2.1 Introduction

Management thinkers and practitioners around the world agree on the fact that the twenty-first century brings in a lot of responsibility and stress to the life of a manager compared to the last century. They are expected to produce results irrespective of whether the situations are in their favour or not and also they need to think of solutions for the various challenges that crop up very often. Challenges like limited budget, reassignment of staff, reorganization of units, withdrawal of finance, lack of availability of resources, government policies etc. keep cropping up every now and then. The importance of people who have the ability to lead masses has increased all the more in order to survive the impact of current challenges and future changes. It is in this context that Kanter (1997) asserted that for companies to survive, they should pay attention to human factors. Not just the company’s layout, machinery, and tools need to be updated and modified.
but most importantly the human resource of an organization has to be assessed and developed at regular intervals. However, Kanter (1997) argued that, all the concepts and tools such as power, structure, hierarchy, ownership, and incentives that has dominated and shaped our thinking will have to be re-examined. Therefore, it is necessary to have the right kind of managers in every organisation to lead the company towards growth.

This chapter presents an overview of the literature relating to this study. The key concepts of each construct are defined and a theoretical overview along with the dimensions of each variable of the study is provided. The current status of research, regarding the relationships between the key concepts and managerial performance in the hypothesized model is explored.

2.2 Managerial Performance

Managerial work is undergoing such enormous and rapid change that many managers are reinventing their profession as they move forward. With little precedent to guide them, they are watching hierarchy fade away and the clear distinction of title, task, department and even corporation blur. Faced with extra ordinary levels of complexity and interdependency, they watch traditional sources of power erode and the old motivational tools lose their magic.

Management of Performance starts with defining what is to be accomplished, which means, the goals or results that are to be achieved. Without articulating the results or deliverables as articulated in the business parlance, there would hardly be a focus on the activities that lead to those results and all resource and attention would be spent on activities that hardly contribute to attainment of the desired results.
There are different approaches used by organisations to define performance in organisational context. The most popular among these are competencies or trait based approach, task based approach, results or outcomes based approach and behaviour based approach (Wayne, Mondy, & Noe, 2005). Brief descriptions of each of these approaches are given below:

2.2.1 Competency or Trait Based Approach

Competency or trait based approach postulates that performance depends on relatively stable competencies or traits possessed by employees and their performance is defined in terms of cognitive abilities, personality traits, or competencies which are deemed important for carrying out the job. The assumption behind this approach is that if the employee has the competencies then he or she is more likely to engage in the desired behaviours or carry out the tasks in a better manner than someone who does not have those competencies or who has those competencies to a lesser degree. McClelland and Boyatzis (1980) were the strong supporters of this view by bringing out research results in favour of the linkage between competencies and desired work related behaviours. This argument faced lot of criticism starting with the argument that mere presence of competencies or traits does not necessarily translate into desired outcomes. Currie and Roger (1995) criticised that even seemingly identical managerial jobs can differ from firm to firm, department to department, and situation to situation. Identical list of competence can create a stereotypical manager which may and often hide variation in how managers do their work.

2.2.2 Task Based Approach
Task based approach focuses on what tasks are required to be done and to what extent the same have been carried out to the degree of professionalism desired by the respective organisations. This approach is suitable when the links between the tasks and the outcomes either come with a lag or there are other factors beyond the control of the employee that influence the outcomes (Bagchi, 2010). Task based approach helps to assess the performance of managers in both line and staff functions alike in organisations where the linkages of the duties carried out in the department and the organisational outcomes are distant and the linkages are influenced by a host of other factors.

2.2.3 Results or Outcomes Based Approach

Result based approach emphasises on the outcomes or results that are produced in the organisation to assess the performance of managers. There is no consideration of competencies or traits that are not possessed by the employees, nor is the behaviour exhibited by the employees considered. Even the tasks that are carried out are not taken into account as the main focus is on the outcomes. By focusing on the results, the management is actually leaving it free for the employees to figure out the best way to achieve them. Simons (2005) suggests that for this approach to work, an organisation has to ensure that the definition of performance is accompanied by the availability of requisite resources to achieve the desired performance and corresponding organisational support. Return on investment (ROI), Management by objective (MBO) and Balanced Score Card propounded by Kaplan and Norton (1996) are few of the most popular methods of assessing performance at individual and organisational level in the emerging context.

2.2.4 Behaviour Based Approach
Behaviour based approach carries out the assessment of individuals in terms of behaviours that are oriented towards the organisation’s goals. The assumption behind the behaviour based approach is that if the employee engages in the desired behaviours, then it is likely that the organisational goals will be attained. The identification of different categories of behaviours is done by the top management after understanding the linkages of the behaviours to organisational outcomes. This approach can also be used to reinforce certain responses which are positive and in some cases to discourage certain behaviours among the employees which can damage the organisation at large.

An assessment of various behaviours that are universally desired by organisations in the changing environment brings us to the identification of managerial performance behaviours that map onto broader task performance factors such as structuring work and getting things done, contextual factors comprising of facilitating the psychological and social contexts of work and getting along with others (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000) and also innovative work behaviours (Spreitzer, 1995).

The linkage between different approaches for defining performance described above may be diagrammatically represented as follows:
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The diagram explains the linear relationship among the different approaches. When the employees possess the required competencies, they tend to engage in work related positive behaviours which are further ensuring organisationally desirable outcomes. As discussed earlier, the presence of competencies alone is not a guarantee of performance (Currie and Darby, 1995) and this prompted the researcher to search and find out what are the conditions under which the employees in organisations tend to exhibit positive work behaviours.

Organizations invest significant effort and resources to attract, select and retain conscientious, proactive, engaged and committed employees (Macey, Schneider, Barbera & Young, 2009). Therefore, there is a need for on-going research directed toward identifying the organizational factors that best promote positive employee attitudes and behaviour and positive organizational performance. Consistent with this argument, the present research aimed to test a model which shows how the attitudes of job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment, psychological empowerment at work, work-life balance, and psychological contract violation influences managerial performance exhibited through organizational citizenship behaviour, in-role behaviour and innovative work behaviours. The study is designed to provide an account of the direct and indirect mechanisms by which these variables impact managerial performance. A detailed discussion of the independent variables and their relationship with Managerial Performance is provided in the current chapter as a continuation of the following discussion on Managerial Performance.

Research and theory on managerial performance have often converged on a set of performance factors that are reflected in broad
Managerial task and contextual performance factors. A review of literature on Managerial Performance brings out various models being discussed by researchers. For instance, Borman and Brush’s (1993) taxonomy of managerial performance proposed eighteen factors. Viswesvaran and Ones (2000) noted that the eighteen factors can further be grouped into four broad managerial performance dimensions such as leadership and supervision, technical behaviours and mechanics of management, interpersonal facilitation and job dedication. Johnson (2003) further argued that Viswesvaran and Ones’ four dimensions can be classified into task and contextual performance factors. This will also fit into Van Scotter and Motowidlo’s (1996) two factors of managerial contextual performance: interpersonal facilitation and job dedication, respectively. Campbell et al. (1993) proposed an eight-factor model of job performance, with two of these factors related to managerial performance: supervision or leadership and management or administration. According to Campbell et al., the former represents behaviours directed at influencing the performance of subordinates through face-to-face interpersonal interaction and influence, and the latter represents behaviours directed at major elements in management that are distinct from direct supervision; i.e., things such as monitoring progress or obtaining additional resources.

Thus, management or administration duties represent more core job tasks with behaviours focused on structuring work and getting things done, and supervision or leadership duties have a more interpersonal focus. Behaviours focused on structuring work and getting things done resemble managerial task performance, and performance behaviours with a more interpersonal focus resemble managerial contextual performance. What these models have in common is a set of managerial performance
behaviours that map onto broader task performance factors and contextual performance factors.

This thesis represents an attempt at empirically testing a model that integrates all the important literatures, with important antecedent variables and outcomes. This study incorporates the notion of managerial performance as comprising of organizational citizenship behaviour, in-role behaviour and innovative work behaviour within the model. These three behavioural dimensions of performance are discussed in the following section.

2.3 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

2.3.1 Defining the Concept

Over the past quarter-century, organizational scholars have been paying increased attention to work behaviour that is in some way beyond the reach of traditional measures of job performance but holds promise for long-term organizational success (Koys, 2001; Marshall, Moncrief, Lassk, & Shepherd, 2012; Podsakoff & Mac Kenzie, 1997; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). Every organization needs to maintain its long-term effectiveness through the positive perceptions, attitudes, and behaviours of its members. Organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) is one of the extra-role behaviours that serve as an important aspect of the organizational effectiveness. In the long-term, OCB would affect the sustainability of organizations, particularly in the turbulent environment (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). In order to sustain the organization’s long-term effectiveness in twenty first century, employees need to engage in positive individual behaviour and attitudes. As stated by Yilmaz and Tasdan (2009), organizations need employees’ cooperation, benevolence, self-sacrifice
and, at times, extra effort. Thus, voluntary behaviour by employees is important for organizations.

Organ (1988) defined Organizational citizenship behaviour as those behaviours which represent individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization. These behaviours lubricate the social machinery of the organization, provide the flexibility needed to work through many unforeseen contingencies, and help employees in an organization cope with the otherwise awesome condition of interdependence on each other (Smith, Organ & Near, 1983). Employees’ OCB or extra-role behaviour differs from the formally assigned in-role responsibilities which is defined by a job description linked directly to the functioning of an organization. In essence, the core concept of OCB is hinged on whether the behaviour is discretionary and serves to promote an organizational culture in which employees are known to cooperate widely and contribute broadly in ways that ultimately enhance organizational effectiveness (Organ et al., 2006).

Konovsky and Pugh (1994) trace the roots of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour to the works of Katz (1964) who argued that there were three types of employee behaviours that were important for organisational success. Firstly, individuals enter and remain with the organisation; secondly, they undertake well defined roles and functions within the organisation; and, finally they engage in innovative and spontaneous activity that goes beyond role prescriptions. According to them, it was Katz’s contention that behaviours that goes beyond role prescriptions, though not formally required of employees, is essential for organisational success.
2.3.2 Theoretical Framework

In recent years, as organizational structures have become more flexible, much attention has been given to the role that employee citizenship behaviour plays in improving organizational functioning (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Van Dyne, Cummings & McLean Parks, 1995). OCB makes an important contribution to overall organizational performance in that it can facilitate work processes by filling the gaps associated with non-prescribed tasks that job descriptions might not cover clearly. Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume (2009) have compiled considerable evidence that the extent of OCB can be linked directly to variability in organizational performance including both productivity and efficiency indicators. In general, it has been argued that organization with higher degree of OCB leads to reduced absenteeism, reduced turnover, employees satisfaction and employees loyalty (Chughtai & Sohail, 2006; Khalid & Hassan ,2005; Meyer & Allen,1997; Podaskoff & Mackenzie,1997) which subsequently leads to improved organizational performance.

It is found that OCB would affect the organizational effectiveness for specifics reasons. OCB could help extend the peer performance, improve the managerial productivity, improve the use of organizational resource for productive reasons in the most efficient manner, and decrease the need of organizational resources for employee maintenance. OCB also serves as an effective basis for the coordination of the activities among team members and work groups, improve the organizational ability for hiring and keeping qualified employees by promoting the notion that the organization is an interesting place to work, improve the stability of organizational
performance and also improve the organization’s ability to adapt with changes in the business environment (Bachrach, Bendoly & Podsakoff, 2001; Bettencourt, Gwinner, & Meuter, 2001; Rioux & Penner, 2001; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994).

Borman, Penner, Allen and Motowidlo (2001) argued that citizenship performance contributes to organizational effectiveness because it helps create the psychological, social and organizational context necessary to carry out the formal responsibilities of the job. The organization’s social machinery is lubricated increasing effectiveness and reducing friction among employees. OCB supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place. The practical importance of OCB is that they can improve organisational efficiency and effectiveness by contributing to resource transformation, innovation and adaptability. Thus, OCB may be more important at the managerial level, because the modelling of these behaviours has a multiplier effect on subordinates. A manager who consistently demonstrates support for organizational goals could set a positive tone for the attitudes of those who work for him or her.

2.3.3 Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Organ (1988) proposed a five-dimensional model of OCB consisting of altruism (assisting co-workers with work-relevant tasks); courtesy (being respectful and considerate of other employees); conscientiousness (fulfilling in-role duties well beyond required levels); civic virtue (participating in organizational life such as meetings, events, and governance); and sportsmanship (tolerating difficulties without undue complaints). Later, he expanded this framework to include peacekeeping and cheerleading.
Williams and Anderson (1991) suggested that a good measurement of OCB should include items representing intra-role behaviours because such an analysis would clarify whether the respondents differentiated between intra-role and extra-role behaviours. Specifically, they draw a distinction between citizenship behaviours which are intended to benefit the organization (termed OCB-O) and citizenship behaviours which are intended to benefit specific individuals within the organization, especially co-workers (termed OCB-I). For example, citizenship behaviours directed at the organization include such actions as adhering to informal rules designed to maintain order, demonstrating above average work attendance, and not taking extended work breaks. Citizenship behaviours that are more personally focused on helping specific individuals include such actions as assisting others who have been absent, helping colleagues who have heavy workloads, and taking a personal interest in the well-being of other employees. Conceptual representations of OCB include altruism, courtesy, peacekeeping, and cheerleading in the OCB-I category, and conscientiousness (sometimes termed compliance), civic virtue, and sportsmanship in the OCB-O category (Podsakoff et al., 2009).

In another study conducted by Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996) on contextual performance, new labels were given to two dimensions of the construct – Interpersonal Facilitation and Job Dedication. Interpersonal Facilitation consists of interpersonally oriented behaviours that contribute to organizational goal accomplishment. It differs from job specific task performance. Interpersonal facilitation also encompasses deliberate acts that improve morale, encourage cooperation, remove barriers to performance or help co-workers perform their task oriented job activities. Thus, interpersonal facilitation encompasses a range of interpersonal acts
that help maintain the interpersonal and social context needed to support effective task performance in an organizational setting. Job Dedication, on the other hand centers on self-disciplined behaviours such as following rules, working hard, and taking the initiative to solve a problem at work. It is the motivational foundation for job performance that drives people to act with the deliberate intention of promoting the organization’s best interests.

3.4 In-Role Behaviour

3.4.1 Defining the Concept

In-role behaviours (IRB) are defined as being part of one’s job and are recognized by the organization’s formal reward systems (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Because in-role performance represents an obligation on the employees’ behalf, employees may refuse to fulfil such obligations if they perceive that the organization did not fulfil its obligations. In a study by Williams and Anderson (1991), it was found that IRB and OCB are separate forms of employee behaviour which supported the view that in order to have a comprehensive understanding of individual performance, it is better to look at IRB of employees along with other dimensions of performance. Alternately IRB can be defined as work behaviour that is related to the organization’s technical core, either by executing its technical processes or by maintaining and servicing its technical requirements (Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997) and it is typically viewed as fundamental responsibilities that employees are hired to perform in exchange for their compensation packages (Rousseau & Parks, 1993). In-role job performance is described as the assigned responsibilities associated with an individual’s formal employment contract (Kickul et al., 2002). It also includes compliance of employees’ responsibilities that are essential in
organizational operations and are specified in the job description (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Williams & Anderson, 1991).

3.4.2 Theoretical Framework

In-role performance relates to specific job requirements and includes all activities that are directly related to the organization’s technical core for example, closing a sale or contributing to sales unit revenue (Motowidlo et al., 1997). It can be viewed as an activity in which an individual is able to accomplish successfully the task assigned to him or her, subject to the normal constraints of reasonable utilization of the available resources. In-role behaviour is tied closely to the organization’s formal power structure. There are two types of in-role performances. One consists of activities that transform raw materials into the goods and services that are the organization’s products. They include activities such as selling merchandise in a retail store, operating a production machine in a manufacturing plant, teaching in a school, performing surgery in a hospital, and cashing cheques in a bank. A second type of task performance consists of activities that service and maintain the technical core by replenishing its supply of raw materials; distributing its finished products; or providing important planning, coordination, supervising, or staff functions that enable it to function effectively and efficiently. Thus, IRB bears a direct relation to the organization's technical core, either by executing its technical processes or by maintaining and servicing its technical requirements.

IRB habits are patterns of responses to task situations that either facilitate or interfere with the performance of task behaviours. They include characteristic ways of using technical information, performing technical procedures, making decisions, and so on that may or may not be consistent
with what the performers know are the most effective ways to do these things. They also include motivational task habits such as characteristic tendencies to exert high or low levels of effort, focus sustained effort on a task, fall victim to distraction, and set challenging personal goals. Task habits are affected by individual differences both in cognitive ability and in personality traits such as conscientiousness.

2.5 Innovative Work Behaviour

2.5.1 Defining the Concept

Janssen (2000) defines innovative work behaviour (IWB) as intentional creation, introduction and application of new ideas within a work role, group or organization, in order to benefit role performance, the group, or the organization. The definition of IWB involves the creation, promotion, and implementation of new ideas that benefit organizations. Such innovative work behaviour can be in the form of the implementation of new methods, new procedures, or new approaches in an organization that are valuable to the organization. The definition also refers to performing tasks beyond team, group, or organization routines. The environment of teams or organizations is very dynamic. Occasionally the routines implemented by teams or organizations may not be able to respond to the rapid changes. Employees, therefore, need to develop, endorse, and implement new methods, approaches or procedures and it encompasses taking risks (Chen & Aryee, 2007). Innovative employees may only have limited knowledge of the effects of new ideas and innovation may put their status and rewards in the organization at risk (Janssen, Vliert & West, 2004; Kanter, 1988). Therefore, to be an innovation, new ideas may be a combination of existing ideas or a truly new idea (Oldham & Cummings,
1996). IWB is thus a complex process that involves three steps including the creation of ideas, followed by the promotion and implementation of the new ideas (Janssen, 2004; Kanter, 1988; Scott and Bruce, 1994; Yuan & Woodman, 2010).

2.5.2 Theoretical Framework

The ability to continuously innovate and improve products, services and work processes is nowadays crucial for organizations. Individual employees need to be both willing and able to innovate if a continuous flow of innovations is to be realized (Alfes, Soane, Truss, Rees & Gatenby, 2013). The idea that actions of individual employees are of crucial importance for continuous innovation and improvement is not just found in academic literature on innovation, but also stressed in work on several other popular management principles, such as total quality management (McLoughlin & Harris, 1997) and corporate entrepreneurship (Sharma & Chrisman, 1999).

Scholars have identified a wealth of benefits produced by Innovative Work Behaviour in organizations. Innovative employees may enjoy more job satisfaction, achieve better performance in the workplace, develop better relationships with other colleagues, experience relatively low stress, enjoy higher personal growth (West & Anderson, 1996), and produce positive conflicts (Janssen et al., 2004).

Innovation at work place can be conceptualized in various ways. Generally, the construct has been thought of in terms of personality characteristics, outputs and behaviours. For instance, Hurt, Joseph and Cook (1977) regarded individual innovation to be personality-based, defining it as a generalized willingness to change. Kirton’s (1976)
Adoption-Innovation Inventory measured two distinct cognitive styles ranging from adaptors who solve problems within existing perceptual frames and innovators who restructure them. Output-based measures include West’s (1987) measure of role innovation which records how many changes have individuals initiated in their jobs and Bunce and West’s (1995) composite innovation score which is obtained by multiplying the perceived effectiveness of innovations by the number of innovations. In both cases, innovation is conceptualized as a set of behaviours. In this perspective there are many studies that focus on creativity and idea generation, but innovation theory has also stressed that innovation also includes the implementation of ideas (King & Anderson, 2002).

IWBs are neither expected of the employees in their formal role as employees, nor form an explicit contract between the employees and the organization. Such behaviours are purely discretionary behaviours, called extra-role behaviours, and are not formally recognized by organizational reward systems. Nevertheless, employees engaging in such behaviours are likely to benefit the organization, the group or even individual employees to perform their job tasks more effectively. In other words, if and when employees fail to engage in IWBs, they may not be in violation of the explicit contract with the organization and hence, may not suffer any adverse consequences. In this sense, IWBs are more likely to be the result of intrinsic motivations of the employees, and may be the outcome of their perceptions of psychological contract fulfilment. That is, they may or may not feel obliged to engage in these behaviours, depending on the extent to which they feel that their psychological contracts have been fulfilled (Ramamoorthy, Patrick, Flood, & Sardessai, 2005).

2.5.3 Dimensions of Innovative Work Behaviour
Early measures of innovative work behaviour were mostly one-dimensional. Scott and Bruce (1994) first regarded innovative work behaviour as a multistage process. Based on in-depth interviews with managers of a research and development facility and drawing on Kanter’s (1988) work on the stages of innovation, they developed a six-item scale. Kanter (1988) had distinguished between four major tasks: idea generation, coalition building, idea realization and transfer. Leaving out the transfer task, Scott and Bruce’s (1994) measure captures the behaviours of idea generation, coalition building and idea realization.

Other authors have operationalised IWB in more parsimonious and simple ways. Bunce and West (1995) used five items to measure the ‘propensity to innovate’. Spreitzer (1995) used a four-item measure of IWB that served as a dependent variable to validate a four-dimensional scale of psychological empowerment in the workplace. Her measure was based on four items derived from the competing values model of Quinn (1988). Likewise, Basu and Green (1997) developed a four-item IWB scale to correlate with measures of leader-member exchange (LMX) and transformational leadership in leader-subordinate dyads. Both of those measures basically ask supervisors to rate employees’ innovativeness and originality, without any reference to specific types of behaviour.

Janssen’s (2000) contribution may be regarded as significant progress. Referring to Scott and Bruce (1994), he regarded IWB as consisting of three dimensions, namely idea generation, idea promotion and idea implementation. After formulating items explicitly linked to these behaviours, his analysis of empirical data showed strong correlations between the dimensions.

### 2.5.3.1 Idea Generation
Idea generation forms the first step in the exploitation of opportunities. Mumford (2000) suggests that ultimately, the individual is the source of any new idea. To be able to innovate, besides being aware of a need or an opportunity, the ability to construct new ways to address the need is also crucial. Idea generation refers to generating concepts for the purpose of improvement. The generation of ideas may relate to new products, services or processes, the entry of new markets, improvements in current work processes, or in general terms, solutions to identified problems (Amabile, 1988; Kanter, 1988; Van de Ven, 1986). The key to idea generation appears to be the combination and reorganization of information and existing concepts to solve problems or to improve performance. Good idea generators are individuals who can approach problems or performance gaps from a different angle. Kanter (1988) spoke of 'kaleidoscopic thinking'. In a kaleidoscope a set of fragments form a pattern but when shaken or twisted, the same fragments form an entirely new pattern. Idea generation often involves rearranging already existing pieces into a new whole. In his study, Nobel laureate Rothenberg (1996) found that these new combinations often provide a basis for advances in science. Similarly, Mumford, Baughman & Palmon (1997) found that skill in combining and reorganizing concepts is one of the best predictors of creative achievement.

2.5.3.2 Idea Promotion

Championing is a relevant aspect of IWB once an idea is generated. Most ideas need to be sold. Although ideas may have some legitimacy and appear to fill a performance gap, for most ideas it is uncertain whether their benefits will exceed the cost of developing and implementing them, and resistance to change is to be expected. In many cases, the prospective users
of a proposed innovation such as colleagues, leaders, customers, etc. may feel uncertain about its value and such innovations will often need to be 'sold' to users. The innovative individual who takes prime responsibility for the introduction of innovations is often not formally appointed, but rather someone who feels a strong personal commitment to a particular idea and is able to sell it to others (Kanter, 1988). A champion has been described as someone in an informal role that pushes a creative idea beyond roadblocks within the organization (Shane, 1994) or as someone who emerges to put efforts into realizing creative ideas and bringing them to life (Kleysen & Street, 2001). This can involve the champion's own or other people's ideas. Championing includes behaviours related to finding support and building coalitions, such as persuading and influencing other employees or management, and pushing and negotiating (Howell & Higgins, 1990; King & Anderson, 2002, Van de Ven, 1986).

2.5.3.3 Idea Implementation

Finally the supported idea needs to be implemented and put into practice. Implementation can mean improving existing products or procedures, or developing new ones. Considerable effort and a results-oriented attitude are needed from employees to make ideas happen. Application behaviour relates to the efforts individuals must put forth to develop an idea selected for implementation into a practical proposition. Application often implies making innovations a regular part of work processes (Kleysen & Street, 2001) and includes behaviours like developing new products or work processes, and testing and modifying them (West & Farr, 1990; Van de Ven, 1986; Kanter, 1988).

2.6 Introduction to the Antecedent Variables
Having discussed the multidimensional nature of Managerial Performance in terms of OCB, IRB and IWB, the following section discusses the different antecedent variables that are part of the study to explain the interplay of the research model to be proposed. Both researchers and practitioners are interested in understanding valid predictors of managerial performance and an examination of the various antecedent variables studied in the literature brings out a number of individual and organisational factors that are significant predictors of performance behaviours of managers. A brief description of the antecedent variables of Managerial Performance identified from the review of literature is summarised in the following table:

**Table 2.1. Antecedent variables of Managerial Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedents of Managerial Performance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence (Cherniss, C.,2000; Cavallo and Brienza’s, 2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Innovative climate (Schneider & Reichers, 1983; Scott & Bruce, 1994)

Job Attitudes (Moorman, 1991; Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998; Mossberger et al., 1998; Naumann & Bennett, 2000; Liao & Rupp, 2005)

Job Characteristics (Parker & Wall, 1998; Zaccaro & Banks, 2004; Torrance, 2005; Abbott, Boyd, & Miles, 2006)

Leader Member Exchange (Deluga 1994; Organ and Ryan, 1995; Wayne et al. 1997; Masterson et al., 2000)

Leadership (Amabile, 1988; Lowe et al., 1996; Oldham & Cummings, 1996)

Organisational Justice (Moorman R.H., 1991; Moorman et al., 1998; Cropanzano et al., 2001)

Organisational support (Moorman et al., 1998; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002)

Personality (Ilies et al., 2009; Judge T.A. & Ilies, 2002)


Psychological Contract Violation (Robinson & Morrison, 1995; Robinson, 1996; Turnley & Feldman, 1999; Turnley et al., 2003; Restubog & Bordia, 2006; Restubog et al., 2007)

Psychological Empowerment at Work (Spreitzer, 1995; Morrison & Phelps, 1999)

Work Life Balance (Muse et al., 2008; Beauregard & Henry, 2009; Baral & Bhargava, 2010)

### 2.6.1 An initial nomological network
In the following section, an attempt is made to develop a partial nomological network (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955) under girding Managerial Performance through reviewing the available literature. The proposed nomological network is not comprehensive; far more factors can be part of it. Although the researcher uses the terms antecedents and outcomes during the literature survey discussion, a cross-sectional design is used in the study that does not allow for testing causal directions. These directions are assumed on the basis of prior theory and empirical work.
The list of antecedent variables generated through the review of literature and iterated from the nomological network were taken to practicing managers in the industry and a focused group discussion (FGD) with them helped the researcher to focus the study on a viable numbers of selected variables. A focus group discussion, or focus group interview, is a qualitative research tool often used in social research, business and marketing. Focus groups are small group discussions, addressing a specific topic, which usually involves 6-12 participants, either matched or varied on specific characteristics of interest to the researcher. (Fern, 1982; Morgan & Spanish, 1984). FGD thus is a rapid assessment, semi-structured data gathering method in which a purposively selected set of participants gather to discuss issues and concerns based on a list of key themes drawn up by the researcher or facilitator (Kumar, 1987).

In order to conduct the FGD, researcher invited a group of senior managers at the level of heads of department and heads of verticals from selected service and manufacturing industries. Seven senior managers had accepted the invitation and were willing to spend time on discussing the issues related to the topic of interest to the researcher. A sufficiently detailed description of the focus of study was given to the group to clarify...
the context and theme and, the variables identified through literature survey were also shared with them. Through a detailed deliberation of each of the variables brought by the researcher in the context of their real world implications to the effective functioning of an organisation, the discussion team was able to sharpen the focus to a much less number of variables. According to the group the list of variables identified by them were significant enough to vary the level of performance of individual managers in organisations.

One of the most prominent determinants of behaviour as per the FGD was job attitude and a detailed examination brought out two of the prominent job attitudes namely job satisfaction and organisational commitment to the forefront. They are favourable or unfavourable evaluative reaction towards something or someone exhibited in ones beliefs, feelings or intended behaviours. This is in line with the empirical research results available in the literature. There are seminal studies done to find out the relationship between attitude-behaviour relationships such as LaPiere (1934) who found inconsistency in this relationship. Later researchers like Ajzen & Fishbein (1977) contended that attitudes can predict behaviour, provided that both are assessed at the same level of generality.

Subsequent discussions brought in the relevance of studying the influence of Work Life Balance issues. Balancing the demands of work and life is in the forefront of hurdles one may face while trying to simultaneously be effective in work place and at family. The discussion also brought in the significance of frequently dealing with changes and global competition in the day to day working of a manager’s life. Majority of the participants felt the importance of being empowered at the workplace
to deal with these contemporary challenges. This is in tune with the observation of Peter Drucker (1988) that widespread interest in psychological empowerment has come at a time when turbulent change and global competition require employee initiative and innovation. Spreitzer (2007) describes psychological empowerment as a group of psychological states essential for a person to feel that he or she can control the relationship to his or her own work.

In line with the challenges of change and competition, another concern brought out by the practicing managers was the frequent emotional drain they experience due to the breakages in the hitherto unwritten expectations of organisational norms, promises or practices in their organisational environment. Norms of performance evaluations, promotions, transfers or job security were all challenged on account of the unpredictability of the market place. From a theoretical perspective, this feeling may be understood as Psychological Contract Violation, which is the emotional or affective state that may, but does not always, results from the perception of psychological contract breach (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). This Psychological Contract Violation will result in feelings of anger, injustice, resentment, and distrust that arise from the realization that the organization has not honoured the psychological contract (Raja, Johns, & Ntalianis, 2004).

While discussing about the demographic variables that can have an impact on the antecedent variables, the participants were able to identify gender, age, marital status, educational qualification, presence of dependent children at home and organisation type as major influences on managers. This observation was in tune with the observations available from various
studies on these aspects in the literature. This brings us to the next section of literature discussion on the selected antecedent variables namely:

a) Job Satisfaction (JS)
b) Affective Organisational Commitment (AOC)
c) Psychological Empowerment at Work (PEW)
d) Work-Life Balance (WLB), and;
e) Psychological Contract Violation (PCV)

2.7 Job Satisfaction

2.7.1 Defining the Concept

For decades organizational researchers have been intrigued by employee satisfaction with work because organisations have tremendous effect on the people who work in them and the way people feel about work – both positive and negative. Organisational practices that maximise job satisfaction will likely benefit to employees who are more cooperative and willing to help the organisation to be successful (Wood, Veldhoven, Croon & Menezes, 2012). Negative feelings can lead to behaviours that are detrimental to organisations and potential to adverse physical and psychological health. It is certainly within everyone’s best interest for our organisations to function efficiently and smoothly.

There are numerous definitions of job satisfaction available in literature. The most-used research definition of job satisfaction is by Locke (1976), who defined it as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences. Job satisfaction can also be defined as an individual’s total feeling about his or her job and the attitudes he or she has towards various aspects or facets of the job, as well
as an attitude and perception that could consequently influence the degree of fit between the individual and the organization (Ivancevich & Matteson 2002; Spector 1997). A person with high job satisfaction appears to hold generally positive attitudes, and one who is dissatisfied to hold negative attitudes towards the job (Robbins 1993). Thus job satisfaction is an attitudinal variable that reflects how people feel about their jobs. It emphasizes the specific task environment where an employee performs his or her duties and reflects the more immediate reactions to specific tangible aspects of the work environment (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982).

2.7.2 Theoretical Framework

Spector (1997) says job satisfaction is an attitudinal variable, as it is generally assessed. In the past, job satisfaction was approached by some researchers from the perspective of need fulfilment, i.e, whether or not the job met employees physical or psychological needs for the things provided by work, such as pay (Porter, 1963; Wolf, 1970). However this approach has been deemphasised because today most researchers tend to focus attention on cognitive processes rather than on underlying needs. The attitudinal perspective has become the predominant one in the study of job satisfaction. Spector (1997) also notes that an employee’s attitude is a major topic in many studies examining organizational behaviour that improves efficiency and quality of work. A person with a high level of job satisfaction invariably has positive attitudes toward his job; while a person dissatisfied has negative attitudes about his job. Conceptually, job satisfaction is a broad construct, regarding all or most of the characteristics of the job itself and the work environment, which employees find rewarding, fulfilling and satisfying, or frustrating and unsatisfying (Weiss, 2002). All these arguments converge on the general and shared assumption
that global job satisfaction is associated with a complex set of interrelationships of tasks, roles, responsibilities, interactions, incentives and rewards (Bowling & Hammond, 2008; Cameron, 1973).

Job satisfaction is considered to be a central concept in organizations, as it mediates the relation between working conditions on the one hand and organizational and individual outcomes on the other (Dormann and Zapf, 2001). The situational approach to job satisfaction (Hackman & Oldman, 1980; Herzberg, 1966) considers this issue to be primarily determined by the characteristics of the job. Working conditions such as communication, task variety or responsibility are believed to be highly responsible for job satisfaction.

The traditional model of job satisfaction focuses on all the feelings that an individual has about his job. According to While and Barriball(2004) what makes a job satisfying or dissatisfying does not depend only on the nature of the job, but also on the expectations that individuals have of what their jobs should provide. Noted theorists like Maslow (1943) and, Herzberg and Mausner (1959) emphasized the importance of the fulfilment of various needs of employees. Maslow(1943) postulated the physiological needs, the safety needs, belongingness and love needs, the social need of approval and recognition, the esteem needs for mastery and achievement, and the self-fulfilling needs to realize one’s full potential for continual self-development.

Herzberg and Mausner(1959) formulated the two factor theory of job satisfaction that satisfaction and dissatisfaction were two separate and sometimes unrelated phenomena. Extrinsic factors were named ‘hygiene’ factors and were claimed to involve primarily the context in which the job
was performed. They were found to be ‘dissatisfiers’, and included salary, supervision, company policies, administration, interpersonal relations and working conditions. Intrinsic factors were named ‘motivators’ and were believed to involve mainly aspects of the job itself. They were found to be job ‘satisfiers’ and included advancement, responsibility, recognition, work itself and achievement. They concluded that only the fulfilment of motivators could lead to positive satisfaction on the job, and that the fulfilment of hygiene factors could prevent dissatisfaction, but could not contribute to positive satisfaction.

Job satisfaction can be considered either as a related constellation of attitudes about various aspects or facets of the job, or as an overall perception of the job (Spector, 1997). The first, the facet approach, is used to find out what elements of the job produce satisfaction or dissatisfaction. This can be particularly useful for organizations that wish to identify areas of dissatisfaction that they want to improve. As a multifaceted construct, job satisfaction includes both intrinsic and extrinsic elements of the job (Howard & Frick, 1996; Warr, Cook & Wall, 1979). The second, the global approach, is used to assess overall job satisfaction in relation to other variables of interest. A single item measure is generally used to assess overall job satisfaction (Wanous, Reichers & Hudy, 1997). Although the use of a single item measure is often questioned, some studies shows that empirically no validity or reliability appears to be lost (Ganzach, 1998; Wanous & Reichers, 1996; Wanous et al., 1997). There is also an argument that a single item survey is better positioned to capture cognitive assessments of the job than affective experiences of the job (Ilies & Judge, 2002). Thus inorder to capture the affective experiences of the job, it is
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appropriate to use scales having more items. Bacharach, Bamberger, & Conley (1991) developed a scale to measure job satisfaction relative to expectation as a global approach of measurement using five items, viz, comparison of his or her job with other jobs in the organisation, goal setting, scope of the job for self-development, expectations one had while taking up the job, and career growth opportunities.

Perception of job satisfaction is influenced by two aspects: the pleasant mood or state affect and the job beliefs or cognition on job satisfaction (Ilies & Judge, 2004; Weiss, 2002). Research suggests that job satisfaction, as a work-related outcome, is influenced by certain organizational and managerial characteristics. Communication, dialogue, teamwork, interaction with the external environment and collaboration represent trust and proximity, which in turn motivate and increase commitment, and finally satisfy employees.

Wagner and Le Pine (1999) conducted a meta-analysis and revealed significant impacts of job participation and work performance on job satisfaction. Eylon and Bamberger (2000) reported that empowerment had a significant impact on job satisfaction. Johnson and McIntye (1998) found that the measures of culture most strongly related to job satisfaction were empowerment, involvement and recognition. Hwang and Chi (2005) have more recently provided empirical evidence of the positive effects of job satisfaction on organizational performance.

Smith, Organ, & Near (1983) had conducted a research about the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviour and they suggested that job satisfaction was the best predictor of OCB. Many studies have supported the associations between job satisfaction and organizational
citizenship behaviour. In general, studies that analysed this relationship empirically found that employee job satisfaction influences OCB (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Organ and Ryan, 1995; Netemeyer et al., 1997; Moorman, 1993; Gonzalez and Garazo, 2006; Nadir and Tanova, 2010). Beyond the empirical evidence concluding that job satisfaction affect OCB, there are more interesting findings by Gonzalez and Garazo (2006) that job satisfaction served as a mediator variable on the relationship between OCB and its predictors.

2.8 Affective Organizational Commitment

2.8.1 Defining the Concept

The concept of commitment in the workplace is one of the most challenging and researched concepts in the fields of management, organizational behaviour, and human resource management. A variety of studies have been conducted to explore the concept of organizational commitment (OC). Although there have been several definitions and measures of OC, Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component model of OC has been the dominant framework for OC research because it is based on a more comprehensive understanding of OC. The three-component model consists of: affective commitment (AC) which is the emotional attachment to one’s organization, continuance commitment (CC) which is the attachment based on the accumulation of valued side bets such as pension, skill transferability, relocation, and self-investment that co-vary with organizational membership; and, normative commitment (NC) which is the attachment that is based on motivation to conform to social norms regarding attachment. Much of the research undertaken in the area of organizational commitment is focused on affective commitment (Allen & Shanock, 2012; Brunetto & Wharton, 2003).
O'Reilly and Chatman’s (1986) definition of organizational commitment as the psychological attachment individuals feel for the organization is also emphasising this aspect of affective commitment. Those with strong commitment want to continue their organizational affiliation. Affective commitment is the strength of emotional attachment to the organization based on positive attraction and a sense of belonging (Meyer & Allen, 1997). This variable is one of the most often studied variables in organizational behaviour research (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Probably the main reason for the extensive and long-lasting research interest in Affective Organisational Commitment (AOC) is that it is assumed to influence almost any behaviour that is beneficial to the organization such as performance, attendance, and staying with the organization (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990, Mowday et al., 1982 & Randall, 1990).

2.8.2 Theoretical Framework

Organizational commitment refers to an individual’s feelings about the organization as a whole. It is the psychological bond that an employee has with an organization and has been found to be related to goal and value congruence, behavioural investments in the organization, and likelihood to stay with the organization (Mowday et al., 1982). According to them there are three characteristics for organizational commitment: a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organisation. Organisational commitment is conceptualised as an affective response that results from an evaluation of the work situation that links the individual to the organization.
This study focuses on affective organisational commitment, which is specifically defined as the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment with the organization because they want to do so. Affective commitment has demonstrated powerful correlations with desirable outcomes and organizations have fostered this affective commitment among their employees (Meyer & Allen, 1997). In addition, some studies have used affective commitment as a single measure of organizational commitment (Feather & Rauter, 2004; Lee & Bruvold, 2003).

Organizational scholars and business leaders have long rendered special attention to AOC based on the belief that organizations with committed employees are more effective and employees who exhibit high levels of AOC are more productive and less likely to quit. The individual level linkages between AOC and turnover and between AOC and performance are strongly supported in meta-analyses (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005; Riketta, 2008). Business leaders are more likely to frame the importance of AOC in terms of attracting, motivating and retaining key talent (Michaels, Jones, & Axelrod, 2001). Employees who are low in AOC are also more likely to miss work and engage in counterproductive behaviours such as theft, sabotage and aggression (Luchak & Gellatly, 2007; Meyer & Allen, 1997). Contemporary changes in work practices such as downsizing, elimination of defined benefit retirement plans and patterns like new generations of employees entering the workforce who hold different values, have been identified as possible explanations for lower AOC. Moreover, as several management scholars have recently pointed out (Coyle-Shapiro & Shore, 2007), research-based
findings have not transferred well to the workplace, leaving managers to rely on fads and personal experience.

While conducting a critical review of the organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) literature, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach (2000), observed that Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment were positively related to OCB and they further observed that some of the common antecedent variables of OCB like task variables or leader behaviour influence OCB through Job Attitudes. They recommended future studies to include more complete set of antecedent variables to investigate the possibility of Job Attitude playing a mediating role in the relationship between OCB and its antecedent variables.

2.9 Psychological Empowerment at Work
2.9.1 Defining the Concept

Psychological empowerment refers to how employees view themselves in the work environment and the extent to which they feel capable for shaping their role in the work. The term psychological empowerment connoted different meanings by various researchers. Conger and Kanungo (1988) defined psychological empowerment as a process of increasing employee feelings of self-efficacy. However, Thomas and Velthouse (1990) characterize psychological empowerment as an increase in intrinsic motivation. Spreitzer (1995) defined psychological empowerment as intrinsic task motivation manifested in a set of four cognitions reflecting an individual’s orientation to his or her work role: competence, impact, meaning, and self-determination. According to Bhatnagar (2012), psychologically empowered individuals exhibit more innovative behaviour because as autonomous performers, they are less
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constrained by technical rules, feel more efficacious about their task activities, and are willing to introduce change. Psychological empowerment is therefore a set of psychological states that focuses on how employees actually think about and experience their work in the real time. They believe about their own roles and influence in an organisation, which makes employees feel confident and enthusiastic to prosperity.

2.9.2 Theoretical Framework

Contemporary research on psychological empowerment has increased focus on articulating the empowerment process and the psychological underpinnings of the construct in terms of self-efficacy and autonomy. This view suggests that empowerment techniques that provide emotional support for subordinates and create a supportive atmosphere can be more effective in strengthening self efficacy beliefs (Bordin, Bartram, Casimir, 2007). The stream that conceptualizes employee empowerment in motivational terms therefore advances the notion of self-efficacy by defining psychological empowerment as a process of enhancing feelings of self-efficacy among organisational members. This may be facilitated through the identification of conditions that foster powerlessness and removal of this powerlessness by both formal organizational practices and informal techniques including providing efficacy information (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990).

Widespread interest in psychological empowerment has come at a time when turbulent changes and global competition require employee initiative and innovation (Drucker, 1988). Spreitzer (2007) describes psychological empowerment as a group of psychological states essential for a person to feel that he or she can control the relationship to his or her own
work. Thomas and Velthous (1990) developed the cognitive elements of empowerment based on the cognitive motivational content of Deci (1975), Hackman and Oldham (1976), and Bandura (1986). The four dimensions reflect a proactive, rather than passive orientation to one’s work role (Spreitzer, Kizilos, & Nason, 1997).

A great deal of effort was made to increase individuals’ psychological empowerment by focusing both on empowering management practices (Blau & Alba, 1982; Mainiero 1986) and on the psychological nature of empowerment (Conger & Kanungo 1988). At the same time, psychological empowerment has been emphasized as an important factor for employees’ health (Zimmerman, 1995), satisfaction and loyalty (Spreitzer 1996). Several researchers also suggest that empowered employees have a higher level of organizational commitment, as empowered employees tend to be highly concentrated, self-motivated and resilient (Avolio, Zhu , Koh, & Bhatia, 2004; Kanter 1983; Kraimer, Seibert, & Liden, 1999). Empowering conditions, such as opportunities for decision autonomy, challenge, and responsibility make employees appreciate what they have. In turn, such appreciation results in feelings of meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact (Linden, Wayne, & Sparrow 2000). Consequently, they are likely to reciprocate by being more committed to an organization (Avolio et al. 2004; Eisenberger, Fasolo, & LaMastro 1990). Empowering individuals could result in higher levels of work satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance (Linden, Wayne & Sparrow, 2000).

According to Kanter (1979), psychological empowerment is the product of employee interaction with organisational structures of information, support, resources, and opportunity that enable the employee to develop further and to be more effective in the organization. Information
about the organization’s mission, performance, and reward system is an important antecedent to psychological empowerment. Employee access to information in the organization helps create a sense of meaning and purpose for the individual, which may provide an employee with an understanding of how their work can contribute to the goals of the organization and subsequently enable them to see the bigger picture. Potterfield (1999) views psychological empowerment as a subjective state of mind where an employee perceives that he or she is exercising efficacious control over meaningful work. Similarly, Menon (1999) define psychological empowerment as a cognitive state that is characterized by a sense of perceived control, perceptions of competence, and internalization of goals and objectives of the organization. Some studies report that employees are less likely to leave the organization if it means giving up empowerment and development benefits. Cappeli and Neumark(2001) states that organizations that offer development and empowerment programmes report lower turnover compared to similar organizations without such programmes. Whether people feel empowered can have consequences for both the individuals and organizations. Perceptions of empowerment can enhance the value of work for individuals, increase job satisfaction, and contribute to work productivity and success. Psychological empowerment is an internal stimulator that allows employees to feel or perceive they have the ability to get things done. This perception results in work effectiveness and job satisfaction.

Menon (2001) classifies empowerment research in three broad categories, based on the underlying thrust and emphasis, namely situational (structural), motivational (psychological) and leadership empowerment. The situational approach emphasises the redistribution of authority and
delegation of decision-making power down the organisational hierarchy so that the employee has the ability to impact on organisational outcomes, be creative and have more flexibility to take risks (Cloete, Crous & Scheepers, 2002; Greasley et al., 2005; Menon, 2001). The ‘leadership’ approach focuses on the leader who energises his or her followers to act with the leader in providing future vision (Menon, 2001). Delegation of authority, accountability for outcomes, self-directed and participative decision making, information sharing and coaching and the developing of people have been identified as leadership behaviours that will empower people (Arnold, Arad, Rhoades & Dragsow, 2000; Konczak, Stelly & Trusty, 2000). The ‘psychological’ approach to empowerment refers to the internal processes of the individual being empowered (Menon, 2001).

Some researchers indicated that the Job satisfaction is one of the most important consequences of psychological empowerment (Seibert, Silver & Randolph, 2004). The researches conducted in this field indicate that there is a relation between empowerment and job satisfaction (Holdsworth & Cartwright, 2003). Liden, Wayne, & Sparrowe (2000) claimed that empowerment is accompanied with commitment, and personnel, who are more empowered, are more loyal. Moreover, Vacharakiat (2008) indicated the positive relationship between empowerment and organizational commitment in their studies. Empowerment has also been found to be related to positive work performance – more specifically managerial effectiveness (Spreitzer 1995), employee effectiveness and employee productivity (Koberg, Boss, Senjem, & Goodman, 1999). Empowerment is also associated with more innovation at work (Singh & Sarkar, 2012; Spreitzer, 1995) and with more OCB, (Wat & Shaffer, 2005).
Most of the studies in the Indian context are focused on empowerment techniques or empowerment per se (Gupta, 2002); they do not address psychological empowerment, except for Singh and Bhandarker (2002) who mention emotional empowerment, which is closer to, though different from, psychological empowerment.

2.9.3 Dimensions of Psychological Empowerment at Work

Spreitzer (1995), in her multidimensional measure of psychological empowerment in the work place, explains four components of psychological empowerment, viz, meaning of the work, competence to do the work, self determination, and employee’s perception of the impact or outcomes of their work. Meaning involves a fit between the needs of one's work role and one's beliefs, values and behaviours (Hackman & Oldham, 1980) while Competence refers to self-efficacy specific to one's work, or a belief in one's capability to perform work activities with skill (Gist, 1987; Bandura, 1989). Self-determination is a sense of choice in initiating and regulating one's actions. It reflects a sense of autonomy or choice over the initiation and continuation of work behaviour and processes like making decisions about work methods, pace, and effort; and Impact is the degree to which one can influence strategic, administrative, or operating outcomes at work (Deci, Connell & Ryan, 1989, Ashforth, 1989). Together, these four cognitions reflect an active, rather than passive, orientation to one's work role. In other words, the experience of empowerment is manifested in all the four dimensions – if any one dimension is missing, then the experience of empowerment will be limited. For example, if people have discretion to make decisions (i.e., self-determination) but they don’t care about the kinds of decisions they can make (i.e., they lack a sense of meaning), they will
not feel empowered. Alternatively, if people believe they can make an impact but don’t feel like they have the skills and abilities to do their job well (i.e., they lack a sense of competence), they will not feel empowered as well. Thus, employees feel psychologically empowered when they experience all the four psychological states.

2.10 Work-Life Balance

2.10.1 Defining the Concept

Since the beginning of the industrial revolution, the world’s industries have increased their demand for the quality and efficiency of their products and outcomes and it is all the more evident especially in today’s global market. This has caused excessive work demands, leading to an increased level of stress among employees (Deshpande, 2012; Guest, 2002). The more pressure organisations impose upon their employees, the more strain the employees tend to experience. This has caused many employees to strive for greater balance between work and private life. Therefore, making organisations aware of the perception held by their employees about their work environment may facilitate the necessary changes within the organisation.

A number of studies on work-life balance define it as the balance of an individual’s levels of work and private life (Fisher, McCulloch & Gershuny, 2009). Work and family are the most crucial domains in most people’s lives; therefore, balancing these two domains is essential for the well-being of the individual. Many people fail to reach a balance which causes a work-life imbalance (Brough, Holt, Bauld, Biggs, & Ryan 2008). A number of factors could cause this: an increased demand on working hours, a larger number of women joining the workforce, and many more
couples involved in the workforce in order to fulfil their financial commitments.

Work-life balance is defined as the extent to which an individual is equally engaged in and equally satisfied with his or her work and non-work roles (Greenhaus, Collins & Shaw, 2003). This definition recognizes that balance can be either positive or negative and accommodates the growing understanding that participation in multiple roles can contribute to good mental and physical health (Barnett, Gareis & Brennan, 1999). Long work hours, defined as forty five hours or more, have been consistently linked to difficulties in balancing work and personal life (Moen & Yu, 2000; Tausig & Fenwick, 2001; Batt & Valcour, 2003; Kodz et al., 2003).

2.10.2 Theoretical Framework

Work-life balance is about individuals having some form of control over when, where and how they work (Pocock, 2005). It is accomplished when people’s right to carry out what is needed for their life, inside as well as outside paid work, is respected and approved as a common benefit to people, society and business.

Conflict within work and family domains, in terms of work to family conflicts, develops when work activities are interfering with family activities (Breaugh & Frye, 2007). This type of conflict has shown to be negatively related to employee performance and satisfaction and positively related to high levels of absenteeism. But there are not many studies available which studies the effect of family demands interfering with the demands of work. The current research studies the effects of work interference with family activities (work-to-family conflict) and the effects of family activities interfering with work (family-to-work conflict). It is
important to study the results of conflict between an individual’s work and private life, and how this may affect different aspects of their performance. This includes the possibility of increasing conflict between an individual’s work and private life due to an imbalance within these two domains, as evidence shows conflicts develop due to lack of balance within work and family domains (Winslow, 2005).

2.10.3 Dimensions of Work –Life Balance

Work-Life Balance is a form of inter role conflict in which engaging in one role interferes with engaging in another role. Work-Life Balance has been conceptualized as a two-dimensional construct where work interferes with family (work-to-family conflict) and family interferes with work (family-to-work conflict). In their integrative model of the work-family interface, Frone, Yardley & Markel (1997) suggest that these two types of work-family conflict reciprocally affect one another indirectly through role overload and distress.

Consistent with the idea that they are separate factors, work-to-family and family-to-work conflicts have been found to have different antecedents and consequences. For example, some research has demonstrated that work-to-family conflict is primarily caused by work-related stressors and characteristics and that it predicts family-related affective and behavioural outcomes, while family-to-work conflict is caused by family-related stressors and characteristics and predicts work-related outcomes. The underlying assumption is that high levels of interference from one role to the other makes meeting the demands of the second role more difficult. For example, MacEwen and Barling (1994) found family-to-work conflict to be positively related to work withdrawal and work-to-family conflict to be
positively related to family withdrawal. Likewise, Frone et al. (1997) found work-to-family and family-to-work conflict to predict family and job performance outcomes, respectively. Other researchers, however, have found direct relationships between work-to-family conflict and work outcomes, in addition to family outcomes, and between family-to-work conflict and family outcomes, in addition to work outcomes (Adams, King, & King, 1996; Gignac, Kelloway, & Gottlieb, 1996; Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999).

Thus, it is important to consider the effects of both dimensions of work life balance simultaneously. In this study, both dimensions of work life balance are included in predicting the work behaviours. Including both directional measures of WLB in the present analyses allows the researcher to test the effects of each, above and beyond the other, and shall provide more information about the nature of the directional measures of work-family conflict, thus contributing to theoretical models of the work-family interface.

2.11 Psychological Contract Violation

2.11.1 Defining the key Concept

The employment relationship has undergone a number of significant changes in recent years. In large part, this transformation has been brought about by the increasing globalization of business, by the dramatic rise in the number of mergers, restructurings, and layoffs, and by the increasing rate of change that permeates all of organizational life today (Kissler, 1994; McLean Parks & Kidder, 1994). As a result of these events, psychological contracts have become increasingly important in helping to define the contemporary employment relationship (Conway & Shapiro, 2012).
Specifically, psychological contracts are comprised of the obligations that employees believe their organization owes them and the obligations the employees believe they owe their organization in return. Psychological contract breach arises when an employee perceives that his or her organization has failed to fulfil one or more of the obligations comprising the psychological contract (Robinson, 1996).

Differentiation between breach and violation is a relatively new concept in the study of psychological contract theory. It is common for researchers to use the terms interchangeably for any breaking of psychological contract terms (Bunderson, 2001; Zhao, Wayne, Glibkowski & Bravo, 2007). The perception of a broken promise is referred to as a breach of the psychological contract. Circumstances associated with the breach may elicit a negative emotional reaction to the breach. The negative emotional reaction is referred to as a psychological contract violation (PCV). Morrison and Robinson (1997) were the first to propose that psychological contract breach and violation were distinctly different constructs. They argued that violation results in a degree of emotional damage while breaches do not. Psychological contract violation is defined as the emotional or affective state that may, but does not always, result from the perception of psychological contract breach (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). Thus, PCV has been described as the feelings of anger, injustice, resentment, and distrust that arise from the realization that the organization has not honoured the psychological contract (Raja, Johns, & Ntalianis, 2004).

2.11.2 Theoretical Framework
Psychological contracts help to define the relationship between employees and their organizations (Argyris, 1960; Rousseau, 1989). In particular, psychological contracts specify what employees believe they owe their organizations and what they believe they are owed in return. Most prior research has conceptualized the psychological contract as one aspect of the social exchange relationship that exists between individuals and their organizations. Social exchange relationships (Blau, 1964; Homans, 1961) are comprised of the voluntary actions that each party engages in with the expectation that the other party will reciprocate those actions in one way or another. Although the exact nature of the exchange relationship is not fully specified in advance, general expectation of reciprocity guides its development.

A central element in the psychological contract is the employee’s belief that the organization will live up to its promises and commitments. When an employee perceives that the organization has failed to fulfill its promises or obligations, then the employee experiences psychological contract breach. Psychological contract breach is defined as the employee’s cognition that he or she has received less than was promised. As such, psychological contract breach typically creates the perception of an imbalance in the social exchange relationship. Psychological contract violation, as mentioned earlier, is related to, but conceptually distinct from, psychological contract breach. It is a result of psychological contract breach and is related to the inducement of anger, injustice, resentment, and distrust.

Raja, Johns & Ntalianis (2004) has examined whether the relationship between psychological contract breach and work-related outcomes might be mediated by the employees’ experience of
psychological contract violation. In that study, Raja et al.,(2004) found that psychological contract violation fully mediated the relationship between psychological contract breach and job satisfaction and intent to quit and partially mediated the relationship between psychological contract breach and affective organizational commitment. This study extends the research on psychological contracts by examining the extent to which the negative emotional feelings associated with psychological contract violation act as a key explanatory mechanism in the relationship between psychological contract breach and important work outcomes.

Prior research suggests that an organization’s failure to honour its promises, i.e., psychological contract breach, often has a negative impact on employee attitudes (Gakovic & Tetrick, 2003& Rousseau, 1995). In addition to the negative effect on employee attitudes, prior research also suggests that psychological contract breach may negatively impact employee behaviours (Kickul, Neuman, Parker & Finkl, 2001; Robinson & Morrison, 1995). In general, social exchange theory has been used to understand the relationship between psychological contract breach and employee attitudes and behaviours. Social exchange theory posits that employees are motivated to seek a fair and balanced relationship between themselves and their organisation (Homans, 1961). In order to restore balance to the exchange relationship after psychological contract breach occurs, employees are often motivated to reduce their commitment to the organization or to contribute less to the organization in terms of in-role or extra-role performance. Studies reveal that Psychological Contract Violation erodes trust and undermines the employment relationship, yielding both lower employee contributions like performance and attendance and lower employer investments such as retention and
promotion. In a recent study by Ng & Feldman (2010), examining the relationships among psychological contract breaches, organizational commitment, and innovation related behaviours, increased perceptions of psychological contract breaches were associated with decreases in innovation-related behaviours and also found evidence that organizational commitment mediates the relationship between psychological contract breaches and innovation-related behaviours.

2.11.3 Dimensions of Psychological Contract Violation

Much of the original development of the psychological contract approach has come from Rousseau, and while some elements have been challenged (Guest, 1998), it is supported by a substantial body of theoretical and empirical research by other scholars. Psychological contract is formed when an individual perceives that contributions he or she makes obligate the organization to reciprocate or vice versa. It is the belief in this obligation of reciprocity, although unilateral, that constitutes the contract. It was Rousseau (1995) who first articulated the psychological contract using a bipolar continuum from “transactional” to “relational” for classifying contract content and generic contract features. In line with the notions of economic and socio-emotional transaction found in social exchange theory, he linked content character directly to generic contract features to describe four contract types.

Firstly, the transactional type has primarily economic terms, and is short-term in focus with explicit performance terms. Secondly, there is the relational type that has primarily emotional terms, long-term commitments by both parties, and non-explicit performance terms. The balanced (hybrid) type has a uniquely complex combination of transactional and relational
terms, and aims at a long-term relationship while at the same time specifying performance requirements. It is becoming commonplace in today’s workplace. The fourth type is the transitional contract that offers no guarantees because of instability in the organization’s environment and conditions.

The transactional and relational contract types are the foundation classifications in Rousseau’s framework. The currency of transactional exchange is reasonably explicit, short-term and economic in nature; such exchange assumes rational and self-interested parties, and does not result in ongoing interdependence. Relational exchange is more complex and promotes interdependence through a commitment to the collective interest over self-interest; its currency is less clear, evolves over time, and involves long-term investments from which withdrawal is difficult.

By linking the nature of a promise to the way in which individuals respond in the event of its non-delivery by the organization, Rousseau’s (1995) bipolar framework has contributed significantly to our understanding of how and why individuals respond to change in the employment relationship. However, a view is developing that on going change in the employment context may have rendered the framework too simplistic and inadequate for understanding the increasingly complex relationship between contract terms and features and response to perceived breaches.

### 2.12 Building the Conceptual Focus of Study

On the basis of the review of literature carried out for understanding, clarifying and articulating the concept of managerial performance, the researcher arrived at a reasonable conclusion to focus the study on work
related behaviours rather than competency based, task based or result based approaches. An assessment of the behaviour based approach of managerial performance prompted the researcher to use a multi-dimensional analysis covering all aspects of individual behaviour in organisational environment. It is an accepted fact that the modern organizations invest significant effort and resources to attract, select and retain conscientious, proactive, engaged and committed employees (Macey, Schneider, Barbera & Young, 2009). Therefore, there is a need for on-going research directed toward identifying the organizational factors that best promote positive employee attitudes and behaviour and positive organizational performance. Consistent with this argument, the present research proposes to test a model which shows how job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, psychological empowerment at work, work-life balance, and psychological contract violation influences managerial performance. The study is designed to provide an account of the direct and indirect mechanisms by which these variables impact managerial performance. The relationship among the selected antecedent variables and managerial performance is discussed in the following section to develop the conceptual focus adopted for this study:

2.12.1 Impact of Psychological Contract violation on Managerial Performance

Psychological Contract (PC), which is derived from the social exchange theory and the norm of reciprocity, helps to define the relationship between employees and organizations (Rousseau, 1989; Suazo et al., 2005). When an employee perceives that the organization has failed to fulfil its obligations, the employee experiences psychological contract breach, which is the employee’s cognition of receiving less than what was
promised. When these perceptions engender intense emotional reactions, they may cause a psychological contract violation (Guillard, 2008), which can be characterized by frustration and anger.

Previous research identifies that OCB correlates negatively with PCV due to the fact that emotions serve as an adaptive function and act to formulate the intention to engage in certain behaviours at a subsequent time (Specter & Fox, 2002). Negative emotional responses reduce the willingness to engage in OCB, while positive emotional responses increase it. Rousseau (1989) states that a condition for employees behaving as good citizens is that they should feel respected, otherwise, PCV will occur and feelings of deception and betrayal may adversely affect employees’ behaviours. In other words, employees who feel that the organization has violated the contract will try to reciprocate by reducing contributions to the organization. Consistent with the above arguments, the literature contains an extensive body of research which empirically shows that psychological contract framework can be a good predictor of OCB (Robinson & Morrison, 1995; Robinson, 1996; Van Dyne & Ang, 1998).

In line with previous researchers (Restubog & Bordia, 2006; Turnley et al., 2003), we can distinguish between transactional and relational contract breaches. The transactional dimension comprises the tangible and task-oriented components of the employment relationship which involve employees exchanging their competence and task involvement for monetary rewards. Transactional contracts generally reflect an employee’s expectation of specific, short-term, and economic inducements from the organization. In contrast, the relational dimension involves the employee’s exchange of more abstract and non-tangible components of the employment relationship, such as opportunities for training and development, career
growth, and a safe and harmonious work environment. In essence, the relational dimension emphasizes a more long-term and socio-emotional element in the employment relationship.

2.12.2 Impact of Work-Life Balance on Managerial Performance

There are studies available in the literature describing work-life imbalance, the attendant work-life conflicts, and the negative outcomes for organizations and individuals. One stream of literature examines the direction of the conflict, be it from work to home and or from home to work (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992) and, it is important to address WLB, given the negative outcomes for individuals and organizations associated with these imbalances. It is found that organizations are likely to see variations in employee commitment and satisfaction levels, as well as absenteeism rates and turnover intentions (Duxbury, Higgins, Lee, & Mills, 1992; Grover & Crooker, 1995) when they are faced with WLB issues. Employee adjustments in terms of time and effort have obvious implications for overall productivity levels (Konrad & Mangel, 2000). On a personal level, choices made to balance work and life affect the individual’s career, stress level, mental health, and overall life satisfaction (Duxbury, Higgens, & Mills 1992). Conflict within work and family domains, in terms of work to family conflicts and family to work conflicts, develops when work activities are interfering with family activities and vice versa. This type of conflicts are found to be negatively related to employee performance and satisfaction and positively related to high levels of absenteeism (Breaugh & Frye, 2007).

2.12.3 Impact of Psychological Empowerment at work on Managerial Performance
Employees who feel more personal control over how to perform the job would be more aware of the business and the strategic context in which the job is performed, and would be more accountable for performance outcomes. Spreitzer (1995) defined these cognitive-affective responses as psychological empowerment. There is a consistent and strong relationship between empowerment cognitions and employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Aryee & Chen, 2006). Results indicate that the more employees feel empowered, the happier they are with their job and the more committed they are to their organization. Directing and increasing individual performance also increases the organization’s performance.

Innovation involves the creation of a new product, service, idea, procedure, or process or the dramatic redesign of existing products or services. Prior research suggests that empowerment can facilitate innovation. Conger and Kanungo (1988) posit that psychological empowerment is important for stimulating and managing innovativeness in organizations; empowered individuals' creative efforts persist despite pervasive organizational and environmental obstacles (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Moreover, in case of studies of entrepreneurial organizations, Kanter (1983) found that empowerment and innovation were inextricably linked.

Furthermore, prior research suggests that each of the four dimensions of empowerment can facilitate innovativeness. Redmond, Mumford and Teach (1993) found that employees with high intrinsic task motivation which is consistent with the meaning dimension of empowerment were more innovative. Bass (1985) further hypothesized that clear inner meaning would stimulate innovative actions. Self-efficacy which is consistent with
the competence dimension of empowerment is also likely to lead to more innovation due to positive expectations of success (Amabile, 1988; Bass, 1990; Redmond, Mumford & Teach, 1993).

Thomas and Velthouse (1990) pointed out that empowerment practices are intended to produce behavioural responses from empowered employees that are not based on cognitive expectations of reward and punishment. Empowered employees are expected to perform beyond their formally prescribed roles. Organ (1988) suggested that the most likely avenue for employees to honour their obligation in a social exchange relationship is to choose to reciprocate with organizational citizenship behaviours. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach (2000) supported the observation that employees who experience empowered environment may, through the norms of reciprocity, adopt discretionary behaviours like OCB.

2.12.4 Impact of Job Satisfaction on Managerial Performance

There are a number of empirical studies in support of the relationship between job satisfaction and work performance (Judge et al. 2001; Politis 2005; Suliman & Iles 2000; Wilson & Frimpong 2004; Yousef 2002). Research showed that employees who experience job satisfaction were more likely to be productive and stay on the job. The job satisfaction experienced by employees will affect the quality of service they render and in turn will affect their work performance. The apparent logic comes from the arguments of Wilson and Frimpong, (2004) that employees who are satisfied with their job tend to be cooperative, respectful, helpful and considerate, hence deliver an excellent job.
Job satisfaction refers to an employee’s overall sense of well-being at work. It is an internal state based on assessing the job and job-related experiences with some degree of favour or disfavour. Social exchange theory posits that people strive to balance what they give and receive from social exchanges.

Organisational Citizenship Behaviours are thought to be a means by which an employee can give back to the organization, so, if an employee is satisfied with his or her job, the employee may be more likely to reciprocate by helping others through their citizenship behaviours. Employees may be less likely to perform extra duties, endorse, support, or defend the organization’s objectives, or engage in other citizenship behaviours if they have low levels of satisfaction with the job. In contrast, the task facets of a job are typically prescribed. So, whether an employee is satisfied with the job or not, the memos and letters have to be typed and the classes have to be taught. Thus, job satisfaction should have a positive relationship with OCBs and task performance. Several studies support the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB. Organ (1988) and Organ and Konovsky (1989) have argued for and provided empirical evidence supporting a relationship between satisfaction and OCB, as did Williams and Anderson (1991). Moorman (1993) found support for the relative importance of cognitive job satisfaction over affective job satisfaction in predicting OCB. In a sample of human-service professionals, Murphy, Athanasou, and King (2002) found that job satisfaction is positively correlated with OCB to a degree that indicates a medium to strong relationship.
2.12.5 Impact of Affective Organizational Commitment on Managerial Performance

Organizational commitment has been conceptualized as composed of affective, continuance, and normative commitments (Meyer & Allen 1984; Allen & Meyer 1990). Of these three components, affective organizational commitment, which is defined as emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization, is considered to be the most important form that has an impact on employees’ behaviour within their organizations. Employees tend to accomplish more for their organizations in a positive manner when they have a strong emotional attachment to their organizations; therefore, their high affective organizational commitment is expected to have a positive effect on their work behaviours, including OCB. Affective organizational commitment is based specifically on the exchange process with the organization. Thus, positive exchanges with the organization should motivate employees, through affective organizational commitment, to increase their formal contributions to the organization, namely in-role performance. It is possible, however, that this process will encourage employees to contribute in a more spontaneous way as well, namely through OCB. The strong relationship of commitment to OCB shows that commitment pushes employees to be more involved in informal activities in the organization, OCB being one of the main ones.

One of the hypothesized benefits of being committed to the organization is improved job performance (Somers & Birnbaum, 1998). Employees who experience positive exchanges with the organization will reciprocate with higher levels of commitment, which will motivate them to contribute to the organization in other ways, for example, through better performance or higher levels of OCB (Cohen, 2003; O’Reilly & Chatman,
Currently, researchers are calling for a re-examination of the relevance of commitment to the current workforce (Baruch, 1998). Studying the relationship of commitment to extra role behaviours is one way of responding to this call. An important aspect of the relationship between organizational commitment and outcomes concerns the nature of the relationship itself.

In fact, some of the Asian studies have revealed a positive relationship between affective organizational commitment and OCB (Chen & Francesco, 2003; Chughtai, 2008; Cohen, 2006; Kuehn & Al-Busaidi, 2002; Kwantes, 2003; Van Dyne & Ang, 1998). Van Dyne and Ang (1998) demonstrated the positive effect of affective organizational commitment on OCB, using a Singaporean sample. A similar positive relationship between affective organizational commitment and OCB was found by research that used samples from the following west Asian countries: Israel (Cohen, 2006), Oman (Kuehn & Al-Busaidi 2002), and India (Kwantes, 2003). Although it was not limited to Asian research, the meta-analysis by Organ and Ryan (1995) on the effects of the organizational commitment revealed that affective organizational commitment had a positive effect on extra role behaviours.

### 2.12.6 Conceptual Focus of the study

The present study depends on behaviour based approach to study managerial performance. The assumption behind the behaviour based approach is that if the employee engages in the desired behaviours, then it is likely that the organisational goals will be attained. In the organisational environment the identification of different categories of behaviours is done by the top management after understanding the links of the behaviours to
This approach can also be used to reinforce certain responses which are positive and in some cases to discourage certain behaviours among employees which can damage the organisation at large.

An assessment of various behaviours that are universally desired by organisations in the changing environment brings us to the identification of managerial performance behaviours that map on to broader task performance factors, viz, structuring work and getting things done; contextual performance factors, viz, facilitating the psychological and social contexts of work and getting along with others (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000) and innovative work behaviours (Spreitzer, 1995). Therefore, the present study proposes to test the relationship between managerial performance and its selected antecedent variables such as Psychological Contract Violation, Work Life Balance, Job Satisfaction, Affective Organisational Commitment and Psychological Empowerment at Work. Further, the study uses Structural Equation Modelling to develop and statistically validate a model linking Managerial Performance and the selected antecedent variables and background variables.

Review of literature revealed that there are no major attempts made in Kerala for studying the relationship between managerial performance and the contextual and attitudinal factors, and also, the study will be able to assess the significance of managing the organisational context in predicting work behaviours. There is a literature gap existing in explaining the comprehensive nature of contextual factors and work attitudes in explaining managerial performance more meaningfully in the real world. The study will also be an attempt to understand empirically, the intervening process.
involved in the relationship between selected independent variables and managerial performance.

Based on the above discussion on the relationship among the variables available in literature, the conceptual focus adopted for this study is visualised as given below:

### 2.13 The nature of variables of the study

**Table 2.2 Nature of variables of the study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.no.</th>
<th>Variables of the study</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Socio-Demographic Background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Psychological Empowerment at Work</td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Psychological Contract Violation</td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Affective Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Managerial Performance</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.14 Diagrammatic Representation of the Conceptual Model
Based on the theoretical framework and deducing from the conceptual focus adopted for this study, the following hypothesis have been proposed for this study:

H1: There is significant difference in Psychological Empowerment at Work, Work-Life Balance and Psychological Contract Violation across the organization type, gender, age, educational qualification, marital status, working spouse and dependent children at home.

H2: Psychological Empowerment at Work will be positively related to Managerial Performance

H3: Higher the Job satisfaction, higher will be Managerial Performance

H4: Higher the Affective Organisational Commitment, higher will be Managerial Performance

H5: Work-Life Balance will be positively related to Managerial Performance

H6: Psychological Contract Violation will be negatively related to Managerial Performance