CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY
The major objective of the present study was to examine the impact of positive psychological capital and emotional intelligence of employees on their work-outcomes. Work-outcomes were taken as job satisfaction, job performance, organizational commitment and turnover intention. The method employed to meet this objective is delineated here under specific headings.

SAMPLE

All employees were solicited to partake in the study. Thus, seven hundred (700) questionnaires in both English and Hindi version were administered of which four hundred and eighty two (482) questionnaires were returned including males (394) and female (88) both, conceding an approximately 69% response rate. According to Sekaran (2000), a response rate of thirty percent (30%) is regarded as acceptable for most research purposes. This good response rate can be attributed to the participants being informed well in advance of the purpose and objectives of the research. As our research is conducted on males only, the female’s questionnaires were not deliberated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>SD Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>38.55</td>
<td>11.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>10.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>38.71</td>
<td>10.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study was finally conducted on a sample of 308 male employees working in Banking and Insurance organisations from different districts (Hisar, Sirsa, Kurukshetra, Jind, Fatehabad, Yamunanagar, Kaithal, Karnal) of Haryana State on the basis of purposive sampling procedure. Data of eighty six (86) subjects was dropped due to incompletion. All the male (permanent and part-
time) employees were working in private & government organizations and all the
subjects were selected from both the urban and rural areas and having different
marital status.

MEASURING TOOLS

After selection of the sample, the next task was to select the tools for
measuring the positive psychological states, emotional intelligence and work
outcomes of employees. The selection of the tools for a particular study depends
on various considerations, such as objective of the study, nature of sample,
amount of time at the investigation, availability of suitable tools, personal
competence of the investigator to administer etc. After carefully reviewing tools,
on the basis of objectives, following measures of Positive Psychological States
(Hope, Optimism, Self Efficacy, Resilience), Emotional Intelligence and work
outcomes indicators (Job Satisfaction, Job Performance, Organisational
Commitment and Turnover Intention) were selected because they had been found
to be reliable. Some other factor taken into consideration in selection of the tool
were: (1) the efficiency of the test (2) ease in administration and scoring (3) the
educational level which the test was best suited for (4) content of the test (5) the
suitability of the test to research objectives. Taking into account of all
considerations, only standardized and psychometrically sound tools were selected
for the study. The sequence and order of measures was controlled independently
and randomized each subject.

The participants were assessed with following tools:

1. Psychological Capital Questionnaire (Luthans et al., 2007)
2. Multidimensional Measure of Emotional Intelligence (Darolia, 2003)
3. Organizational Commitment Scale (Allen & Meyer, 1993)
4. Muthyya Job Satisfaction Scale (Muthyya, 1973)
5. Job Performance Scale (Singh and Pestonjee, 1988)
6. Turn Over Intention Scale (Shore and Martin, 1989)
DESCRIPTION OF THE TOOLS

A brief description of tests used in the study is as under:

1. Psychological Capital (PsyCap) Questionnaire

PsyCap was measured with the use of the 24-item psychological capital questionnaire (PCQ) by Luthans, Youssef, and Avolio (2007) and empirically validated by Luthans, Avolio et al. (2007). Permission to use the PCQ is available to researchers free of charge at www.mindgarden.com. The 24 items that make up the survey were adapted from previously published scales that have been analyzed and supported in the positive psychology literature across multiple studies and have been used in previous workplace studies by themselves and in combination (Avey, Luthans & Youssef, in press; Luthans, Avolio et al., 2007; Luthans et al., 2005; Luthans, Norman et al., 2008; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). The internal consistency (Cronbach Alpha) reliability for this scale is .92. Specifically, the instrument consists of six items adapted from each of the following scales:

(F1) Efficacy (Parker, 1998)
(F2) Hope (Snyder et al., 1996)
(F3) Resilience (Wagnild & Young, 1993)
(F4) Optimism (Scheier & Carver, 1985)

The description of components in positive psychological capital as given below:

(F1) Efficacy: This is one of the PsyCap construct that has the most extensive theory and research support (e.g., Bandura, 1997). Multiple meta-analyses have concluded that self-efficacy has considerable impact on performance outcomes (Sadri & Robertson, 1993; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). With roots in Bandura’s (1997) social cognitive theory, applied to the workplace, efficacy has been defined as “the individual’s conviction or confidence about his or her abilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources or courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context” (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998).

(F2) Hope: The construct of hope in PsyCap is generally considered to be an “empowering way of thinking” (Snyder, 1994). In formulating hope theory, Snyder began with the assumption that people are generally goal oriented; that is,
people behave in such a way that they are trying to accomplish something. Snyder determined there were two components comprising hope: agency (willpower) and pathways (Snyder, 2000; Snyder, Rand, & Sigmon, 2002).

(F3) Resiliency: Masten & Reed, 2002 defined resilience “refers to a class of phenomena characterized by patterns of positive adaptation in the context of significant adversity or risk,” which enables individuals to bounce back quickly and effectively from adverse events. Resilience is the difference between those who recover well after adversity and those who remain devastated and unable to move ahead (Masten et al., 1985). Richardson (2002) argues that those higher in resilience bounce back psychologically (including emotion and cognition) to levels at, or even beyond, previous levels of homeostasis or equilibrium (Bonanno, 2004).

(F4) Optimism: Carver and Scheier (2002) said “optimists are people who expect good things to happen to them; pessimists are people who expect bad things to happen to them” and the difference between the two is not trivial, as optimists “differ in how they approach problems and challenges and differ in the manner and success with which they cope with adversity.” There are two major complementary theoretical streams by which optimism is explained in positive psychology. Seligman (1998) uses an attribution framework (i.e., explanatory style) whereby optimists make internal, stable, and global causal attributions of positive events and external, unstable, and specific attributions of negative events. Sample items from each of the subscales included: “I feel confident helping to set targets/goals in my area of work” (efficacy); “If I should find myself in a jam at work, I could think of many ways to get out of it” (hope); “I always look on the bright side of things regarding my job” (optimism); and “I usually manage difficulties one way or another at work” (resilience). Responses were given on a 6-point Likert-type scale: 1 _ strongly disagree, 2 _ disagree, 3 _ somewhat disagree, 4 _ somewhat agree, 5 _ agree, and 6 _ strongly agree.

All the subscales in this study demonstrated reliability alphas greater than 0.70 with the exception of resilience in the student sample of the pilot (a _ 0.69). However, resilience did demonstrate alpha above 0.70 in the practicing managers’ sample. In addition, the overall 24-item composite PCQ demonstrated reliability
alphas greater than 0.90 in both samples. Because this is a relatively new scale, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with the two samples to determine whether we could replicate validation results reported previously by Luthans, Avolio et al. (2007).

2. Multidimensional Measure of Emotional Intelligence

The Multidimensional Measure of Emotional Intelligence (MMEI) was constructed by C.R. Darolia (2003) to provide reliable and valid measurement of emotional intelligence. The test is based on Salovey and Mayer’s (1990) model of emotional intelligence. Salovey and Mayer defined emotional intelligence as “a form of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and other’s feeling and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and action”. According to them, emotional intelligence is a multidimensional construct, which taps at least five broad dimensions – self-awareness, managing emotions, motivating oneself, empathy, and handling relationship. In view of these indications, the multi-dimensional measure of emotional intelligence was designed to cover the widest possible range of emotional intelligence and to be equally useful with high school students to superior adults and applicable in different life situations.

The MMEI is comprised of 80 multi-choice items distributed in five dimensions, each consisting 16 items. Each item is answered on a five-point scale, viz. very true, mostly true, sometimes true, mostly false, and very false. The test has been designed so as to control for response sets through the balancing of affirmative and negative statements. This has been done for each of the dimensions separately. The dimensions of EI were found independent to personality and temperament (Sharma, Darolia et al., 2004). Salovey and Mayer (1990) have described these dimensions as under:

1. Self – Awareness (SA): Observing yourself and recognizing a feeling as it happens.
2. Managing Emotions (ME): Handling feeling so that they are appropriate; realizing what is behind a feeling; finding ways to handle fears and anxieties, anger, and sadness.

3. Motivating Oneself (MO): Channeling emotions in the service of a goal, emotional self – control; delaying gratification and stifling impulses.

4. Empathy (E): Sensitivity to others’ feeling, concerns, and talking their perspectives; appreciating the differences in how people feel about things.

5. Handling Relationships (HR): Managing emotion in others; social competence and social skills.

Two types of reliability coefficient were worked out for all the five scales. Both reliability estimates are fairly high. The coefficient alpha ranged between .76 and .81 (N=415). The test – retest reliability coefficient were obtained by re – administrating the test on a sample of 126 adults after an interval of 40 days. The test – retest coefficient ranged between .79 and .84. The MMEI scales were validated in terms of constructs validity. Principal components analysis revealed that construct validities (relevance’s) of the scales are substantial, which range from .68 to .76. These values express the extents to which scales scores correlate with the emotional intelligence factor. Apart from factorial validity, overall MMEI score was correlated with Schutte et al. (1998) measure of emotional intelligence. The correlation between the two was found to be .78.

Administration of MMEI is simple and similar to most personality inventories. Each examinee will need one test booklet, as the booklets are not reusable. The examinee is asked to mark his answer by putting X in the related box. The administration of MMEI takes about 25 to 35 minutes. For scoring MMEI scales place the key on the response column by matching the circle marked on the key with the star on the inventory. Add the scores of marked responses for each of the scales separately. The items assigned to different scales as under:

Self – Awareness (SA): 4,7,8,15,28,29,39,40,47,52,61,67,68,74,77,80.
Managing Emotions (ME): 6,13,17,19,22,26,31,37,46,51,57,58, 63,69,71,79.
Motivating oneself (MO): 3,9,14,16,18,27,30,38,43,44,54,59,60,62, 72,78.
Empathy (E): 1,2,10,23,24,34,35,41,49,50,55,65, 66,70,73,75.
Handling Relationships (HR):5,11,12,20,21,25,32,33,36,42,45,48,53,56,64,79.

3. Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS)

The revised scale of Organizational Commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990 a) was used to study work commitment of the respondents. The original scale comprises 8 items each on the three dimensions. The revised scale comprises 6 items on each of the three dimensions and hence, consists of 18 items. The English version of the Mayer, Allen and Smith's (1993) scale was used in the present study. Meyer and Allen (1993) applied different levels to what they described as three components of commitment: affective, continuance and normative. In order to control for a response bias, as suggested by Meyer and Allen (1993) some of the items were negatively worded. According to them the affective commitment (ACS) refers to employee’s emotional attachment to identification with and involvement in the organization. Continuance commitment (CCS) points to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization whereas normative commitment (NCS) reflects a feeling of obligation to continue employment. The OCS consists of 18 items - 6 items for each dimension i.e. affective, continuance, and normative commitment, respectively. The statements included in the questionnaire are worded in accordance with the organizational commitment. Scale comprises both positively and negatively keyed items. The subject is asked to choose one of the responses on five point scale. The scale’s items are responded on 7 point scale with anchor labels, i.e., 7 indicating strongly agree to 1 indicating strongly disagree. The scale is scored by assigning a score of 7 to strongly agree, 6 to agree, 5 to slightly agree, 4 to undecided, 3 to slightly disagree, 2 to disagree and 1 to strongly disagree. The scoring is reverse in the case of negative statements. The scores on individual items are added to generate overall on each of the components of organizational commitment. Thus, the possible score for commitment sub-scales is from 6 to 42. High score indicates high level of commitment and low score indicates low commitment on respective dimension of the organizational
commitment. Reliability of the scale was assessed using split-half method and found to be 0.76, .75 and 0.70 respectively for affective, continuance and normative organizational commitment. Construct validity of the scales was established through factor analysis (Meyer & Allen, 1993).

**Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS)**

The Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) was developed by Muthayya (1973). The scale is intended to measure the extent of job dissatisfaction among the administrative personnel engaged in the implementation of the developmental programmes at the block level. The preliminary form of the questionnaire was prepared on the basis of the style and content of the earlier questionnaires used for studying in job satisfaction among the personnel in the field of industry by Robert Kahn and others in their studies on 'organizational stress'. While choosing the content area, care was taken to consult the job charts of the functionaries for getting an idea of the type of interaction they have on the job. The job satisfaction questionnaire consisted of 34 out of 48 preliminary items, after the item analysis. Arbitrarily, the 34 items constituting the job-satisfaction questionnaire were classified into three aspects, viz., job aspect, the personal aspect and the interpersonal aspect. This classification was thought of as a guideline for understanding the extent of contribution of each of these aspects to one’s job satisfaction. The job aspect covers information on pay, work opportunity, lack of technical know-how, promotional opportunities, facilities for work, work load, conflicting work-roles, under work, monotony of work, work expectation of superiors, and authority vested on the job. There were 17 items covering this aspect. The personal aspect includes ten items and covers information on feeling of inadequacy, security, non-acceptance in the department, under-employment, feeling to change the job, lack of authority and belief in the programmes. The interpersonal aspect consists of seven items covering information on people's apathy to the programs, political interference and pressure on one’s work, and attitude to superior officers. The items in the final scale were arranged at random. The answer categories for each of the items were agree (A), disagree (D) and not sure (NS). The split - half of reliability (odd-even
items) was used for the 34 item job satisfaction scale was found to be .81, after applying the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula, which may be regarded as quite satisfactory reliability of the scale. Higher score indicates higher job dissatisfaction. The agreement with the scoring key gets 2 marks, ‘Not Sure’ gets 1 mark and disagreement with the Key gets 0. The score range is 0-34-68.

**Job Performance Scale (JPS)**

The job performance of the subjects was assessed through Job Performance Rating Scale prepared by Singh and Pestonjee (1988). This scale was used in two ways: first, respondent was required to rate himself on various areas included in the scale. Respondents have to give opinion regarding their work-efficiency on five given alternatives. Secondly, the immediate senior was required to rate how a particular sub-ordinate was doing on various job areas/work efficiency included in the scale. The areas of job performance covered by the scale are amount of effort expanded on the job, competence in completing work, speed of work accomplishment, quality of work, efficiency to edit the work, regularity and punctuality, capacity, care in handling company property, ability to work without supervision, ability to plan work, ability to handle different jobs, dependability, initiative on the job and overall performance etc. It is a Likert type scale consisting of 14 items each having five alternate responses. The scoring was done on five point scale with score of one indicating the least and five the highest and three the average performance. Self rating of the performance of each of the respondent and immediate superior rating was obtained. A score of 1 was assigned to response to alternative (a); score of 2 was assigned to response to alternative (b); score of 3 was assigned to response to alternative (c); score of 2 was assigned to response to alternative (d); score of 1 was assigned to response to alternative (e). Total score for each scale was obtained by adding up individual item scores. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability of the scale was estimated to be .89.

**Turnover Intention Scale (TOIS)**

The Intent to stay in the organization of the subjects was assessed through a six items scale. The areas covered are views/ feelings regarding stay in the
organization, feelings regarding leaving organization, feelings regarding continuation to work in the organization and feelings regarding making your career in the present organization. Four of these items were adopted from Shore and Martin (1989) and the other two were adopted from Simmon, Cochran, & Blount (1997). The total six items were presented to the respondents as a series of statements to which they were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree/disagree along a five-point Likert response scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). A score of 5 was assigned to response strongly agree; 4 to agree; 3 to undecided; 2 to disagree and 1 to strongly disagree. Total score for each scale was obtained by adding up individual item scores. The scoring was reversed in the case of negatively worded statements, i.e. a score of 5 was assigned to response strongly disagree; 4 to disagree; 3 to undecided; 2 to agree; and 1 to strongly agree. Understandably, there might be a reasonable suspicion that even if an employee shows an inclination to quit employment, the intention does not necessarily manifest the employee’s actual turnover. However, Hom & Griffeth (1995) conducted a meta-analysis of studies to examine the relationship between voluntary turnover and 35 different variables and found that among these variables, intentions to quit had the strongest relationship to actual voluntary turnover. The additive scale produced of these six items had a high alpha reliability coefficient (0.92). The negative response reveals substantial evidence to support a top priority for probation administrators to reduce staff turnover in an era of tightening budgets and expanding expectations.