towards work place, and organizational citizenship behavior towards organizational employees. By utilizing 134 supervisor-subordinate dyads samples, he conducted a study and found that there exists positive connection between psychological contract fulfillment and employees behavior in all its types. In addition, the results indicate that psychological contract fulfillment is directed towards citizenship behavior at the workplace as compared to citizenship behavior focused towards other employees. Lastly, according to the findings of his study, in a situation of where employees ascribed relating the cause that psychological contract break will influence their work performance efficiency though there exists support to this belief on limited grounds that employees will be negatively motivated and it affects their task performance if employees regarded workplace as supportive and not up to its commitments with its own intentions.

Employees with relational psychological contracts consider organizational objectives as important as their personal objectives and are willing to do what is beneficial for the
organization (Rousseau 2000). Since their role as loyal employees is beneficial to the firm, so those (having relational contract with their organizations) focus on performing their in-role behaviors wholeheartedly which is mandatory for overall organizational performance (Chien & Lie 2013)? It is therefore assumed that employees with higher PsyCap perceived that the contract is relational and exhibit more in-role performance as compared to employees with higher PsyCap and perceived that the contract is transactional contract. In light of the above theory and practice hypothesis is derived:

**Hypothesis 11 (a):** Relationship between PsyCap and in-role performance is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is stronger when relational contract is higher.

**Hypothesis 11 (b):** Relationship between PsyCap and in-role performance is moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is stronger when transactional contract is higher.

### 2.13.2 Psychological Capital, Psychological Contract Types and OCB:

It has been explored in organizational literature that the relationship between psychological capital (PsyCap) and both organizational citizenship behaviors and employee deviance is moderated by organizational identity in such a way that employees with higher PsyCap and high identification with the organization were engaged in organizational citizenship behaviors and least likely engaged in deviance behaviors (Norman et al., 2010). It is assumed by psychological contract theory that on behalf of the organization, employees increase their efforts to the extent to which it is perceived that organization is able to and agree to respond to impersonal resources which are desirable. As it is a two way process so individuals with high esteem
resources which included in the form of various opportunities to train and provide them incentives, they will feel happy and ultimately helpful to organization in its goal attainment through increased extra-role and in-role performances (Aselage, and Eisenberger, 2003). It has been proved by previous studies that organizational commitment, contract behavior, organizational citizenship behavior, performance and employee’s job satisfaction are positively affected by psychological contract (and in contrast, psychological contract breach) (Robinson and Rousseau, 1994; Aselage and Eisenberger, 2003). Furthermore, a relational contract facilitates organizational outcomes and positive personal outcomes as a result of the mutual commitment between the organization and employees (Raja et al., 2004). Finally, Millward and Hopkins (1998) stated that employees having a relational contract are more likely to behave as organizational citizens and are more committed to the organizational goals than those with transactional contract. Hence, employees with a relational contract are more likely to engage in their work, more satisfied with their jobs and least likely to quit the organization. Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler (2003), in a large cross-sectional study (with 5,709 respondents) conducted in the public sector in United Kingdom, examined the impact of psychological contract fulfillment on employees commitment and citizenship behavior. Their results indicated a negative relationship between transactional contracts and citizenship behaviors and a positive relationship between relational contract and citizenship behavior. It is therefore assumed that employees with higher PsyCap and perceived that the contract is relational would exhibit more organizational citizenship behavior that employees with higher PsyCap and perceived that the contract is transactional. For example, employees who perform better at work, exhibit positive work behaviors beyond their job descriptions are more likely to have greater expectations towards their organization than those employees whose
performance is comparatively less appropriate. Both parties will benefit each other based on bidirectional exchange process (Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler 2002).

Previous research suggested that perceived psychological contract breach will result in impacting employees’ organizational commitment, job satisfaction, willingness to be engaged in an organizational citizenship behavior, job performance, productivity and enhances the intention to leave the organization and actual turnover (Bunderson, 2001; Conway & Briner, 2002; Coyle-Shapiro, 2002; Thomas, Au & Ravlin, 2003; Edwards, Rust, McKinley & Moon, 2003). Psychological contract plays a substantial role in the elicitation and maintenance of citizenship behavior. Hypothesis is derived:

**Hypothesis 12 (a):** Relationship between PsyCap and OCB is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is stronger when relational contract is higher.

**Hypothesis 12 (b):** Relationship between PsyCap and OCB is moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is stronger when transactional contract is higher.

### 2.13.3 Psychological Capital, Psychological Contract Types and Counterproductive Work Behaviors:

Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) posits that employees are unlikely to reciprocate positively if their employers fail to fulfill their work-related needs. The theory further asserts that this lack of long-term perspective and trust in employment may be associated with negative outcomes (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Norman et al., (2010) found that organizational identity moderates the relationship of (PsyCap) and both OCB and employee deviance in such a way that employees with highest PsyCap and most strongly identified with the organization are most likely to be engaged in organizational citizenship behaviors and least likely to be engaged in deviance behaviors. It is a natural phenomenon that employees expect from their organizations to deliver explicitly and implicitly the promised inducements and in turn they reciprocate
by engaging in organizationally valued behaviors (Shore, Tetrick, Lynch, & Barksdale, 2006). There are also studies showing relationship between psychological contract type and employees’ CWB. Lim (1996) found that there is a positive correlation between job insecurity (Transactional Contract) and deviant behavior. Those who may not perceive the relationship with their organizations as a long-term, reciprocal exchange, corresponds with heightened CWBs (Luksyte, Spitzmueller & Maynard, 2011). A recent study by Zagenczyk, Restubog, Kiewitz, Kiazed & Tang (2011), explored that High Machiavellian employees practiced low level of citizenship behavior because they tend to form transactional psychological contracts and as a result high deviant behavior was observed. It is therefore assumed that employees with higher PsyCap and perceived that the contract is transactional would engage more in organizational deviant behavior as compared to employees with higher PsyCap and perceived that contract is relational. Jensen et al. (2010) showed in their research on counterproductive work behavior (CWB) that breaching the psychological contract triggers the employee’s CWB. Specially, they explored the relationship between relational contract and transactional contract breach and five forms of Counterproductive work behavior (production deviance, abuse, theft, withdrawal and sabotage). Furthermore, they also considered the role of individual factors as well as situational factors that lessen CWB engagement and studied the moderating effects of organizational policies which deter personality and counterproductive work behaviors (emotional stability, conscientiousness, and agreeableness). In light of the above literature hypothesis is derived:

**Hypothesis 13 (a):** Relationship between PsyCap and CWB is moderated by relational Contract type such that the relationship is weaker when relational contract is higher.
**Hypothesis 13 (b):** Relationship between PsyCap and CWB is moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is weaker when transactional contract is higher.

### 2.12.4 Psychological Capital, Psychological Contract Types and Job Satisfaction:

PsyCap is used as a positive resource to enhance the well-being and positive work behaviors of employees in organizations. It has shown a reciprocal effect on work related outcomes such as job satisfaction and commitment (Avey et al., 2010). Larson & Luthans (2006) explored in the relationship between Psychological capital and job satisfaction on the production workers. In this study they found that positive relation exists between job satisfaction and PsyCap. On the other hand psychological contract is used as a signal to show the position of relationship between employees and employer (Guest, 2004).

Psychological contract theory forecasts that relationship between an organization and employees is characterized by reciprocal commitment and mutual investment to the relationship and this relationship can be a self-fulfilling insight which increases the attachment of the organization and employees (Dabos & Rousseau, 2004). Employees thus showing high level of involvement, satisfaction level enhancement and low level of turnover intention and as a result can expect greater future incentives. And according to social exchange theory, they will be motivated to interact with others in order to obtain inducements from another party (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960). So, chances of getting incentives from organization increases in case of Relational contracts. In addition to it, relationship between psychological contract and job satisfaction has also been studied by a number of researchers (Dabos & Rousseau, 2004; Millward & Hopkins, 1998; Raja et al., 2004). Robinson & Rousseau (1994) and Aselage &
Eisenberger (2003) empirical studies found positive impact of psychological contract on employee’s job satisfaction. Bal & Kooij (2011), while studying the impact of psychological contract type on job satisfaction found that Transactional Psychological Contract has negative relationship with job satisfaction unlike Relational Psychological Contract which has positive association with job satisfaction.

Organizational research shifts from collectivist focus to individual one over the past two decades, so psychological contract has replaced collective frameworks of the employment relationship in the organizational behavior literature (Guest, 2004). Millward and Hopkins (1998) also reported that people with a relational contract are more satisfied with their job as compared to transactional contract. It is therefore assumed that employees with higher PsyCap and psychological contract perception would be more satisfied with their job whereas, employees with higher PsyCap and transactional contract perception would be less satisfied with their job. On the bases of these theoretical and experimental evidences we hypothesized as.

**Hypothesis 14 (a):** Relationship between PsyCap and satisfaction is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is stronger when relational contract is higher.

**Hypothesis 14 (b):** Relationship between PsyCap and satisfaction is moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is stronger when transactional contract is higher.

**2.13.5 Psychological Capital, Psychological Contract and Employee’s Commitment:**
Shahnawaz and Jafri (2009) explored the relationship between psychological capital (which includes psychological capacities of self-efficacy, optimism, resilience, and hope) and organizational commitment in their study conducted on public and private sector organization and reported that psychological capital works as a predictor of
organizational commitment. The positive impact of individual dimensions of PsyCap on organizational commitment has also been reported by different researchers for example, Sinha, Talwar, & Rajpal (2002) and Hurter (2008) found relationship between self-efficacy and organizational commitment. Another study by Bressler (2006) reported a positive relationship between dimensions of PsyCap such as hope & optimism and organizational commitment. Research has also shown that the fulfillment of obligations comes under organizational commitment and commitment can be construed as a collection of obligations being performed by an employee as a result of inducement. Psychological Contract has effects on organizational performance, employees’ attitudes as well as employees’ behaviors whereas, the fulfillment of these psychological contracts is associated with employees attitudes like job satisfaction (Robinson et al., 1994; Tekleab and Taylor, 2003; Pate et al., 2003; Guzzo and Noonan, 1994), organizational commitment (Lester et al., 2002; Turnley and Feldman, 2002), organization citizenship behaviour. Kun (2007) found out the existence of association between empowerment and organizational commitment which is mediated by psychological contract. His study was based on analysis of 291 sample size by using SEM. His study confirmed that positive association between empowerment and organizational commitment which is mediated by psychological contract such as economic factor of organizational commitment through employee expectations; competence affected organizational commitment via partial mediated function of employee expectations. Moreover employee’s expectation of psychological contract has significantly positive effect on employees’ perceptions of obligations and psychological factor is positively affected by social-economic factor of organizational commitment. Schein (1980) argues despite being unwritten contract, psychological contract act as most powerful contributing
factor of organizational behavior. The Institute of Manpower (IMS) conducted a survey in 1994, showed that a transactional employment climate is emerging and is traditionally set to prevail, where people are least likely to be relational than transactional towards their work. It has been assumed that if employees are more transactional in relation to their work, there will be lower level of organizational commitment among employees towards their organization which can become challenging for organizational effectiveness.

Employees with more relational orientation have higher level of organizational commitment and self-reported job. On the contrary, employees with more transactional psychological orientation have lower level of organizational commitment and self-reported job. Hopkins found that operationally the psychological contract is alike to commitment, such as, despite of the high association between job commitment scores and relational orientation, the former accounts for a significant proportion of explanatory variance over and above the job and organizational commitment in explaining whether employees are willing to put extra effort and cover extra like doing work in additional hours without additional incentive.

The impact of psychological contract type on organizational commitment has also been studied by different researchers for example, Robinson & Rousseau (1994) and Aselage & Eisenberger (2003) reported positive impact of psychological contract on organizational commitment. Millward and Hopkins (1998) found that employees are more committed to organization with a relational psychological contract than those with a transactional contract. Meyer and Allen (1991) explored that due to conceptual similarities, those people having relational contract with an organization would have high levels of organizational commitment. On the other hand, people having transactional contract will be having short-term nature of relationship with an
organization because of having view that their job and organization is creating hindrance in their career goals and aspirations. So this results in decreasing their level of commitment with their respective organizations. Uen et al., (2009) found a negative relationship between transactional contract and organizational commitment. It is therefore assumed that employees with higher PsyCap and relational contact would be more committed than employees with higher PsyCap and transactional contract.

**Hypothesis-15 (a):** Relationship between PsyCap and organizational commitment is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is stronger when relational contract is higher.

**Hypothesis-15 (b):** Relationship between PsyCap and organizational commitment is moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is stronger when transactional contract is higher.

### 2.13.6 Psychological Capital, Psychological Contract and Turnover Intention:

Relationship between psychological capital and turnover intention has been studied by a number of researchers and found that PsyCap is negatively related to undesirable employee attitudes such as cynicism and turnover intention (Avey, Reichard, Luthans & Mhatre, 2011). Luthans, et al., (2007) also reported that PsyCap works as a negative predictor of employees’ turnover intention. Avey, Luthans and Youssef (2010) found that PsyCap is negatively related to cynicism and intension to quit. Literature also provides instances showing the relationship between psychological contract type and employees’ turnover intention. Individuals having transactional contract will show low level of involvement, satisfaction and high tendency of turnover. Support for such direct relationship between the type of psychological contract with the jobs and organizational attitude is shown by many studies (Dabos & Rousseau, 2004; Millward...
& Hopkins, 1998; Raja et al., 2004). Low level of centrality in individuals results in low level of value attachment to job and along with little level of energy and time they spend for their organizations, thus, low work centrality results in a transactional contract with the organization which results in low level of satisfaction and role involvement. (Collins, 2010) studied that job satisfaction is the most consistent predictor of turnover intention; but the correlation of job satisfaction is modest with turnover intention in most studies. Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) is not a reliable predictor of turnover intention. Meanwhile, the psychological contract proved to be useful indicator of understanding the employee/employer relationship. Psychological contract fulfillment is important statistically proved predictor of turnover intention. According to Collins, management turnover may be lessen in case where organizational leaders respect their managers, develop strong relationship with them and this relationship of trust will result in fulfilling and understanding the unwritten contract perceived to exist between the firm and its management personnel.

Raja et al., (2004) reported negative relationship between psychological contract types and employees’ turnover intention. Bal & Kooij (2011) found that Transactional Psychological Contract has positive relationship with turnover intention, and negative relationship with Relational Psychological. Millward and Hopkins (1998) also reported that employees with a relational contract have less intention to leave as compared to employees with transactional contract. Rousseau (1995) suggested that considerable investments are involved in relational contracts on behalf of both employers and employees that these “investments involve a high level of interdependence and barriers to exit” (p. 92). These are providing barrier to quit so employees will be less likely to seek employment with other organizations. In contrast, transactional contracts are typically involved in limited time frames within which there exists a relationship
between employer and employees based on economic exchange. Limited time frame can be initiated by the employer as in the case of seasonal work or contract. Sometimes it is initiated by employees when they consider their relationship with the organization as a stepping stone on their career paths, because these individuals consider their job temporary with the organization and at the same time they might be looking for some better opportunities. It is therefore assumed that employees with higher PsyCap and relational contract would have less turnover intentions as compared to employees with higher PsyCap and transactional contract.

**Hypothesis-16 (a):** Relationship between PsyCap and turnover intention is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is weaker when relational contract is higher.

**Hypothesis-16 (b):** Relationship between PsyCap and turnover intention is moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is weaker when transactional contract is higher.

### 2.14 Psychological Capital as Mediator:

As PsyCap has been used as a mediating variable in a number of studies with regard to authenticating leading groups and trust (Walumbwa, Luthans, Avey & Oke 2009); supportive organizational climate and employee performance (Luthans, Norman, Avolio, Avey, 2010). So the relationship has been well established in literature.

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) posits that the innate essential psychological nutrients needed for ongoing psychological integrity, well-being, and growth are specified by needs. A direct outcome of the SDT perspective is that individuals tend to pursue relationships goals, and domains which satisfy needs. The extent to which these
individuals will become successful in finding the opportunities, they will experience positive psychological outcomes (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Based on experiments and laboratory experiments it is argued that the work environment promotes satisfaction of the three basic psychological needs. It promotes full internalization of extrinsic motivation and enhances intrinsic motivation which in turn produces the important work outcomes of (1) job satisfaction; (2) psychological adjustment and well-being (3) positive work-related attitudes (4) persistence and maintained behavior change (5) organizational citizenship behaviors and (6) effective performance, particularly on tasks requiring conceptual understanding creativity and cognitive flexibility (Gagne & Deci, 2005). Baard, Deci, and Ryan (2004), examined and found association between satisfaction of these needs and employees’ performance evaluations. Additionally some scholars linked SDT concepts to organizational commitment theories.

Self-determination theory asserts that basic psychological satisfaction of psychological needs such as competence and autonomy (dimensions of psychological empowerment) are considered as a means through which optimal development and authentic functioning can be understood. Different dimensions of psychological empowerment may help furthering psychological resources by developing in individuals more resilience, creativity and initiative approach towards work (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Rinehart & Short, 1994). Psychological empowered individuals have more resilience, creativity (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Rinehart & Short, 1994).

Work environment which provides opportunities to satisfy employees’ psychological needs helps to enhance intrinsic motivation which may result in positive work outcomes such as effective task performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, positive work attitude and behavior, OCB and reduce negative attitude and behavior.
(Bogler & Somech, 2004; Rinehart & Short, 1994). Baard, Deci and Ryan (2004) also found that satisfaction of psychological needs results in improved employees’ performance.

Sahoo et.al. (2015) propose a conceptual model which projects the relationship between psychological capital and work attitudes. Relationship between PsyCap and positive work attitude has been reported by a number of studies for instance, positive impact of PsyCap on employees’ job satisfaction (Larson & Luthans, 2006), organizational commitment (Shahnawaz and Jafri, 2009), employees’ performance (Peterson et al, 2011; Campbell and colleagues, 1993), OCB (Norman et. al., 2010). Similarly, negative relationship between PsyCap and turnover intention (Luthans, et al., 2007), and PsyCap and CWB (Norman et. al., 2010) has also been established.

The impact of PsyCap in motivating employees for positive attitude and behavior are highlighted by previous studies for example, satisfaction (Luthans et al, 2007), organizational commitment (Shahnawaz and Jafri (2009) and wellbeing (Avey et. al., 2010) as well as its effects as mediating variables (Luthans et al, 2008). To the best of our knowledge, the potential impact of Psychological empowerment on PsyCap and the associations between PsyCap and employees attitudinal and behavioral outcomes have not been examined in a single study in literature so far. Additionally, whether or not PsyCap mediates the association between psychological empowerment and employees’ attitudinal and behavioral outcomes? It is also important to understand the effect of PsyCap which may help to effectively prevent the counterproductive work behaviors in organizations and encourage extra role behaviors. The impact of PsyCap in motivating employees for positive attitude and behavior as highlighted by previous studies (Luthans et al, 2007; Luthans et al, 2008), satisfaction (Luthans et al, 2007), organizational commitment (Shahnawaz and Jafri (2009) and wellbeing (Avey et. al.,
as well as its effects as mediating variables (Luthans et al, 2008), Totawar and Nambudiri (2014) tested the structural model with PsyCap as mediator between organizational justice and job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Suifan (2016) found a statistically significant relationship between organizational climate and OCB which fully mediates the relationship between organizational climate and OCB. The present study postulates that PsyCap mediates the relationship between psychological empowerment and employee’s attitudes and behaviors. Mediating hypotheses are derived.

**Hypothesis 17 (a):** PsyCap mediate the relationship between Psychological empowerment and employee work behaviors of (1) in role performance, (2) OCB and (3) Counterproductive Work Behaviors.

**Hypothesis 17 (b):** PsyCap mediates the relationship between Psychological empowerment and employee work attitudes of (1) job satisfaction and (2) employee’s commitment and (3) turnover intentions.

### 2.15 Theoretical Framework:

#### 2.15.1 Psychological Empowerment:

Psychological empowerment, which can theoretically be defined as “one’s perception that he or she has control over his/her environment and feels congruence between his or her values and those of the organization” (Spreitzer, 1995b; Zimmerman, 1995). This is the four dimensional construct consisting of (a) meaning, the value of the work to the individual (b) competence, the ability to perform the work (c) self-determination, autonomy and (d) impact, the ability to influence outcomes (Spreitzer, 1995b).
2.15.2 Psychological Capital:
PsyCap refers to a person’s positive psychological states consisting of four important components: self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience (Luthans et al., 2007a). According to Luthans (2002) state-like characteristics must be incorporated by psychological capital contrary to trait-like characteristics like human moods as well emotions that changes with situation and therefore they are flexible opposed to static nature of trait-like characteristics like talent and intellect (Luthans, 2002; Luthans et al., 2007a).

2.15.3 Core Self Evolution (CSE):
Judge et al. (1997), defined Core Self Evolution (CSE) as the bottom-line evaluations that individuals make about themselves. Judge et al. (1997, 1998), find out four traits of CSE. First, self-esteem is the most significant and broad self-evaluation as it represents the overall value one holds for himself (Locke, McClear, & Knight, 1996). Second, generalized self-efficacy is an evaluation of how to deal with challenges of life (Smith, 1989). Third, a high internal locus of control shows one’s evaluation of his ability to manage life outcomes. Finally, emotional stability (low neuroticism) indicates a stable person, who is free of debilitating negative emotions such as anxiety. Thus, all these traits are broad in scope, fundamental to define an individual’s personality, and carry a bottom-line evaluation or judgment about oneself.

2.15.4 Psychological Contract:
Psychological contracts are defined as a person’s perceptions and expectations about the mutual obligations in an employment exchange relationship (Rousseau, 1989). Relational contracts are broad and long-term. These contracts also include terms for loyalty in exchange for growth or security in an organization (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Rousseau & McLean Parks, 1993). Transactional contracts are short-term, but are
purely materialistic and economic focused and entail limited involvement by both parties. These are temporary contracts.

2.16 Proposed Research Model:

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) is a theory of human personality and motivation which is concerned with individual’s innate psychological needs and their inherent growth propensities. It deals with the motivation beyond the choices made by individuals without any external interference and influence. The main focus of STD is on the extent to which an individual’s behavior is self-determined and self-motivated (Deci, & Ryan, 2002).

Self-determination theory (SDT) states that the innate essential psychological nutriments needed for ongoing psychological integrity, well-being and growth are specified by needs. A direct outcome of the SDT perspective is that individuals tend to pursue
relationships goals and domains which satisfy needs. The extent to which these individuals will become successful in finding the opportunities, they will experience positive psychological outcomes (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Based on experiments and laboratory experiments it is argued that the work environment promotes satisfaction of the three basic psychological needs. It promotes full internalization of extrinsic motivation and enhances intrinsic motivation which in turn produces the important work outcomes of (1) job satisfaction; (2) psychological adjustment and well-being; (3) positive work-related attitudes; (4) persistence and maintained behavior change; (5) organizational citizenship behaviors; and (6) effective performance, particularly on tasks requiring conceptual understanding creativity and cognitive flexibility (Gagne & Deci, 2005). Baard, Deci, and Ryan (2004) studied association among those needs satisfaction and performance evaluation employees. Additionally some scholars associate SDT concepts to the theories of organizational commitment.

Fredrickson’s (2001, 2003) broaden-and-build theory, Wright (2005) had direct contribution in building positive resources and thus resulting in enhancing job performance. Referring to Fredrickson’s (2003) broaden and build theory of positivity, it is stated that person with high level of PsyCap i.e, positivity show more OCBs than employees who tend to be negative.

Psychological resource theories such as conservation of resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 2002; Wright & Hobfoll, 2004) can be used in explaining how employees get motivated to acquire, maintain, and foster the essential resources found in psychological capital in order to achieve successful performance outcomes. More precisely, psychological resources such as resilience, efficacy, optimism and hope can explain an individual’s motivating choices and striving that create higher-order “resource caravans” (or in this
case, the core construct of psychological capital), which in turn impact motivation and performance (Hobfoll, 2002).

The social cognitive view of the individual emphasizes person-situation interaction (e.g., Mischel, 1973; Shoda & Mischel, 1993). This view suggests that the psychological effect of a situation depends on how a person interprets the situation and that such differences in interpretation can vary as a function of significant individual differences. Based on this view, the impact of PsyEmp on PsyCap may vary from individual to individual depending upon differences in personality dispositions. As CSE reflects the personality characteristics of individuals, therefore assumed that CSE would moderate the relationship between PsyEmp and PsyCap.

The reciprocal behavior of employees can better be explained in the light of Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), which asserts that employees are unlikely to reciprocate positively if their employers fail to fulfill their work-related needs. The theory further posits that this lack of long-term perspective and trust in employment may be associated with negative outcomes (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

The strength of the bond between employees and employer depends upon the time expected the relationship would last. Expectancy theory of Vroom (1964) highlighting this aspect says that individuals who are in relational contract (long term) with their employers are more likely to identify themselves with their respective organizations and in turn they become more committed and satisfied employees. The theory further posits that satisfied employees will perform better because they perceived they are in long term contract with their organizations and they perceive organizational and their personal objectives as the same. So it is less likely that individual who are in relational contract with their organizations go for organizational deviance and more likely that they will go for high organization performance, commitment, and job satisfaction.
Chapter No. 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1 METHODOLOGY:
The present study is based on Hypothetico-Deductive method because in this study, 17 hypotheses have been postulated to investigate the underlying phenomenon. Hypothesis testing is deductive in nature because we test if a general theory is capable of explaining a particular problem.

3.2 Research Design and Study Context:
Data has been collected from full time employees serving in management cadre in telecom sectors of Pakistan. Survey based method has been used to reach the respondents, which has also been used by similar studies conducted in Pakistan (Jamal, 2007; Bashir and Ramay, 2010; Abbas, Raja, Darr, & Bouckenooghe, 2012; Khan, Abbas, Gul, and Raja, 2013).

Due to the fact that the study variables such as Psychological Empowerment, Psychological Capital, Psychological Contract Types, Core Self Evaluation, Attitudes (Satisfaction, Commitment and Turnover intensity) and Behaviors (In role performance, Extra role Performance and Counterproductive Work Behavior) and the proposed causal relationship among these can best be tapped over a period of time, longitudinal design has been employed. This is in line with the assertion that theoretical causal model time lag research design is superior to cross sectional research design because the later shortens the implication about causality (Wallace et al., 2009; Webster, Beehr, & Christiansen, 2010).

Extending this view, self-reported data on study variables such as psychological empowerment, psychological capital and psychological contract types were collected at time periods at T1, whereas self-reported data were collected after two months at time two (T2) on Core self-evaluation, Employees Attitudes (Satisfaction, Commitment and
Turnover Intension) and Employees Behaviors (In role performance, Extra role Performance and Counterproductive Work Behavior). Data on In role performance was collected at Time two (T2) using supervisory reports.

3.3 Population:
Population of this research was comprised of companies from Telecom sector in Pakistan. There were different reasons for selecting this industry. From business point of view, communication has shaped the world into a global village. Pace of the business has been changing drastically. Accesses to resources, markets and consumers have been facilitated. This at the same time has intensified the competition manifolds. On the other hand, it has also changed the life style of individuals. Providing them with information and access to almost the whole world on a single click at very affordable charges has facilitated their decisions and priorities. To survive in such a competitive environment, companies have to develop such a working culture that helps motivate employees to realize business challenges and respond them accurately and promptly. This is what telecommunication companies in Pakistan have succeeded to achieve.

One of the major challenges, the Telecom Sector of Pakistan have been confronting over a couple of years is the ability of the organizations to attract and retain talented personnel. It’s critical because employees working in telecom sector are considered more tech-savvy then people working in other fields. So, ensuring employees’ commitment and team efficacy have gained much attention (Altaf & Naqvi, 2013). According to Islam & Habib (2010), Telecom sector faces high employee turnover, which can be attributed to a larger extent to the underlying working conditions capable of addressing factors such as psychological empowerment, psychological capital, and psychological contract.
Keeping in view the importance and uniqueness of telecom industry, significance of variables of the study and differing characteristics of telecom sector organizations, this study aims to investigate the variables of interest for telecommunication companies in Pakistan.

### 3.4 Sample & Procedure:

Total estimated population of the study was 15000 employees. Due to time and resources constraints, it was not possible to study the entire population. Therefore, a sample size of 375 employees has been calculated using formula (http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm). To ensure 375 responses from employees, 500 survey instruments have been distributed among participants working at different management levels (line, middle, and top level management) in Telecommunication companies in Pakistan. Convenient sampling technique was used to collect the data. Survey method has been used instead of observation, interview or experiment to collect employees’ data. Experiment has not been employed because data has been collected in natural settings. Well researched survey instruments have been used to tap responses of all the study variables, therefore observation or interviews has not been employed.

To ensure maximum valid response rate, survey has been self-administered instead of floating through email or other means. Convenience sampling technique was used to select the respondents. The reason being that though experience and impact of phenomenon like psychological empowerment, psychological capital and attitudinal and behavioral consequences thereof may vary among employees based upon their management level, yet these attitudinal and behavioral aspects are so natural that all employees irrespective of their demographic profile experience the same to certain extent.

A cover letter was attached to each questionnaire in which the purpose of the research was explained and confidentiality of responses was ensured to the participants. No
individual would be identified in any published report and only aggregate level data would be reported. 500 questionnaires were distributed; I received 462 surveys at time 1. The time 1 survey included instruments on psychological empowerment, psychological capital and psychological contract types (Relational contract and Transactional contract). Approximately two months later, the same 462 employees were contacted again and time 2 surveys were distributed to them. The time 2 survey included instruments on core-self-evaluation, organization citizenship behavior, counterproductive work behavior, employee satisfaction, employee commitment and turnover intention. Out of 462 respondents who reported at time 1, 435 respondents reported for time 2 surveys, the response rate was 89%. And lastly after 2 surveys collection, respondent’s supervisors were contacted. The survey included instrument on in-role-performance. Each supervisor was asked to evaluate his or her subordinate’s in-role performance on the given scales. Each supervisor minimum three (3) subordinates evaluated, and total 62 supervisors evaluated the 421 employees. For total 421 responses their supervisor’s response was obtained and 10 were excluded as they were not usable responses. Therefore, the final sample size included 411 paired-responses yielding a response rate of 84%.

3.5 **Instrument and Measurement:**
The instruments used for obtaining data in this research study have previously been validated across different work settings, professions and industries. These instruments have also been used in studies conducted in Pakistan (Abbas, Raja, Darr, & Bouckenooghe, 2012; Raja, Johns, & Ntalianis, 2004). According to Youssef & Luthans (2007), use of established standardized scales to measure the study variables reduces the likelihood of instrumentation threats. All the instruments have good psychometric properties and are scientifically, methodologically and systematically appropriate.
All the study variables except job performance and innovative performance have been measured using self-reported instruments because self-reports are considered to be more appropriate for these measures. However, to avoid self-report bias issues, job performance was measured using supervisory-rated responses.

The following questionnaires were used for the collection of data.

**3.5.1 Psychological Empowerment:**
Four component of psychological empowerment (Meaning, Competence, Self-determination and Impact) was measured by 12 items scale of empowerment in current study. Empowerment scale was firstly developed and used by (Spreitzer, 1995a). Example of items included, “the work I do is very important to me”, “I am confident about my ability to do my job”, “I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job”, and “my impact on what happens in my department in large”. The reliability of psychological empowerment measure reported in previous studies ranged from 0.62 to 0.80.

**3.5.2 Psychological Capital:**
Psychological capital was measured by 24-item PsyCap questionnaire or PCQ (Luthans, Avolio, et al., 2007; Luthans, Youssef, et al., 2007). This instrument includes 6 items for each of the four components of hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Sample items are as follows: efficacy-“I feel confident helping to set targets/goals in my work area;” hope-“If I should find myself in a jam at work, I could think of many ways to get out of it;” resilience-“I usually take stressful things at work in stride;” and optimism-“When things are uncertain for me at work, I usually expect the best.” Previous research has shown strong factor-analytic fit for the PsyCap questionnaire across multiple samples (e.g., Avey et al., 2006; Luthans, Avolio, et al., 2007).
3.5.3 Core Self Evaluation:

Core self-evaluations scale was measured by Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, (2003). The CSES was a 12 items questionnaire that has been developed to operationalize the construct of core self-evaluations. Benefit of using this questionnaire is that it has been designed to measure the underlying concept itself rather than the particular indicators of the concept. Despite the salience of the traits that compose this construct (self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and neuroticism), it is not common to scholars to study these traits together. And in case they were studied together in case personality research, generally they are treated as entirely separate variables with no discussion of their interrelationships or possible common core (Judge et al., 2003). Example items include, “I complete tasks successfully”, “Overall, I am satisfied with myself”, “Sometimes I feel depressed”. The original alpha value for CSES total score for was 0.80.

3.5.4 Psychological Contract Type (Relation and Transactional):

Millward and Hopkins (1998) the shortened 18 items scale having a clear two-factor solution, with coefficient alphas of 0.79 for relational contract and 0.72 for transactional contract was used to measure psychological contract. Example of the item for relational contract, “I feel part of a team in this organization”, and for transactional contract, “I work only the hours set out in my contract and no more”. Previous studies have reported that reliability of this measure ranged from 0.72 to 0.79.

3.5.5. Organization Citizenship Behaviors:

OCB was measured by using Questionnaire developed by Smith, Organ and Near (1983) with original alpha value 0.86. Responses was obtained on a five point Likert
scale, where 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree. Example items include: To what degree do you help others who have been absent? Are you volunteer for things that are not required? Previous alpha values of various researches ranged from 0.78-0.90.

3.5.6 In-role Performance: 
The five items scale on the survey was designed to measure supervisor-rated employee performance and are based on the work of Heilman, Block, & Lucas (1992). A sample items are, “All in all, how competently does this individual perform their job?” Data Managers would be asked to complete the five-item performance measure for each of the employees who they directly supervise or manage. The intention is to have manager ratings serve as the primary measure of performance. Pervious reliability was 0.90 for self-reported and 0.96 for supervisor reported.

3.5.7 Counterproductive Work Behaviors:
CWBs was measured with 10 items from Fox and Spector’s (1999) CWBs scale (α = .81), which has demonstrated strong psychometric properties. Example items were asked the extent to which respondents have “purposely ignored their boss” and “purposely wasted company materials/supplies.” Ratings was on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from hardly, if ever to frequently, if not always. These items have been used in previous research (Avey, Luthans, & Youssef, 2010) and were selected on the basis of face validity for the broad sample and high reported frequency in Fox and Spector’s (1999) work.
3.5.8 Job Satisfaction:
Job satisfaction was measured using a four-item scale of Hackman & Oldham, (1975). Examples of Items are: “I feel very satisfied with my job, “I feel I would be happy to work here until I retire.” Possible responses ranged from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5). Previous studies have reported that reliability of this measure ranged from 0.80 to 0.86.

3.5.9 Employee’s Commitment:
Six (06) items scale (Allen and Mayer, 1996) was used to measure the commitment of employees with organization. Example of the items includes “this organization deserves my loyalty” and “I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now”. Previous studies have reported that reliability of this measure ranged from 0.72 to 0.90.

3.5.10 Turnover Intention:
Three (03) items measure of turnover intention adapted from Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cummann et al, 1979) was used to measure turnover intention. These three items are "I will actively look for a new job in the next year"; "I often think about quitting" and "I will probably look for a new job by the next year". Responses were recorded on 5 point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The scale showed previously very good Reliability up to (0.92).
### 3.6 Measurement used in the study and their source:

**Table No. 3.1: Variables and along with source and number of items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>Spreitzer, M.G. (1995a)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>Luthans et.al (2007)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Self Evaluation</td>
<td>Judge et.al (2003)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation and Transactional</td>
<td>Millward and Hopkins (1998)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In role Performance</td>
<td>Heilman, Block, &amp; Lucas (1992)</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra role performance</td>
<td>Smith, Organ &amp; Near (1983)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterproductive Work Behaviors</td>
<td>Fox and Spector’s (1999)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Hackman &amp; Oldham, (1975)</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees Commitment</td>
<td>Allen and Mayer (1997)</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intension</td>
<td>Cummann et al, (1979)</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.7 Control variables:
Several variables would be controlled that may affect the relationship among the study variables but that were not of direct theoretical interest. Among those are the demographic variables such as employee age, employee tenure and employee gender, as previous research
(Aquino & Douglas, 2003) suggests that these status variables affect employee responses inner feeling.
CHAPTER 4  
RESULTS

4.1 Summary of Hypothesis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Psychological empowerment will be positively related to PsyCap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PsyCap will be positively related to OCB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PsyCap will be positively related to in-role performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PsyCap will be negatively related to CWBs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PsyCap will be positively related to job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PsyCap will be negatively related to employee’s commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PsyCap will be positively related to turnover intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Psychological empowerment is positively related to the employee work behaviors of (a) in role performance, (b) OCB and (c) negativity related to CWB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Psychological empowerment is positively related to the employee work attitudes of (a) job satisfaction and (b) employee’s commitment and negatively related to (c) turnover intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Relationship between Psychological empowerment and PsyCap will be moderated by CSE such that the relationship is stronger when CSE is high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (a)</td>
<td>Relationship between PsyCap and in-role performance is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is stronger when relational contract is higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 11 (b)  Relationship between PsyCap and in-role performance is moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is stronger when transactional contract is higher.

Hypothesis 12 (a)  Relationship between PsyCap and OCB is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is stronger when relational contract is higher.

Hypothesis 12 (b)  Relationship between PsyCap and OCB is moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is stronger when transactional contract is higher.

Hypothesis 13 (a)  Relationship between PsyCap and CWB is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is weaker when relational contract is higher.

Hypothesis 13 (b)  Relationship between PsyCap and CWB is moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is weaker when transactional contract is higher.

Hypothesis 14 (a)  Relationship between PsyCap and satisfaction is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is stronger when relational contract is higher.

Hypothesis 14 (b)  Relationship between PsyCap and satisfaction is moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is stronger when transactional contract is higher.

Hypothesis 15 (a)  Relationship between PsyCap and organizational commitment is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is stronger when relational contract is higher.
Hypothesis-15 (b)  Relationship between PsyCap and organizational commitment is moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is stronger when transactional contract is higher.

Hypothesis-16 (a)  Relationship between PsyCap and turnover intention is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is weaker when relational contract is higher.

Hypothesis-16 (b)  Relationship between PsyCap and turnover intention is moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is weaker when transactional contract is higher.

Hypothesis No. 17-a:  PsyCap mediate the relationship between Psychological empowerment and employee work behaviors of (1) in role performance, (2) OCB and (3) Counterproductive Work Behaviors.

Hypothesis No. 17-b:  PsyCap mediate the relationship between Psychological empowerment and employee work attitudes of (1) job satisfaction and (b) employee’s commitment and (3) turnover intentions.

4.2  Confirmatory Factor Analysis:

Researcher had collected data on Psychological Capital, Psychological empowerment, relational contract and transactional contract in Time 1; therefore it was necessary to conduct CFA comparing a four factor structure with a one factor structure to see if Psychological Capital, Psychological empowerment, relational contract and transactional
contract discriminate from each other. The results for CFA revealed that a four factor structure for Psychological Capital, Psychological empowerment, relational contract and transactional contract provided a better fit ($\chi^2 = 2707.38$, $df = 1135$, CFI = .82, GFI = .80, IFI = .86, and RMSEA = .07) as compared to a single factor structure ($\chi^2 = 5930.77$, df = 1377, CFI = .58, GFI = .60, IFI = .58, and RMSEA = .09).

I had collected data on Core-self-evaluation, OCB, CWB, Employee satisfaction, employee commitment and turnover intension in Time 2, therefore it was necessary to conduct CFA comparing a six factor structure with a one factor structure to see if Core-self-evaluation, OCB, CWB, Employee satisfaction, employee commitment and turnover intension. The results for CFA revealed that a six factor structure for Core-self-evaluation, OCB, CWB, Employee satisfaction, employee commitment and turnover intension provided a better fit ($\chi^2 =$, $df = 1224$, CFI = .83, GFI = .85, IFI = .80, and RMSEA = .07) as compared to a single factor structure ($\chi^2 = 7462.32$, $df = 1224$, CFI = .41, GFI = .46, IFI = .42, and RMSEA = .12).

### 4.3 Descriptive Analysis:

#### 4.3.1 Demographics:
The demographic variables of the study are Gender, Age, Education, and Work experience. Total numbers of respondents were 411 with 74.9% (308) male and 25.1% (103) female. Respondents’ age ranged from 20-60 years (1=20-30, 2=31-40, 3 =41-50 & 4 = 51-60) with the age group 31-40 years reported the highest percentage (59.6/245) followed by 22.1% (91) respondents in having age 41-50 years, 13.9% (57) respondents having age between 20 -30 years and 4.4 % (18) respondents having age between 51-60 years. Most of our respondents were university graduates. 59.6% (245) respondents reported master level (16 years) of education, 28.7% (118) respondents reported Bachelor
level (BA/B.Sc 14 years) education and 9.5% (39) respondents reported postgraduate (MS/M. Phil-18 years) education. 47.9% (197) respondents possessed more than 10 years of experience, 30.4% (125) respondents possessed 7-10 years of experience, 12.4% (51) respondents possessed 4-6 years of experiences, and 9.2% (38) respondents possessed 1-3 years of experience.

In general, there is no significant association between demographic variables and variables of this study. There is significant differences in time related variables in psychological capital such as experiences level of the employees (total work experiences and tenure in current organization), age of the employees. As Psychological capital is a state-like resource which is developable resources, it is therefore likely accrue with the passage of time.

Table # 4.1 depicts the Mean, Standard Deviation, Variance and Cronbach’s Alpha of the variables of the study. PsyCap (M= 4.1, S.D = .457, & Variance = .209), Psychological Empowerment (M= 3.56, S.D = .365, & Variance = .134), Relational Contract (M = 3.86, S.D = .760, & Variance = .450), Transactional Contract (M = 2.72, S.D = .459, & Variance = .211), Core Self-Evaluation (M = 3.64, S.D = .491, & Variance = .242), Organization Citizenship Behavior (M = 3.90, S.D = .430, & Variance = .180), In-Role-Performance (M = 3.94, S.D = .513, & Variance = .263), Counterproductive Work Behavior (M = 2.08, S.D = .832, & Variance = .694), Employees Commitment (M = 3.99, S.D = .498, & Variance = .248), Employees Satisfaction (M = 3.89, S.D = .583, & Variance = .341) and Turnover Intention (M = 1.90, S.D = .832, & Variance = .693).
Table # 4.1: Means, Standard Deviations, Variance and Reliabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyEmp</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Role-Performance</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Internal consistency of variables was tested using Cronbach’s Alpha reliability analysis. According to Cooper & Schindle (2005), a scale is considered to be reliable if report consistent results when used and tested under different conditions and at different time periods. The value of Alpha reliability higher than 0.50 is considered appropriate for the scale to be reliable. Table No. 4.1 and table No. 4.2 show that all the study variables reported reliabilities higher than 0.50.

4.4 Correlation Analysis:
The table No. 4.2 shows the results of correlation of the main variables of interest in this study. The correlation between psychological empowerment and psychological capital (r = .644, p < .001) was positive and significant which provided initial support to our hypothesis no 1. The correlation between psychological empowerment and organization citizenship behavior (r = .588, p < .001) and in-role-performance (r = .427, p < .001) was
positive and significant and negatively correlated with counterproductive work behavior ($r = -.349, p < .001$), which provided support to our hypothesis no 8. The correlation between psychological empowerment with employees commitment ($r = .472, p < .001$), employees satisfaction ($r = .447, p < .001$) was positive, and correlation with employees turnover intention ($r = -.366, p < .001$) was negative and significant, which provided support to our hypothesis no 9. The results also reveal the correlation between psychological capital and employee behaviors and attitudes. There was a positive and significant correlation of psychological capital with employees satisfaction ($r = .639, p < .001$) and commitment ($r = .693, p < .001$), whereas negative correlation with turnover intention ($r = -.519, p < .001$), which also provide initial support to our hypothesis no. 5, 6, and 7.

The results also show highly positive and significant relation between PsyCap and organization citizenship behavior ($r = .756, p < .001$), in-role-performance ($r = .629, p < .001$) of employees and negative correlation with counterproductive work behavior ($r = -.507, p < .001$). These results provided support to our hypotheses no 2, 3, & 4.

Significant positive correlation has also been found between relational contract and organization citizenship behavior ($r = .544, p < .001$), in-role-performance ($r = .596, p < .001$), employees commitment ($r = .462, p < .001$), job satisfaction ($r = .573, p < .001$), and negative correlation with counterproductive work behavior ($r = -.488, p < .001$), and turnover intention ($r = -.316, p < .001$). The results show negative and significant association of transactional contract with organization citizenship behavior ($r = -.389, p < .001$), in-role-performance ($r = -.221, p < .001$), employees commitment ($r = -.305, p < .001$), job satisfaction ($r = -.240, p < .001$), and positive and significant relationship with counterproductive work behavior ($r = .386, p < .001$), and turnover intention ($r = .237, p$}
< .001). The core-self-evaluation was also positively significantly correlated with psychological capital (r = .427, p < .001).
Table No 4.2: Correlations and reliabilities of the main variables of the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PsyCap</th>
<th>Psy Emp</th>
<th>Transactional Contract</th>
<th>Relational Contract</th>
<th>CSE</th>
<th>Supervisor Rated Performance</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Turnover Intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>1(94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psy Empowerment</td>
<td>.644**</td>
<td>1(.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Contract</td>
<td>-.433**</td>
<td>-.329**</td>
<td>1(.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Contract</td>
<td>.662**</td>
<td>.486**</td>
<td>-.249**</td>
<td>1(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>.427**</td>
<td>.389**</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.590**</td>
<td>1(.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S R Performance</td>
<td>.629**</td>
<td>.427**</td>
<td>-.221**</td>
<td>.596**</td>
<td>.459**</td>
<td>1(.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>.756**</td>
<td>.588**</td>
<td>-.389**</td>
<td>.544**</td>
<td>.393**</td>
<td>.513**</td>
<td>1(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>-.507**</td>
<td>-.349**</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>-.488**</td>
<td>-.332**</td>
<td>-.425**</td>
<td>-.410**</td>
<td>1(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.639**</td>
<td>.447**</td>
<td>-.240**</td>
<td>.573**</td>
<td>.412**</td>
<td>.543**</td>
<td>.591**</td>
<td>-.450**</td>
<td>1(.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>.693**</td>
<td>.472**</td>
<td>-.305**</td>
<td>.462**</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.601**</td>
<td>-.335**</td>
<td>.516**</td>
<td>1(.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>-.519**</td>
<td>-.366**</td>
<td>.237**</td>
<td>-.316**</td>
<td>-.161**</td>
<td>-.336**</td>
<td>-.434**</td>
<td>.253**</td>
<td>-.274**</td>
<td>-.445**</td>
<td>1 (.85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Note: N=411, Alpha reliabilities given in parenthesis.
4.5 Test of Main and Mediation Effects:

Hypothesis 1 predicted that psychological empowerment has positive association with PsyCap. The results in Table 3 showed that the direct effect of psychological empowerment on psychological capital was positively significant ($\beta = .80$, $p = .000$). Therefore result supported hypothesis no 1.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that PsyCap has positive association with OCB. The results in Table 4 showed that the direct effect of psychological capital on OCB was positively significant ($\beta = .60$, $p = .000$). Therefore result supported hypothesis no 2.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that PsyCap has positive association with in-role-performance. The results in Table 3 showed that the direct effect of psychological capital on in-role-performance was positively significant ($\beta = .67$, $p = .000$). Therefore result supported hypothesis no 3.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that PsyCap has negative association with CWB. The results in Table 5 showed that the direct effect of psychological capital on CWB was negatively significant ($\beta = -.88$, $p = .000$). Therefore result supported hypothesis no 4.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that PsyCap has positive association with employees’ job satisfaction. The results in Table 6 showed that the direct effect of psychological capital on employees’ job satisfaction was positively significant ($\beta = .76$, $p = .000$). Therefore result supported hypothesis no 5.
Hypothesis 6 predicted that PsyCap has positive association with employees’ commitment. The results in Table 7 showed that the direct effect of psychological capital on employees’ commitment was positively significant ($\beta = .72$, $p = .000$). Therefore result supported hypothesis no 6.

Hypothesis 7 predicted that PsyCap has negative association with employees’ turnover intentions. The results in Table 8 showed that the direct effect of psychological capital on employees’ turnover intentions was negatively significant ($\beta = -.88$, $p = .000$). Therefore result supported hypothesis no 6.

Hypothesis 8 predicted that Psychological empowerment is positively related to the employee in-role-performance and OCB whereas negativity related to CWB. The results in Table 3 showed that the direct effect of psychological empowerment on employees’ in-role-performance was positively insignificant ($\beta = .05$, $p = .458$). The results in Table 4 showed that the direct effect of psychological empowerment on employees’ OCB was positively significant ($\beta = .20$, $p = .000$), whereas the results in Table 5 showed that the direct effect of psychological empowerment on employees’ CWB was negatively significant ($\beta = -.08$, $p = .50$). Hence result support hypothesis no 8 (b), where results reject hypothesis no 8 (a) & (c).

Hypothesis 9 predicted that Psychological empowerment is positively related to the employees’ job satisfaction and commitment whereas negativity related to employees’ turnover intention. The results in Table 6 showed that the direct effect of psychological empowerment on employees’ job satisfaction was positively
insignificant ($\beta = .09, p= .225$). The results in Table 7 showed that the direct effect of psychological empowerment on employees’ commitment was positively insignificant ($\beta = .06, p= .341$), whereas the results in Table 8 showed that the direct effect of psychological empowerment on employees’ turnover intention was negatively insignificant ($\beta = -.12, p= .327$). Hence, results didn’t support hypothesis no 9 (a), (b), & (c).

An indirect effect is posited in hypothesis 17, A and B. these hypothesis test for the mediating role of Psychological capital between the predictor variable (psychological empowerment) and criterion variable (in-role-performance, OCB, CWB, Employees’ job satisfaction, employees’ commitment and employees’ turnover intention) A multistep technique suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986) is generally applied to test for the mediation related hypothesis. However, many experts of research methodology have highlighted some deficiencies in the use of Baron and Kenny method for the test of mediation (MacKinnon, Lockwood, Hoffman, West, & Sheets, 2002).

Research methodologists, for example have suspicion regarding the Baron and Kenny method that whether the step of demonstrating a significant relationship between predictor and criterion variables is necessary for the test of mediation (MacKinnon, Krull, & Lockwood, 2000; Shrout & Bolger, 2002). Studies have also verified that the step involving direct effect between predictor and criterions is no longer required (Kenny, Kashy, and Bolger, 1998).
Hence Sobel (1982) test has been suggested which demonstrates the significant indirect effects between dependent-independent relationship (Cole, Walter, and Bruch, 2008, p, 950). It has been argued that Sobel test is more powerful than Baron and Kenny test as it treats the mediation more parsimoniously. But there is one underlying assumption of Sobel test: the dependent-independent effect is normally distributed. This assumption is weak, because the distribution of dependent-independent is known to be non-normal, when the variables constituting the product dependent-independent are normally distributed (Edwards & Lambert, 2007)” (Cited in Cole et al., p 950).

It is also suggested that in comparisons to Sobel test, the bootstrapped confidence interval is more robust in conducting the mediation tests (Hayes, 2013, Preacher & Hayes, 2004). As bootstrapping avoid the problems related to the power of test, so it is preferred over Sobel (MacKinnon, Lockwood, & Williams, 2004).

Based on these arguments, I chose both Sobel test and bootstrap method for testing the mediation as suggested by (Preacher and Hayes, 2008). The macro INDIRECT (Hayes, 2013; available on http://www.afhayes.com/spss-sas-and-mplus-macros-and-code.html) was used for the said purpose. This is an improved version of Preacher and Hayes (2008) for testing indirect effects.

4.5.1 Bootstrap for indirect effects of Psychological Empowerment on In-Role-Performance through Psychological Capital:

Results of mediation analysis for the relationship hypothesized in H.no 17-A (a) (PsyCap mediate the relationship between psychological empowerment and In-
Role-Performance are shown in table 3. The mediation effects of psychological capital in the relationship between psychological empowerment and in-role-performance relationship was examined. The values in table no. 3 show that the direct effect of Psychological Empowerment on In-Role-Performance was not significant ($\beta=.05$, $t = .74$, $p = .458$). However, the direct effect of Psychological Capital on In-Role-Performance ($\beta = .67$, $t = 12.04$, $p = .000$) and effect of Psychological Empowerment on Psychological Capital ($\beta = .80$, $t = 17.02$, $p = .000$) was significant. The total effect ($c$) of the Psychological Empowerment on In-Role-Performance controlling for Psychological Capital was significant ($\beta = .59$, $t = 9.55$, $p = .000$). Moreover, the bootstrap indirect effect of psychological empowerment and in-role-performance through psychological capital was also significant ($\beta = .54$; CI = .41 to .69) at a 95% confidence interval. The results of Sobel test (Normal theory tests for indirect effect) also found mediation in the model ($z = 9.82$, $p=.000$). The mediation in this case implies the mediation effects of psychological capital in the relationship between psychological empowerment and in-role-performance relationship. Hence, Results show that psychological capital mediated the relationship between psychological empowerment and in-role-performance. Hence, results of the study support hypothesis no. 17-A (a).

4.5.2 Bootstrap for indirect effects of Psychological Empowerment on Organization Citizenship Behavior through Psychological Capital:

Results of mediation analysis for the relationship hypothesized in H.no 17-A (b) (PsyCap mediate the relationship between psychological empowerment and
Organization Citizenship Behavior are shown in table 4. The values in table 4 indicate that the direct effects of Psychological Empowerment regressed on OCB ($\beta$=.20, $t$=4.17, $p$=.000), Psychological Capital regressed on OCB ($\beta$=.60, $t$=15.55, $p$=.000), Psychological Empowerment regressed on Psychological Capital ($\beta$=.80, $t$=17.02, $p$=.000) were all significant. Similarly, the total effect of Psychological Empowerment regressed on OCB controlling for Psychological Capital ($\beta$=.69, $t$=14.71, $p$=.000) was also significant. The indirect effects were also significant at the 95% level of significance (LLCI=.37, ULCI=.61), as indicated by the values of LLCI and ULCI when the lower and upper levels of the confidence intervals did not show zero. The results of Sobel test (Normal theory tests for indirect effect) also found mediation in the model ($z$=11.47, $p$=.000). All these values confirm the mediation role of psychological capital in the relationship between psychological empowerment and OCB. Hence, results of the study support hypothesis no. 17-A (b).

4.5.3 Bootstrap for indirect effects of Psychological Empowerment on Organization Citizenship Behavior through Psychological Capital:

Results of mediation analysis for the relationship hypothesized in H.no 17-A (c) (PsyCap mediate the relationship between psychological empowerment and Organization Citizenship Behavior are shown in table # 5.

The values in table # 5 indicate that the direct effects of psychological empowerment regressed on CWB ($\beta$= -.08, $t$= -0.66, $p$=.50) was insignificant, whereas psychological capital regressed on CWB ($\beta$= -.88, $t$=15.55, $p$ =.000),
psychological empowerment regressed on psychological capital (β=.80, t=17.02, p=.000) were significant. Similarly, the total effect of psychological empowerment regressed on counterproductive work behavior controlling for psychological capital (β= -.79, t= -7.52 p=.000) was also significant. The bootstrap indirect effects were also significant the 95% level of significance (LLCI= -.894, ULCI= -.545), as indicated by the values of LLCI and ULCI when the lower and upper levels of the confidence intervals did not show zero. The results of Sobel test (Normal theory tests for indirect effect) also found mediation in the model (z =11.47, p=.000). Results show that psychological capital mediated the relationship between psychological empowerment and counterproductive work behavior. Hence, results of the study support hypothesis no. 17-A (c).

Therefore, results supports our hypothesis no 17-A (a) (b) & (c).

4.5.4 Bootstrap for indirect effects of Psychological Empowerment on Employee’s Satisfaction through Psychological Capital:

Results of mediation analysis for the relationship hypothesized in H.no 17-A (a), in table # 6predicting mediation effects of psychological capital in the relationship between psychological empowerment and employee’s satisfaction relationship, following statistics values has been obtained. The results indicate that the direct effect of psychological empowerment regressed on employee’s satisfaction (β=.09, t=1.21, p=.225) was not found to be significant. However, the effect of psychological capital regressed on employee’s satisfaction (β=.76, t=12.06, p=.000) and impact of psychological empowerment regressed on psychological
capital ($\beta=.80$, $t=17.02$, $p=.000$) were all significant. Similarly, the total effect of psychological empowerment regressed on employee’s satisfaction controlling for psychological capital ($\beta=.71$, $t=10.09$ $p=.000$) was also significant. In table, the Bootstrap indirect effects were also significant the 95% level of significance (LLCI= .468, ULCI=.777), as indicated by the values of LLCI and ULCI when the lower and upper levels of the confidence intervals did not show zero. The results of Sobel test (Normal theory tests for indirect effect) also found mediation in the model ($z=9.83$, $p=.000$). All these values confirm the mediation role of psychological capital in the relationship between psychological empowerment and Employee’s satisfaction. Hence, results of the study support hypothesis no. 17-b (1).

4.5.5 Bootstrap for indirect effects of Psychological Empowerment on Employee’s Commitment through Psychological Capital:

Results of mediation analysis for the relationship hypothesized in H.no 17-a (2), in table # 7 predicting mediation effects of psychological capital in the relationship between psychological empowerment and employee’s commitment relationship, following statistics values have been obtained. The values in table indicate that the direct effect of psychological empowerment regressed on employee’s commitment ($\beta=.06$, $t=953$, $p=.341$) was not found to be significant. However, the effect of psychological capital regressed on employee’s commitment ($\beta=.72$, $t=14.25$, $p=.000$) and impact of psychological empowerment regressed on Psychological Capital ($\beta=.80$, $t=17.02$, $p=.000$) were significant.
Similarly, the total effect of psychological empowerment regressed on employee’s commitment controlling for psychological capital ($\beta=.64$, $t=10.83$ $p=.000$) was also significant. In table, the Bootstrap indirect effects were also significant the 95% level of significance (LLCI= .435, ULCI=.742), as indicated by the values of LLCI and ULCI when the lower and upper levels of the confidence intervals did not show zero. The results of Sobel test (Normal theory tests for indirect effect) also found mediation in the model ($z = 10.91$, $p=.000$). Results show that psychological capital fully mediate the relationship between psychological empowerment and employees’ commitment. Hence, results of the study support hypothesis no. 17-\textbf{b} (2).

4.5.6 Bootstrap for indirect effects of Psychological Empowerment on Employee’s Turnover Intention through Psychological Capital:

Results of mediation analysis for the relationship hypothesized in H.no 17-\textbf{a} (3), in table # 8predicting mediation effects of psychological capital in the relationship between psychological empowerment and employee’s turnover intention relationship, following statistics values have been obtained. The direct effect of psychological empowerment regressed on turnover intention ($\beta= -.12$, $t=-.98$, $p=.327$) was to be negatively insignificant. However, the effect of psychological capital regressed on turnover intention ($\beta=-.88$, $t=-8.76$, $p=.000$) was found significant but shown negative relationship i.e. with one unit change in psychological capital will lead to .88 unit decrease in turnover intention among employees. The impact of Psychological Empowerment regressed on
psychological capital ($\beta=.80, \ t=17.02, p=.000$) was found to be positively significant. Similarly, the total effect of psychological empowerment regressed on turnover intention controlling for psychological capital ($\beta=-.83, \ t=-7.95, \ p=.000$) was also found to be negatively significant. Results shows that, the bootstrap indirect effects were also significant ($\beta=.109$) the 95% level of significance (LLCI= -.936, ULCI= -.507), as indicated by the values of LLCI and ULCI when the lower and upper levels of the confidence intervals did not show zero. The values of Sobel test (Normal theory tests for indirect effect) are ($z=-7.78, \ p=.000$). All these values confirm the mediation role of psychological empowerment in the relationship between psychological capital and turnover intention. Hence, results of the study support hypothesis no. 17-b (3).

4.6 Moderating Analyses:

To test the effect of psychological empowerment on dependent variables, linear regression analysis was used. Moderated regression models were run to test the impact of moderating variables on the relationship between independent and dependent variables in such a way that control variables were entered Covariance followed by independent, dependent and moderators in model # 1 & 2 using the bootstrap technique suggest by Preacher and Hayes (Preacher and Hayes, 2008).

Moderated regression analyses were used to test the interaction effects of psychological empowerment and core-self-evaluation on the psychological capital
and also tested the interaction effects of psychological capital on employee behaviors and attitudes using model 1 and model 2 of bootstrap technique suggest by Preacher and Hayes (Preacher and Hayes, 2008).

4.6.1 Interactive effects of Psychological Empowerment and Core-Self-Evaluation on Psychological Capital:

It was hypothesized that core-self-evaluation would moderate the relationship between psychological empowerment and psychological capital (Hypothesis 10). Table No. 9 shows the results of moderated regression analysis. Results show the direct effect of Psychological empowerment (β = 1.91, p < .05) and Core-self-evaluation (β = 1.52, p < .05) have significantly positive impact on psychological capital. Then Core-Self-Evaluation was examined as a simple moderator of the relation between psychological empowerment and psychological capital. The Simple moderation was examined using “Model 1” in PROCESS. The values show that the overall model was significant (F=63.94, p=.0000) accounting for 48% of the overall variance in psychological capital ($R^2=.487$). Core-self-evaluation interact significantly with psychological empowerment (β = -.374, P < 05). The combine effect of psychological empowerment and core-self-evaluation explained 1.8% variance ($\Delta R^2 = 0.018$, $F = 14.14$, $P < .05$) on psychological capital predicting positive relationship between psychological empowerment and psychological capital when core-self-evaluation was high and lower when core-self-evaluation was low. Therefore results of the study support hypothesis no. 10.
4.6.2 Interactive effects of Psychological Capital, Relational and Transactional Contract on In-Role-Performance:

Hypothesis no 11 a & b, predicts that Psychological contract type moderates the relationship between psychological capital and employees’ in-role-performance. Results of regression analysis of direct and indirect effect of psychological capital on employees’ in-role-performance are shown in table no. 10. Psychological capital (β = .767, p > .10) has insignificantly positive impact on employees’ in-role-performance. Significantly positive relationship was found between relational contract (β = .530, p < .10) and in-role-performance. Transactional contract (β = -.140, p > .10) reported insignificantly relationship with in-role-performance.

The Relational Contract and Transactional Contract were both examined as moderators on the relation between psychological capital and In-Role-Performance. This moderation was examined using “Model 2” in PROCESS. The values show that the overall model was significant ($F$=68.07, $p$=.0000) accounting for 45 % of the overall variance in In-Role-Performance ($R^2$ = .456). The interaction terms of Relational Contract and Transactional Contract when regressed were not found to be significant which not confirms the moderating role of Relational Contract and Transactional Contract in the relation of psychological capital and In-Role-Performance with ($p > 0.10$). Results show that the relationship between psychological capital and employees’ in-role-performance remained unchanged irrespective of type of psychological contract (relational or transactional). The results did not support hypothesis no. 11 a & b.
4.6.3 Interactive effects of Psychological Capital, Relational and Transactional Contract on Organization Citizenship Behavior (OCB):

Hypothesis no 12 a & b predict that Psychological contract types moderate the relationship between psychological capital and organization citizenship behavior. Results of regression analysis of direct and indirect effect of psychological capital on organization citizenship behavior are shown in table no. 11. Direct effects of Psychological capital ($\beta = .244, p > .10$) have insignificantly positive impact on organization citizenship behavior. Insignificantly positive relationship was found between relational contract ($\beta = .127, p > .10$) and organization citizenship behavior and transactional contract ($\beta = -.619, p < .10$) was significantly negative relationship with organization citizenship behavior.

The moderated regression analysis results using relational contract and transactional contract as moderators. This moderation was examined using “Model 2” in PROCESS. The values show that the overall model was significant ($F=114.61, p=.0000$) accounting for 58 % of the overall variance in OCB ($R^2=.58$). Non-significant results ($\beta = -.015, P > .10$) were found in interactive effects of psychological capital and relational contract ($\Delta R^2 = 0.001, F = .075, P = .783$) with organization citizenship behavior. Whereas transactional contract interact significantly with psychological capital ($\beta = .132, P < .10$). Significant results shown that the interaction effects of psychological capital and transactional contract ($\Delta R^2 = 0.002, F = 4.08, P < .10$) with organization citizenship behavior. The relationship is significant but the value of change in R square ($\Delta R^2$) is close
to zero, therefore results show that the relationship between psychological capital and organization citizenship behavior were remained unchanged whether contract is relational or transactional. The results of the study were not supported over hypothesis no. 12 a & b.

4.6.4 Interactive effects of Psychological Capital, Relational and Transactional Contract on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB):

Hypothesis no 13 a & b, predicts that Psychological contract type (Relational & transactional) moderate the relationship between psychological capital and employees’ counterproductive work behavior. Results of regression analysis of direct and indirect effect of psychological capital, relational and transactional contract on employees’ counterwork productive behavior are shown in table no. 12. Psychological capital ($\beta = 1.87, p < .10$) has significant impact on employees’ counterwork productive behavior. Significant relationship was also found between relational contract ($\beta = 1.08, p < .10$) and counterwork productive behavior. The relationship between Transactional contract and counterwork productive behavior was significant ($\beta = 1.99, p < .10$).

Hypothesis no 13 a & b, the moderating role of relational and transactional contract on the relationship between psychological capital and CWB. This moderation was examined using “Model 2” in PROCESS. The values show that the overall model was significant ($F=43.35, p=.0000$) accounting for 34 % of the overall variance in
CWB ($R^2=.34$). Interactive effect of psychological capital and relational contract ($\Delta R^2 = 0.010, F = 6.70, P < .10$) and interactive effect of psychological capital and transactional contract ($\Delta R^2 = 0.006, F = 3.95, P < .10$) on counterproductive work behavior was significant. Results show that interactive effects of psychological capital and psychological contract types (relational and transactional contract) on employees’ counterproductive work behavior were moderated by psychological contract types such that the relationship. As interaction terms brought significant effects, hence, confirming the moderating roles of Relational Contract ($p=.010$) and Transactional Contract ($p=.047$) on the relation between psychological capital and CWB. The results support over hypothesis no. 13 a & b.

4.6.5 Interactive effects of Psychological Capital, Relational and Transactional Contract on Employees’ Satisfaction:

Hypothesis no 14 a & b predicts that psychological contract type moderates the relationship between psychological capital and employees’ satisfaction. Results of regression analysis of direct and indirect effect of psychological capital, relational and transactional contract on employees’ satisfaction are shown in table no. 13

Insignificant impact of Psychological capital ($\beta = -.086, p > .10$) was found with employees satisfaction. Relational contract ($\beta = -.119, p < .10$) reported insignificant positive relationship with employees satisfaction, whereas the relationship between transactional contract ($\beta = -.522, p > .10$) and employee satisfaction was also insignificant.
The interactive effect of relational and transactional contract on the relation between psychological capital and employees’ Satisfaction, “Model 2” was used in PROCESS. The values show that the overall model was significant \((F=66.53, p=.0000)\) accounting for 45% of the overall variance in employee satisfaction \((R^2 = .45)\). However, when interaction terms of relational contract and transactional contract were regressed, non-significant results were found in interactive effects of psychological capital and relational contract \((\Delta R^2 = 0.001, F = .977, P > .10)\) with employees satisfaction and interactive effect of psychological capital and transactional contract \((\Delta R^2 = 0.001, F = 1.19, P > .10)\) with employees satisfaction. The relationship between psychological capital and employees’ satisfaction remained unchanged irrespective of the type of psychological contract type (relational or transactional). Results didn’t support hypothesis no. 14 a & b.

4.5.6 Interactive effects of Psychological Capital, Relational and Transactional Contract on Employees’ Commitment:

Hypothesis no 15 a & b predicts that Psychological contract types moderate the relationship between psychological capital and employees’ commitment such that relationship will be stronger in relational contract as compared to transactional contract. Results of regression analysis of direct and indirect effect of psychological capital, relational and transactional contract on employees’ commitment are shown in table no. 14. Psychological capital \((\beta = .293, p < .10)\) have insignificantly positive impact on employees commitment. The impact of relational contract on employees commitment was significant \((\beta = .658, p < .10)\).
Whereas, the impact of transactional contract on employees commitment was significantly negative ($\beta = -1.14, p < .10$).

The moderating role of relational and transactional Contract on the relation between psychological capital and employees’ commitment was examined. This moderation was examined using “Model 2” in PROCESS. The values show that the overall model was significant ($F=86.89, p=.0000$) accounting for 51% of the overall variance in Employees’ commitment ($R^2=.517$). When Relational Contract ($\beta = -.147, p=.031$) and Transactional Contract ($\beta = .277, p=.005$) as interaction terms were regressed, they brought significant effects, hence, confirming the moderating roles of Relational Contract and Transactional Contract on the relation between psychological capital and Employees’ commitment. The interaction term of relational contract showed $\Delta R^2=.0056$ variance while the interaction term of transactional contract explained $\Delta R^2=.0093$.

Results support the moderating effect of psychological contract type and moderate the relationship between psychological capital and employees’ commitment. Results support our hypothesis no. 15 a & b.

**4.5.7 Interactive effects of Psychological Capital, Relational and Transactional Contract on Employees’ Turnover Intention:**

Hypothesis no 16 predicts that Psychological contract type moderates the relationship between psychological capital and employees’ turnover intention such that relationship will be stronger in relational contract as compared to transactional contract. Results of regression analysis of direct and interactive
effect of psychological capital, relational and transactional contract on employees’ turnover intention are shown in table no. 15. Psychological capital ($\beta = -1.29$, $p > .10$) has non-significantly negative impact on employees’ turnover intention. Significantly negative relationship was found between relational contract ($\beta = -1.934$, $p < .10$) and employees’ turnover intention. Transactional contract ($\beta = 1.37$, $p < .10$) reported significantly positive relationship with employees’ turnover intention.

The moderating role of relational and transactional contract on the relation between psychological capital and turnover intention was examined. This moderation was examined using “Model 2” in PROCESS. The values show that the overall model was significant ($F=39.43$, $p=.0000$) accounting for 32% of the overall variance in turnover intention ($R^2 = .327$). Negative and significant results were found in interactive effects of psychological capital and relational contract ($\Delta R^2 = 0.019$, $F = 11.63$, $P < .10$) with employees turnover intention. Psychological capital and transactional contract ($\Delta R^2 = 0.004$, $F = 2.89$, $P < .10$) was positive and significant with employees turnover intention. The interactive effects of psychological capital and psychological contract types (psychological contract and relational contract) with employees’ turnover intention are statistically significant and change in R square ($\Delta R^2$) is higher in relational contract as compared to change in R square ($\Delta R^2$) in transactional contract. Therefore, the relationship between psychological capital and employees’ turnover intention was moderated by psychological contract types such that the relationship was higher
when relational and transactional contract was higher. Results supported hypothesis no. 16 a & b.

4.7 Moderated Mediation Analysis (Additional Analysis):

4.7.1 Conditional Indirect Effects of Psychological Empowerment on in-role-Performance through Psychological Capital:

The indirect effects of psychological empowerment on in-role-performance through psychological capital would be significant for individuals high and low in CSE and psychological contract types. Table 16 shows that conditional indirect effects of psychological empowerment on in-role-performance through psychological capital were significant for low ($\beta = .391$, S.E =.092 bootstrap CI = .24, .55), average ($\beta = .27$, S.E = .63, bootstrap CI = .18, .39) and high ($\beta = .18$, S.E = .084, bootstrap CI = .07, .36) levels of CSE, relational and transactional contract types. In other words psychological empowerment has an indirect positive effect on in-role-performance through psychological capital for individuals who are low, average and high on CSE, relational and transactional contract.
4.7.2 Conditional Indirect Effects of Psychological Empowerment on OCB through Psychological Capital:

The indirect effects of psychological empowerment on OCB through psychological capital would be significant for both high and low in CSE and psychological contract types. Table 17 shows that conditional indirect effects of psychological empowerment on OCB through psychological capital were significant for low ($\beta = .351, \text{S.E} = .098$ bootstrap CI = .197, .518), average ($\beta = .307, \text{S.E} = .057$, bootstrap CI = .218, .408) and high ($\beta = .249, \text{S.E} = .086$, bootstrap CI = .133, .431) levels of CSE, relational and transactional contract types. In other words, psychological empowerment has an indirect positive effect on OCB through psychological capital for individuals who are low, average and high on CSE, relational and transactional contract.

4.7.3 Conditional Indirect Effects of Psychological Empowerment on CWB through Psychological Capital:

The indirect effects of psychological empowerment on CWB through psychological capital would be significant for both high and low in CSE and psychological contract types. Table 18 shows that conditional indirect effects of psychological empowerment on CWB through psychological capital was insignificant for low ($\beta = -.069, \text{S.E} = .145$ bootstrap CI = -.303, .163) level of CSE, relational and transactional contract, and were significant for average ($\beta = -.307, \text{S.E} = .085$, bootstrap CI = -.472, -.187) and high ($\beta = -.418, \text{S.E} = .165$, bootstrap CI = -.746, -.203) levels of CSE, relational and transactional contract. In
other words psychological empowerment has an indirect negative effect on CWB through psychological capital for individuals who are average and high on CSE, and both types of contracts.

4.7.4 Conditional Indirect Effects of Psychological Empowerment on Employees’ Commitment through Psychological Capital:

The indirect effects of psychological empowerment on Employees’ Commitment through psychological capital would be significant for both high and low in CSE and psychological contract types. Table 19 shows that conditional indirect effects of psychological empowerment on Employees’ Commitment through psychological capital were significant for low (β = .352, S.E = .128 bootstrap CI = .141, .567), average (β = .299, S.E = .061, bootstrap CI = .206, .411) and high (β = .237, S.E = .093, bootstrap CI = .112, .440) levels of CSE, relational and transactional contract. In other words psychological empowerment has an indirect positive effect on Employees’ Commitment through psychological capital for individuals who are low, average and high on CSE, relational and transactional contract.

4.7.5 Conditional Indirect Effects of Psychological Empowerment on Employees’ Satisfaction through Psychological Capital:

The indirect effects of psychological empowerment on employees’ satisfaction through psychological capital would be significant for both high and low in CSE and psychological contract types. Table 20 shows that conditional indirect effects
of psychological empowerment on employees’ satisfaction through psychological capital were significant for low ($\beta = .368$, S.E = .128 bootstrap CI = .168, .529), average ($\beta = .366$, S.E = .077, bootstrap CI = .247, .505) and high ($\beta = .327$, S.E = .114, bootstrap CI = .175, .553) levels of CSE, relational and transactional contract. In other words psychological empowerment has an indirect positive effect on Employees’ Commitment through psychological capital for individuals who are low, average and high on CSE, relational and transactional contract.

4.7.6 Conditional Indirect Effects of Psychological Empowerment on Employees’ Turnover Intention through Psychological Capital:

The indirect effects of psychological empowerment on employees’ turnover intention through psychological capital would be significant for both high and low in CSE and psychological contract types. Table 21 shows that conditional indirect effects of psychological empowerment on employees’ turnover intention through psychological capital were significant for low ($\beta = -.460$, S.E = .173 bootstrap CI = -.757, -.181) and average ($\beta = -.271$, S.E = .108, bootstrap CI = -.470, -.110) level CSE, relational and transactional contract whereas insignificant results for high ($\beta = -.131$, S.E = .133, bootstrap CI = -.400, .045) levels of CSE, relational and transactional contract. In other words psychological empowerment has an indirect negative effect on Employees’ turnover intention through psychological capital for individuals who are low and average on CSE, relational and transactional contract.
**Hypotheses Results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Accepted/Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Psychological empowerment will be positively related to PsyCap.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PsyCap will be positively related to OCB.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PsyCap will be positively related to in-role performance.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PsyCap will be negatively related to CWBs.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PsyCap will be positively related to job satisfaction.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PsyCap will be negatively related to employee's commitment.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PsyCap will be positively related to turnover intentions.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Psychological empowerment is positively related to the employee work behaviors of (a) in role performance, (b) OCB and (c) negativity related to CWB.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Psychological empowerment is positively related to the employee work attitudes of (a) job satisfaction and (b) employee’s commitment and negatively related to (c) turnover intentions.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Relationship between Psychological empowerment and PsyCap will be moderated by CSE such that the relationship is stronger when CSE is high.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (a)</td>
<td>Relationship between PsyCap and in-role performance is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is stronger when relational contract is higher.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11(b)</td>
<td>Relationship between PsyCap and in-role performance is</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (a)</td>
<td>Relationship between PsyCap and OCB is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is stronger when relational contract is higher.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (b)</td>
<td>Relationship between PsyCap and OCB is moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is stronger when transactional contract is higher.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (a)</td>
<td>Relationship between PsyCap and CWB is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is weaker when relational contract is higher.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (b)</td>
<td>Relationship between PsyCap and CWB is moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is weaker when transactional contract is higher.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (a)</td>
<td>Relationship between PsyCap and satisfaction is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is stronger when relational contract is higher.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (b)</td>
<td>Relationship between PsyCap and satisfaction is moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is stronger when transactional contract is higher.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (a)</td>
<td>Relationship between PsyCap and organizational commitment is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is stronger when relational contract is higher.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (b)</td>
<td>Relationship between PsyCap and organizational commitment is</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is stronger when transactional contract is higher.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 (a)</td>
<td>Relationship between PsyCap and turnover intention is moderated by relational contract type such that the relationship is weaker when relational contract is higher.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 (b)</td>
<td>Relationship between PsyCap and turnover intention is moderated by transactional contract type such that the relationship is weaker when transactional contract is higher.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 (a)</td>
<td>PsyCap mediate the relationship between Psychological empowerment and employee work behaviors of (a) in role performance, (b) OCB and (c) Counterproductive Work Behaviors.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 (b)</td>
<td>PsyCap mediate the relationship between Psychological empowerment and employee work attitudes of (a) job satisfaction and (b) employee’s commitment and (c) turnover intentions.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary and Findings
The main objective of the study was to analyze the impact and influence of positive psychological resource (psychological empowerment and PsyCap) on employees’ attitudes (satisfaction, commitment, turnover intention) and behavior (OCB, in-role performance, CWB). Based on self-determination theory and broaden-and-build theory, the mediating impact of Psychological Capital on the relationship between psychological empowerment and employees’ attitudes (employees commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions) and behaviors (organization citizenship behavior, in-role-performance and counterproductive work behavior) have been studied. The role of personality disposition in creating PsyCap has also been examined by incorporating CSE as a moderator between the relationship of psychological empowerment and PsyCap. Based on Social Cognitive theory, this study also explored the moderating role of psychological contract types between the relationship of psychological capital and employees attitudes and behaviors.

Results of the study support the positive relationship between Psychological Empowerment and Psychological Capital as hypothesized (H1) Based on Deci and Ryan (2000) Self Determination Theory (SDT), according to which, psychological resources are of different levels and have the characteristic to be enhanced and developed from basic to more strong levels. It has been asserted that psychological empowerment being the basic level psychological resources help develop and nourish PsyCap- the more advanced and strong psychological resource. Psychological
research shows that perceptions of psychological empowerment may create the necessary positive conditions to flourish PsyCap.

The positive relationship between psychological empowerment and PsyCap substantiates the underlying assertion that more strong and advanced level psychological resources further motivate employees to exhibit positive attitude and behavior in such a way that when basic psychological needs such as psychological empowerment (autonomy, impact, meaning and competence) are met, advance level psychological resource such as PsyCap (hope, optimism, self-efficacy, resilience) are developed, that further motivate employees’ positive attitude and behavior.

According to Deci & Vansteenkiste, (2004), satisfaction of basic psychological needs constitutes the main mental process which facilitates the integrative tendency, intrinsic motivation and intrinsic goals pursuits, which result in optimal development and well-being further developing in individuals more resilience, creativity, commitment, greater level of satisfaction and initiative approach towards work, organizational citizenship behavior (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Rinehart & Short, 1994).

Thomas and Velthouse (1990) and Spreitzer (1995a; 1995b) reported that empowered people have higher sense of impact, can influence work unit, their ideas are listened by others, and they can accomplish goals, make a significant difference in their work environment. According to (Luthans, Luthans, & Luthans, 2004), attributes include autonomy, social competence, a sense of purpose, problem-solving skills; all these can be used for enhancement of resilience making psychologically empowered individuals more creative and resilient.
Results also support the positive relationship between PsyCap and attitude (satisfaction, commitment) and behavior (OCB, in-role performance) as hypothesized earlier (Hypothesis No 2, 3, 5, & 6). This is in line with the previous studies, which reported significant positive relationship between PsyCap and satisfaction (Luthans, Norman, Avolio and Avey, 2008; Avey, Reichard, Luthans & Mhatre, 2012; Luthans, Norman, Avolio & Avey, (in press); Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Mormon, 2007; Youssef & Luthans, 2007; Larson & Luthans, 2006).

A number of studies has also found positive relationship between PsyCap and employees’ commitment (Luthans, Norman, Avolio and Avey, 2008; Avey, Reichard, Luthans & Mhatre, 2012, Luthans, Norman, Avolio & Avey, (in press)).

The results of the study are also in congruence with the previous studies, which reported positive significant relationship between PsyCap and in-role performance (Luthans, Norman, Avolio and Avey, 2008; Avey, Reichard, Luthans & Mhatre, 2012; Luthans, Norman, Avolio & Avey, (in press); Luthans, Avey, Clapp-Smith & Li, 2008; Avey, Nimnicht & Pigeon, 2009; Luthans et al, 2010).

The study also found positive significant relationship between PsyCap and OCB. This supports the findings of existing studies, which reported positive relationship between PsyCap and OCB (Avey, Wernsing and Luthans, 2008; Avey, Reichard, Luthans & Mhatre, 2012; Norman, Avey, Reichard, Luthans and Mhatre, 2011; Norman, Avey, Nimnicht & Pigeon, 2010). Avey et. al. (2010) also suggested that those higher in PsyCap are more likely to engage in highly desirable extra-role behaviors that are so beneficial to today’s organizations. Result shows that those who are higher in PsyCap
engage in not only more desirable behaviors (OCBs) but also fewer undesirable
CWBs.

Results also support the negative relationship between PsyCap and attitude (turnover intension) and behavior (counterproductive work behavior) as hypothesized earlier (Hypothesis No 4 & 7). This is in line with previous studies, which found negative relationship between PsyCap and counterproductive work behavior (Avey, Wernsing and Luthans, 2008; Avey, Reichard, Luthans & Mhatre, 2012; Avey, Luthans, and Youssef, 2010).

The study results are also in congruence with existing studies, which reported negative relationship between PsyCap and turnover intension (Avey, Reichard, Luthans & Mhatre, 2012; Wubin & Zhaoliang, 2010; Avey, Luthans & Jensen, 2009).

Similar result was also found in Avey e. al. (2010) study where PsyCap was negative related to undesirable attitude (turnover intension) and suggested that developing PsyCap may be an effective way to at least indirectly reduce actual turnover of employees’.

The study also found positive relationship between psychological empowerment and employees’ attitude (job satisfaction, commitment) and behavior (in-role performance, OCB). This shows that psychologically empowered employees feel more job satisfaction and are more committed to the organization. This also facilitates employees’ enhanced performance and derives extra-role behavior. This is in line with the findings of previous studies, which reported positive relationship of psychological empowerment with job satisfaction (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Spritzers et al., 1997), commitment (Meyer, Becker, and

The study found negative relationship between psychological empowerment and employees’ turnover intention and CWB. Results reveal that employees who feel psychologically empowered are more likely to have less intentions to quit and do not exhibit CWB. The results also support existing studies, which found negative relationship of psychological empowerment with employees’ turnover intention (Van Katwyk, Fox, Spector, & Kelloway, 2000) and CWB (Bennett and Robinson, 2003; Galperin, 2002).

5.2 **PsyCap as Mediator:**
Results of the study supported the mediating role of PsyCap as hypothesized (Hypothesis No 17-A & 17-B) for all work outcomes (OCB, job satisfaction, commitment, in-role performance, turnover intention, CWB). The results ascertain the assertion made earlier that PsyCap is a stronger and a higher level psychological resource, which facilitates employees’ positive attitude and behavior.

The mediating role of PsyCap in generating positive attitude and behavior as well as discouraging negative attitude and behavior has been investigated by different studies. The results of the study support those studies, which explored the mediating impact of PsyCap. Luthans, et.al. (in press) found the mediating role of PsyCap while investigating the relationship between supportive organizational climate and performance. Totawar and Nambudiri (2014) by testing the structural model with
PsyCap as mediator between the relationship of organizational justice with job satisfaction and organizational commitment found the mediating impact of PsyCap. Hsu and Chen (2015) explored whether employee PsyCap acts as a mediator between organization-level organizational innovation climate and organization-level organizational innovative behavior. They found that both organizational innovation climate and employee PsyCap significantly affect employee innovative behavior and more importantly, employee PsyCap fully mediates the relationship between organizational innovation climate and employee innovative behavior.

So, it is concluded from these findings that resources generated from psychological empowerment are important factors behind advantageous effects of psychological empowerment across a wide variety behaviors and attitudes. So, this study provides extension of self-determination theory applicability from very general to more specific domain of work life. In addition, important contribution is generalizability of this theory to Pakistani societies and the occupation group of telecom sector.

Finally, Avey, Wernsing and Luthans (2008) suggested mediating role of psychological empowerment between PsyCap and employee attitudes and behaviors. Contribution of this study is also that it used contrasting approach by proposing psychological empowerment as the antecedent of PsyCap. So, it can be wisely concluded that PsyCap which resulted in directing employees in positive manner in circumstances generation from psychological empowerment of individuals. At the same time, with regard to Deci and Ryan (2000) self-determination theory, there is also possibility which cannot be ignored that psychological empowerment may also
lead to development of personal resources that is beneficent to employees as well as organizations.

The results of this study showed the existence of PsyCap mediating effect between psychological empowerment and employee’s behaviors and attitudes. Along with this mediating effect was found to be too strong for psychological empowerment and employee’s behaviors and attitudes association. So, this study preliminarily supported the PsyCap mediating role.

5.3 **Moderation Core-Self-Evaluation:**

It has been theorized that CSE would moderate the relationship between psychological empowerment and PsyCap (Hypothesis No. 10). The study results support the moderating impact of CSE. The results show that the level of psychological resources acquired by an individual and their impact on attitude and behavior may vary from individual to individual depending upon personality disposition. CSE has an impact in shaping individuals’ perception, which further affect attitudinal reactions and elicit specific behaviors (Locke, McClearn, & Knight, 1996). It also supports the assertion of Cognitive social view (Mischel and Shoda, 1973) that responding to a situation depends upon personality dispositions.

The results are also in line with existing studies exploring the impact of CSE. The moderating effect of CSE had been proven by Judge, Locke, Durham and Kluger (1998) where they studied the moderating effect CSE on perceived work characteristics and job satisfaction relationship. According to them, it is personal temperament that contributes towards individual view regarding job characteristics.
Harvey and Kacmar (2009) conducted a research on moderating effect of CSE on social stressors and job satisfaction, altruism and intention to quit relationship. It had been reported by Harvey and Kacmar (2009) that people who are having high CSE experience have high level of job satisfaction and low level on intentions to quit from job as compared to people with low CSE. Whereas, the moderating effect of CSE was not being reported in case of altruism. It had been found out by Kammeyer-muller, judge and Scott (2009) in meta-analysis, people who are having high CSE shared characteristics of effective problem solving and low coping of avoidance along with highly emotion focused contrasted to those with low CSE.

5.4 Moderation Psychological Contract Types:
To explore the moderating role of psychological contract (relational, transactional), it has been theorized (H) that psychological contract type would moderate the relationship between PsyCap and employees’ attitude (job satisfaction, commitment, turnover intention) and behavior (in-role performance, OCB, CWB). Results of the investigation show that psychological contract moderates the relationship of PsyCap with commitment, CWB and turnover intention. However, the difference of the moderating impact of both types of psychological contract (relational and transactional) is not significant in the case of commitment, and turnover intention, whereas, in the case of CWB, significant difference between both types of psychological contract has been found in such a way that moderating impact of relational contract is higher than transactional contract. This shows that committed employees prefer to continue with the organization and have fewer intentions to
switch over. Results of the study also support the findings of previous studies, which state that relational contract being a source of ensuring more job security as compared to transactional contract enhances commitment (Cavanaugh & Noe, 1999; Lester et al., 2002; Robinson et al., 1994; Rousseau, 1990; Turnley & Feldman, 1999), which further lowers turnover intentions (Bal & Kooij, 2011).

The results are is in line with Psychological contract theory, which asserts that employees increase their efforts carried out on behalf of the organization to the degree the organization is perceived as willing and able to reciprocate with desirable personal and socio emotional resources. Keeping in view Expectancy Theory of Vroom (1964), individuals who are in relational contract with their employers are more likely to identify themselves with their respective organizations and in turn they become more committed and satisfied employees.

The results of the study, however, do not support the moderating impact of psychological contract type on the relationship of PsyCap with job satisfaction, in-role performance, and OCB. This might be due to the reason that Pakistan is a developing country and its economy has not matured yet. With increasing number of educated youth, demand of jobs is on rise, whereas, market lacks the potential to absorb them all. To retain the job, individuals have to work hard irrespective of the type of contract offered. Furthermore, job structure in telecom sector of Pakistan is mostly contractual. The continuation of the contract for another period depends upon individual’s performance. The employees thus have only one type of contract type.
This might be another reason behind the findings of the study, which do not substantiate moderating impact of psychological contract type.

5.5 **Practical Implications:**
Results of the study generated various useful implications. First, significant contribution of PsyCap in organization by influencing performance of employees, work attitudes and behavior at their work which results in achieving the competitive advantages by organizations. According to results of the study, it is very much crucial to consider the psychological capital of employees in order to understand that it is very useful in supporting organizational climate which is positive (Psychological empowerment and PsyCap) and can play positive role in employees work attitudes and performance.

Another important contribution of this study is by intervening for supporting the role of psychological empowerment and Psychological Capital that helps in saving cost associated with negative work behaviors and outcomes. This study results the role of psychological capital which resulted from psychological empowerment, which is unique individual resource which helps to lessen negative effects of counterproductive work behavior and intention to quit from current job, make them perform better and make them satisfied which in turns lead to more commitment with their job. In this situation where employees perceive that they are having optimum individual well-being state, it results in higher level of in-role and extra-role performance, commitment and satisfaction and lower counterproductive work behaviors and turnover intentions. Counterproductive work behaviors and intentions
to quit the job and associated cost, like time and money spend to train new officer which can be caused by loss of employee can be lessened by promoting productivity through satisfaction and commitment.

The results of this study make it evident that psychological empowerment promotion among the employees and other intervening programs aim at enhancing PsyCap are the practices that help in generating positive work related behaviors and practices and eliminating negative ones.

Furthermore, results of this study provide help to the managers to induce several practices proved to provide relaxation that can serve as first step to experience Psychological empowerment by employees which are the keys to their satisfaction. It is tested through experiments by Fredrickson (2008) effectiveness of practice of mind training which is known as —loving-kindness mediation in developing and promoting positive emotions and thus developing lasting resources. Luthans and his colleagues had designed a PsyCap Intervention training model which helps in developing PsyCap (Luthans, Avey, Avolio, Norman, & Combs, 2006) and its usefulness in working people was empirically tested on 2-hour online exercise, and the idea is supported by the results of the current study that PsyCap can be developed in short time interval.

Description of Positive Psychological Capital Training is provided by Luthans and his colleagues (2010). For example in practice of hope development, program, employees who participated were asked to set those goals relating to their work which were valuable to them, were challenging and were having clear points of start and end for nurturing agency. After that they were trained, for creating ways how to
achieve their goals and what were hurdles that can be fixed by them and how to overcome that hurdles. After the exercise completed, each participant was provided opinions by other participants how his goal can be achieved in other effective ways. The aim of this activity was to create thinking development and ability to analyze hurdles as well as developing plan to overcome that hurdles and this intervention details could be found in several works of Luthans (Luthans, Avey, et al., 2006; Luthans, Avey, Avolio, & Peterson, 2010; Luthans, Youssef et al., 2007).

In today's tough economic environment with high rate of unemployment, it is very important for organizations to understand the role of human capital to gain competitive advantage. According to results of study, employees may be developed by managers by investing in enhancing their PsyCap (e.g., see Luthans, Avey, & Patera, 2008, in overall intervening analysis which helped in increasing state-like PsyCap) which results in increase in OCBs. These impacts in generating significant behaviors which resulted in enhancing team performance as well as organizational performance (Organ, 1997).

Similarly, next implication is the investment in PsyCap for a decrease in employee negative behaviors and attitudes. In organizational tough circumstances, probability to engage in deviant behavior increases by employees in an effort to gain edge over internal competition for resources of organizations like jobs promotions and assignments; (see O’Connell, 2009). As employees with high PsyCap showed low involvement in deviant behavior so efforts in increasing level of PsyCap may result in deviant behavior.
This study major implication for practice is that it is much important to consider by managers, practitioners and employing organizations that employees who are highly empowered are usually career-mobile and they have tendency to quit from organizations at any time in certain circumstances and such circumstances lead managers, practitioners and employing organizations in confused state either to empower their employees or not due to the fact that empowerment leads to job satisfaction, commitment with job and high performance level. So, certain situational factors that lead to relation between empowerment and turnover intention like performance and organizational culture, existing job market should need to find out by further study.

5.6 Limitation and Future Directions:
There are few limitations of the study. Firstly, this study is limited by the sample characteristics as it was conducted amongst employees drawn from the Telecom sector companies. The participants were predominantly male. It is not known whether the results would be applicable to other contextual settings or organizations. Whether the findings can also be generalized for other contexts, like other type of organizations, for mixed samples, should therefore be explored in further studies.
Second, given that the participants in this study were mainly from Telecom sector of Pakistan and were belonging to age category of 31 to 40 years, so probability of the existence of different relationship between those variables measured in current study and in other populations can be like in older age group or younger. So, further studies undertaking different population working in different positions in the
Telecom sector of Pakistan as well as in different professions to explore the generalizability of findings, namely the mediating role of psychological capital, between psychological empowerment and job performance, attitudes and behaviors of employees may also be carried out.

Thirdly, this study focus was on exploring the moderators role on understanding the association between psychological empowerment and PsyCap and between PsyCap and employee outcomes at work, further study can help in analyzing the moderating and mediating variables of the psychological empowerment, psychological capital–performance, attitudes and behaviors of employees relationship at different levels in organizations as well as between organizations and cultural settings to understand fully how PsyCap impacts organizations today.

Finally, the model used in current study is derived from the western theories and is tested in Pakistani organizational context. The results are inconsistent with the previous study results for the relationship between Psychological empowerment, psychological capital, employee’s performance, behavior and attitudes, to our knowledge there are no previous testing in Pakistani culture. Thus, results of study provide support to western theories regarding empowerment and psychological capital and performance behaviors and attitudes, however, application of the theory to other cultural settings can help in verification of the generalizability of our findings.
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### Table # 3: Direct, Total and Indirect Effects: Mediation Effects of Psychological Capital in the Relationship between Psychological Empowerment and In-Role-Performance Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct and Total Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on In-Role-Performance</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital Regressed on In-Role-Performance</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on Psychological Capital</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on In-Role-Performance controlling for Psychological Capital</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect effect using normal distribution (Sobel test)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Effect using Bootstrap</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 411. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 5,000. LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit. Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.00*
### Table #4: Direct, Total and Indirect Effects: Mediation Effects of Psychological Capital in the Relationship between Psychological Empowerment and OCB Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$S.E$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct and Total Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on OCB (Direct Effect)</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital Regressed on OCB (Direct Effect)</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on Psychological Capital (Direct Effect)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on OCB controlling for Psychological Capital (Total Effect)</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect effect using normal distribution (Sobel test)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$S.E$</td>
<td>$Z$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Effect using Bootstrap</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$Boot S.E$</td>
<td>LL 95% CI</td>
<td>UL 95% CI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 411. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 5,000. LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit. Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.00*
Table # 5: Direct Total, and Indirect Effects: Mediation Effects of Psychological Capital in the Relationship between Psychological Empowerment and CWB Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$S.E$</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct and Total Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on CWB (Direct Effect)</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital Regressed on CWB (Direct Effect)</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>-8.67</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on Psychological Capital(Direct Effect)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on CWB controlling for Psychological Capital (Total Effect)</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-7.52</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect effect using normal distribution (Sobel test)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>S.Es</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-7.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Effect using Bootstrap</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>Boot S.E</td>
<td>LL 95% CI</td>
<td>UL 95% CI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.894</td>
<td>-.545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 411. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 5,000. LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit. Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.00*
Table # 6: Direct, Total and Indirect Effects: Mediation Effects of Psychological Capital in the Relationship between Psychological Empowerment and Employee’s Satisfaction Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct and Total Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on Employee’s Satisfaction (Direct Effect)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital Regressed on Employee’s Satisfaction (Direct Effect)</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on Psychological Capital (Direct Effect)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on Employee’s Satisfaction controlling for Psychological Capital (Total Effect)</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Indirect effect using normal distribution (Sobel test) | | | | |
| β | S.E | Z | p |
| .61 | .062 | 9.83 | .000 |

| Indirect Effect using Bootstrap | | | | |
| β | Boot S.E | LL 95% CI | UL 95% CI |
| .61 | .078 | .468 | .777 |

Note. n = 411. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 5,000. LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit. Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.00
### Table # 7: Direct, Total and Indirect Effects: Mediation Effects of Psychological Capital in the Relationship between Psychological Empowerment and Employee’s Commitment Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct and Total Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on Employee’s Commitment (Direct Effect)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital Regressed on Employee’s Commitment (Direct Effect)</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on Psychological Capital (Direct Effect)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on Employee’s Commitment controlling for Psychological Capital (Total Effect)</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect effect using normal distribution (Sobel test)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Effect using Bootstrap</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 411. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 5,000. LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit. Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.00*
### Table # 8: Direct, Total and Indirect Effects: Mediation Effects of Psychological Capital in the Relationship between Psychological Empowerment and Employee’s Turnover Intention Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct and Total Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on Turnover Intention (Direct Effect)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital Regressed on Turnover Intention (Direct Effect)</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-8.76</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on Psychological Capital (Direct Effect)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment Regressed on Turnover Intention controlling for Psychological Capital (Total Effect)</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>.1048</td>
<td>-7.95</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect using normal distribution (Sobel test)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-7.78</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effect using Bootstrap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** \( n = 411 \). Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 5,000. LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit.

Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.00
Table 9: Results for Main Effects and Moderated Regression Analyses for Psychological Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df1$</th>
<th>$df2$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>63.94</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>404.0</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Coefficients</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$Se$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-3.23</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-2.68</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-5.60</td>
<td>-.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>5.678</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.274</td>
<td>2.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 Core-Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>4.280</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3 PsyEmp X CSE</td>
<td>-.374</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-3.763</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.569</td>
<td>-.178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interactions:** PsyEmp X CSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R^2$-Changes</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df1$</th>
<th>$df2$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyEmp X CSE</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.00
Note. N = 411
Table 10: Results for Main Effects and Moderated Regression Analyses for In-Role-Performance

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>68.070</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Path Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.322</td>
<td>2.178</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>-3.913</td>
<td>3.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>1.465</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>-.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Relational Contract</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transactional Contract</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>-.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>PsyCap X Relational Contract</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.908</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>-.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PsyCap X Transactional Contract</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>-.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interactions:** PsyCap X Relational Contract and PsyCap X Transactional Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R²-Changes</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Relational Contract</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Transactional Contract</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Both** | .0014 | .513 | 2.0  | 405.0 | .598 |

Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 90.00
Note. N =411
Table 11: Results for Main Effects and Moderated Regression Analyses for OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df_1$</th>
<th>$df_2$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>114.61</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Coefficients</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$Se$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.871</td>
<td>1.595</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>5.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Psychological Capital</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>-.388</td>
<td>.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 Relational Contract</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>-.255</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Contract</td>
<td>-.619</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>-1.871</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-1.164</td>
<td>-.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3 PsyCap X Relational Contract</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.274</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Transactional Contract</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.665</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interactions**: PsyCap X Relational Contract and PsyCap X Transactional Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R^2$-Changes</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df_1$</th>
<th>$df_2$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Relational Contract</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Transactional Contract</td>
<td>.0028</td>
<td>2.772</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both: .0055 | 2.688 | 2.0 | 405.0 | .069 |

Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 90.00

Note. N = 411
### Table 12: Results for Main Effects and Moderated Regression Analyses for CWB

#### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df_1$</th>
<th>$df_2$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>43.35</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Path Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$Se$</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>$LLCI$</th>
<th>$ULCI$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>-5.491</td>
<td>3.872</td>
<td>-1.418</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>-.11.874</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>2.013</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>3.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Contract</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>1.928</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>2.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Contract</td>
<td>1.992</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>2.480</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>3.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Relational Contract</td>
<td>-3.42</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>-2.589</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.560</td>
<td>-.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Transactional Contract</td>
<td>-3.84</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>-1.989</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.702</td>
<td>-.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interactions:**  PsyCap X Relational Contract and PsyCap X Transactional Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$R^2$-Changes</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df_1$</th>
<th>$df_2$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Relational Contract</td>
<td>.0108</td>
<td>6.705</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Transactional Contract</td>
<td>.0064</td>
<td>3.956</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Both</em></td>
<td>.0112</td>
<td>3.492</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 90.00

Note. N =411
Table 13: Results for Main Effects and Moderated Regression Analyses for Employees’ Satisfaction

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>66.53</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Path Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>β</th>
<th>Se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.280</td>
<td>2.491</td>
<td>1.316</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>-.827</td>
<td>7.388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 1 Psychological Capital
- .086 | .599 | -.144 | .885 | -1.074 | .9017 |

Step 2 Relational Contract
- .119 | .362 | -1.074 | .516 | -1.374 | .478 |
  Transactional Contract
- .522 | .516 | -1.010 | .312 | -1.349 | .329 |

Step 3 PsyCap X Relational Contract
- .084 | .085 | .988 | .323 | -.056 | .224 |
  PsyCap X Transactional Contract
- .135 | .124 | 1.092 | .275 | -.069 | .340 |

Interactions: PsyCap X Relational Contract and PsyCap X Transactional Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R²-Changes</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Relational Contract</td>
<td>.0013</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Transactional Contract</td>
<td>.0016</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both | .0018 | .681 | 2.0 | 405.0 | .506 |

Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.00
Note. N =411
Table 14: Results for Main Effects and Moderated Regression Analyses for Employees’ Commitment

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df_1$</th>
<th>$df_2$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>86.89</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Path Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$Se$</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>1.992</td>
<td>1.325</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>-.645</td>
<td>5.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Psychological Capital</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>-.496</td>
<td>1.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 Relational Contract</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>2.271</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>1.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Contract</td>
<td>-1.142</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>-2.765</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-1.824</td>
<td>-461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3 PsyCap X Relational Contract</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-2.162</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Transactional Contract</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>2.792</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interactions:** PsyCap X Relational Contract and PsyCap X Transactional Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$R^2$-Changes</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df_1$</th>
<th>$df_2$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Relational Contract</td>
<td>.0056</td>
<td>4.676</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Transactional Contract</td>
<td>.0093</td>
<td>7.797</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>.0372</td>
<td>15.634</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 90.00
Note. N = 411
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Table 15: Results for Main Effects and Moderated Regression Analyses for Employees’ Turnover Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39.43</td>
<td>df1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Coefficients</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Se</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>7.318</td>
<td>3.931</td>
<td>1.861</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>13.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Psychological Capital</td>
<td>-1.299</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>-1.374</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>-2.858</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 Relational Contract</td>
<td>-1.934</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>-3.381</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-2.877</td>
<td>-.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Contract</td>
<td>1.374</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>1.686</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>2.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3 PsyCap X Relational Contract</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>3.410</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Transactional Contract</td>
<td>- .333</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>-1.701</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.657</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interactions:** PsyCap X Relational Contract and PsyCap X Transactional Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R²-Changes</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Relational Contract</td>
<td>.0193</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap X Transactional Contract</td>
<td>.0048</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>.0566</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.00

Note. N =411
Table 16: Moderated Mediation Results across Levels of CSE, Relational Contract and Transactional Contract

Conditional indirect effects of Psychological Empowerment on In-Role-Performance through Psychological Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderators (CSE, Relational Contract and Transactional Contract)</th>
<th>Boot Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Boot S.E</th>
<th>Boot LLCI</th>
<th>Boot ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1SD (3.1490, 3.1867, &amp; 2.2611)</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (3.6409, 3.8573, &amp; 2.7205)</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SD (4.1327, 4.5278, &amp; 3.1798)</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 411. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 5,000. LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit. Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.00

Table 17: Moderated Mediation Results across Levels of CSE, Relational Contract and Transactional Contract

Conditional indirect effects of Psychological Empowerment on OCB through Psychological Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderators (CSE, Relational Contract and Transactional Contract)</th>
<th>Boot Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Boot S.E</th>
<th>Boot LLCI</th>
<th>Boot ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1SD (3.1490, 3.1867, &amp; 2.2611)</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (3.6409, 3.8573, &amp; 2.7205)</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SD (4.1327, 4.5278, &amp; 3.1798)</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 411. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 5,000. LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit.
Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.00

**Table 18: Moderated Mediation Results across Levels of CSE, Relational Contract and Transactional Contract**

Conditional indirect effects of Psychological Empowerment on CWB through Psychological Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderators (CSE, Relational Contract and Transactional Contract)</th>
<th>Boot Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Boot S.E</th>
<th>Boot LLCI</th>
<th>Boot ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1SD (3.1490, 3.1867, &amp; 2.2611)</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.303</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (3.6409, 3.8573, &amp; 2.7205)</td>
<td>-.307</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.472</td>
<td>-.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SD (4.1327, 4.5278, &amp; 3.1798)</td>
<td>-.418</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>-.746</td>
<td>-.203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 411. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 5,000. LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit. Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.00*

**Table 19: Moderated Mediation Results across Levels of CSE, Relational Contract and Transactional Contract**

Conditional indirect effects of Psychological Empowerment on Employees’ Commitment through Psychological Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderators (CSE, Relational Contract and Transactional Contract)</th>
<th>Boot Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Boot S.E</th>
<th>Boot LLCI</th>
<th>Boot ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1SD (3.1490, 3.1867, &amp; 2.2611)</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (3.6409, 3.8573, &amp; 2.7205)</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.0617</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SD (4.1327, 4.5278, &amp; 3.1798)</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 411. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 5,000. LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit. Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.00*
### Table 20: Moderated Mediation Results across Levels of CSE, Relational Contract and Transactional Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderators (CSE, Relational Contract and Transactional Contract)</th>
<th>Boot Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Boot S.E</th>
<th>Boot LLCI</th>
<th>Boot ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1SD (3.1490, 3.1867, &amp; 2.2611)</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (3.6409, 3.8573, &amp; 2.7205)</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SD (4.1327, 4.5278, &amp; 3.1798)</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 411. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 5,000. LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit. Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.00*

### Table 21: Moderated Mediation Results across Levels of CSE, Relational Contract and Transactional Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderators (CSE, Relational Contract and Transactional Contract)</th>
<th>Boot Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Boot S.E</th>
<th>Boot LLCI</th>
<th>Boot ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1SD (3.1490, 3.1867, &amp; 2.2611)</td>
<td>-.460</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.757</td>
<td>-.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (3.6409, 3.8573, &amp; 2.7205)</td>
<td>-.271</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-.470</td>
<td>-.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SD (4.1327, 4.5278, &amp; 3.1798)</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>-.400</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 411. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 5,000. LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit. Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 90.00*
Figure No. 1: CSE as a Moderator between Psy Empowerment and PsyCap:

Figure No. 2: Relational Contract as a moderator between PsyCap and In-role-performance:
Figure No. 3: Transactional Contract as a moderator between PsyCap and In-role-performance:

![Graph showing the relationship between PsyCap and In-role-performance with Transactional Contract as a moderator.]

Figure No. 4: Relational Contract as a moderator between PsyCap and OCB:

![Graph showing the relationship between PsyCap and OCB with Relational Contract as a moderator.]

Figure No. 5: Transactional Contract as a moderator between PsyCap and OCB:

Figure No. 6: Relational Contract as a moderator between PsyCap and CWB:
**Figure No. 7:** Transactional Contract as a moderator between PsyCap and CWB:

**Figure No. 8:** Relational Contract as a moderator between PsyCap and Employee’s Commitment:
Figure No. 9: Transactional Contract as a moderator between PsyCap and Employee’s Commitment:
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Figure No. 10: Relational Contract as a moderator between PsyCap and Employee’s Satisfaction:

![Relational Contract Graph]
**Figure No. 11:** Transactional Contract as a moderator between PsyCap and Employee’s Satisfaction:

![Transactional Contract Diagram](image1)

**Figure No. 12:** Relational Contract as a moderator between PsyCap and Employee’s Turnover Intention:

![Relational Contract Diagram](image2)
Figure No. 13: Transactional Contract as a moderator between PsyCap and Employee’s Turnover Intention:
Research Instruments:
Research Questionnaire (Time One)

I am a research scholar at Faculty of Management Sciences, International Islamic University, Islamabad working on my PhD Thesis. The main objectives of this research are to investigate the impact of Psychological Capital on employee attitudes’ & behaviors’, mediating effect of psychological capital and moderating impact of Core self evaluation and Psychological contracts types.

The questionnaire is solely designed for research purpose. Everybody is duly requested to fill up the questionnaire with any bias so that I may be able to build my research on factual data. Your precious time and valuable participation will be a great contribution towards the noble cause of knowledge creation. I ensure that any information obtained in connection with this study, will remain highly confidential. In any written report or publication, no one will be identified and only aggregate data will be presented.

Gender: Male/Female.
Age: ________________
Education: ____________________.
Designation: ____________________.
Tenure in this Organization: ________________.
Total Work Experience: ________________.
Organization: ____________________.

Syed Tazeem Ali Shah Bukhari
PhD Scholar (Management)
IIU, Islamabad
Cell No. 0346-5102030
Email: tazeemiiui@gmail.com
Research Questionnaire

Key for rating the questionnaire:
1 = Strongly Disagree,   2 = Disagree,   3 = Neutral,   4 = Agree,   5 = Strongly Agree.

Psychological Capital:

Self-Efficacy:
1. I feel confident analyzing a long-term problem to find a solution. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I feel confident representing my work area in meetings with management. 2 3 4 5 1
3. I feel confident contributing to discussions about the company’s strategy. 3 4 5 1 2
4. I feel confident helping to set targets/goals in my work area. 4 5 1 2 3
5. I feel confident contacting people outside the company (e.g., suppliers, customers) to discuss problems. 5 1 2 3 4
6. I feel confident presenting information to a group of colleagues. 6

Hope:
7. If I should find myself in a jam at work, I could think of many ways to get out of it. 7 8 9 10 11
8. At the present time, I am energetically pursuing my work goals. 8 9 10 11 12
9. There are lots of ways around any problem. 9 10 11 12 13
10. Right now I see myself as being pretty successful at work. 10 11 12 13 14
11. I can think of many ways to reach my current work goals. 11 12 13 14 15
12. At this time, I am meeting the work goals that I have set for myself. 12 13 14 15 16

Resilience:
13. When I have a setback at work, I have trouble recovering from it, moving on. (R) 13 14 15 16 17
14. I usually manage difficulties one way or another at work. 14 15 16 17 18
15. I can be “on my own,” so to speak, at work if I have to. 15 16 17 18 19
16. I usually take stressful things at work in stride. 16 17 18 19 20
17. I can get through difficult times at work because I’ve experienced difficulty before. 17 18 19 20 21
18. I feel I can handle many things at a time at this job. 18 19 20 21 22

Optimism:
19. When things are uncertain for me at work, I usually expect the best. 19 20 21 22 23
20. If something can go wrong for me work-wise, it will. 20 21 22 23 24
21. I always look on the bright side of things regarding my job. 21 22 23 24 25
22. I’m optimistic about what will happen to me in the future as it pertains to work. 22 23 24 25 26
23. In this job, things never work out the way I want them to. 
24. I approach this job as if “every cloud has a silver lining.”

Key for rating the questionnaire: 
1 = Strongly Disagree,   2 = Disagree,   3 = Neutral,   4 = Agree,   5 = Strongly Agree

**Empowerment: (Spreitzer, M.G. 1995)**

1. The work I do is very important to me. 
2. My job activities are personally meaningful to me.
3. The work I do is meaningful to me

**Competence:**
4. I am confident about my ability to do my job.
5. I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities.
6. I have mastered the skills necessary for my job.

**Self-Determination:**
7. I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.
8. I can decide on my own how to go about doing my work.
9. I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job.

**Impact:**
10. My impact on what happens in my department is large.
11. I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department.
12. I have significant influence over what happens in my department.

**Psychological Contract: (Millward and Hopkins, 1998)**

**Transactional Contracts:**
1. I work only the hours set out in my contract and no more.
2. My commitment to this organization is defined by my contract.
3. My loyalty to the organization is contract specific.
4. I prefer to work a strictly defined set of working hours.
5. I only carry out what is necessary to get the job done.
Research Questionnaire (Time Two)

6. I do not identify with the organization’s goals.  
7. I work to achieve the purely short-term goals of my job.  
8. My job means more to me than just a means of paying the bills.  
9. It is important to be flexible and to work irregular hours if necessary.  

Key for rating the questionnaire:  
1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

Relational contracts:

10. I expect to grow in this organization.  
11. I feel part of a team in this organization.  
12. I have a reasonable chance of promotion if I work hard.  
13. To me working for this organization is like being a member of a family.  
14. The organization develops/rewards employees who work hard and exert themselves.  
15. I expect to gain promotion in this company with length of service and effort to achieve goals.  
16. I feel this company reciprocates the effort put in by its employees.  
17. My career path in the organization is clearly mapped out.  
18. I am motivated to contribute 100% to this company in return for future employment benefits.  

<Thank You>
I am a research scholar at Faculty of Management Sciences, International Islamic University, Islamabad. I am working on my PhD Thesis. The main objectives of this research are to investigate the impact of Psychological Capital on employee behaviors’ and Attitudes’, mediating effect of psychological capital and moderating impact of Core self evaluation and Psychological contracts types.

The questionnaire is solely designed for research purpose. Every body is duly requested to fill up the questionnaire with any bias so that I may be able to build my research on factual data. Your precious time and valuable participation will be a great contribution towards the noble cause of knowledge creation. I ensure that any information obtained in connection with this study, will remain highly confidential. In any written report or publication, no one will be identified and only aggregate data will be presented.

Gender: Male/Female.
Age: ______________
Employee
Name/ Employment#: ________________
Education: ________________
Designation: ________________
Tenure in this Organization: ________________
Total Work Experience: ________________
Organization: __________________________

Syed Tazeem Ali Shah Bukhari
PhD Scholar (Management)
IIU, Islamabad
Cell No. 0346-5102030
Email: tazeemiiui@gmail.com
Research Questionnaire

Key for rating the questionnaire:
1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

Core Self Evaluation: (Judge T. A, et. al., 2003)  
1. I am confident I get the success I deserve in life.  
2. Sometimes I feel depressed.  
3. When I try, I generally succeed.  
4. Sometimes when I fail I feel worthless.  
5. I Complete tasks successfully.  
6. Sometimes, I do not feel in control of my work.  
7. Overall, I am satisfied with myself.  
8. I am fill with doubts about my competence.  
9. I determine what will happen in my life.  
10. I do not feel in control of my success in my career.  
11. I am capable of coping with most of my problems.  
12. There are times when things look pretty bleak and hopeless to me.  

Organization Citizenship Behavior: (Smith, Organ and Near 1983)  
1. To what degree do you help others who have been absent.  
2. Are you volunteer for things that are not required.  
3. Have you oriented new people even it is not required.  
4. I help others who have heavy workload.  
5. Do you assist supervisor in his or her work.  
6. I make innovative suggestions to improve work.  
7. How often do you attend functions that are not mandatory but help company image.  
8. My attendance at work is above the norm.  
9. Do you give advance notice if you are unable to come to work.  
10. Do you take unnecessary time off work.  
11. I take undeserved breaks.  
12. I do not spend time in idle conversation.  
13. I do not take extra breaks.
14. I spend great deal of time with personal phone conversation.  
15. I give advance notice if unable to come to work.  
16. I coast toward the end of the day.

**Counterproductive Work Behavior:**

1.1.1.1 How often have you done each of the following things on your present job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or twice</th>
<th>Once or twice/month</th>
<th>Every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Purposely wasted your employer’s materials/supplies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Complained about insignificant things at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Told people outside the job what a lousy place you work for.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Came to work late without permission.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stayed home from work and said you were sick when you weren’t</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Insulted someone about their job performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Made fun of someone’s personal life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ignored someone at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Started an argument with someone at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Insulted or made fun of someone at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In-Role Performance (Self Rating):**

1. All in all, how competently do you perform your job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all competent</th>
<th>Not competent</th>
<th>Normal/Average</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Very Competently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. In your estimation, how effectively do you get your work done?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Effectively</th>
<th>Not Effectively</th>
<th>Average/Normal</th>
<th>Effectively</th>
<th>Very Effectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. How would you judge the overall quality of your work?
4. How would you judge your overall perceived competence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all competent</td>
<td>Not competent</td>
<td>Normal/Average</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Very Competently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How would you judge the overall quantity of your work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low quality</td>
<td>Low quality</td>
<td>Normal quality</td>
<td>High quality</td>
<td>Very high quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key for rating the questionnaire:**
1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

**Job Satisfaction:** (Hackman & Oldham, 1975)  
1. I feel very satisfied with my job.  
2. I feel that my co-workers are satisfied with their jobs.  
3. I feel I would be happy to work here until I retire.  
4. I feel that the health care facility provides a supportive work environment in which to work.

**Employees Commitment:** (Allen and Meyers’s (1996))
1. I do not feel my obligation to remain with my current employer.  
2. I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.  
3. Right now, staying with my department’s problems are my own.  
4. I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.  
5. This organization deserves my loyalty.  
6. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnover Intension: (Cummunn et al, 1979)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. I will actively look for a new job in the next year.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I often think about quitting.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I will probably look for a new job by the next year.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Questionnaire

I am a research scholar at Faculty of Management Sciences, International Islamic University, Islamabad, working on my PhD Thesis. The main objectives of my research are To investigate the impact of Psychological Capital on employee attitudes' & behaviors', mediating effect of psychological capital and moderating impact Core self evaluation and Psychological contracts types.

The questionnaire is solely designed for research purpose. Everybody is duly requested to fill up the questionnaire with any bias so that I may be able to build my research on factual data. Your precious time and valuable participation will be a great contribution towards the noble cause of knowledge creation. I ensure that any information obtained in connection with this study, will remain highly confidential. In any written report or publication, no one will be identified and only aggregate data will be presented.

Gender: Male/Female.
Supervisor: ________________
Designation: __________________.
Employee Name/Employee #: ________________
Organization: ____________________________.

Syed Tazeem Ali Shah Bukhari
PhD Scholar (Management)
IIU, Islamabad
Cell No. 0346-5102030
Email: tazeemiiui@gmail.com
Research Questionnaire

In-Role Performance (Supervisor Rating):

1. All in all, how competently does this individual perform their job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all competent</th>
<th>Not competent</th>
<th>Normal/Average</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Very Competently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. In your estimation, how effectively do you get your work done?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Effectively</th>
<th>Not Effectively</th>
<th>Average/Normal Effectively</th>
<th>Effectively</th>
<th>Very Effectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. How would you judge the overall quality of your work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very low quality</th>
<th>Low quality</th>
<th>Normal quality</th>
<th>High quality</th>
<th>Very high quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. How would you judge your overall perceived competence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all competent</th>
<th>Not competent</th>
<th>Normal/Average</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Very Competently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. How would you judge the overall quantity of your work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very low quality</th>
<th>Low quality</th>
<th>Normal quality</th>
<th>High quality</th>
<th>Very high quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Thank You