Chapter 1

Introduction

India having a unique advantage of having the second most populous country, the growth of its economy will be affected by human capital. The changing work environment due to rapid growth of technology has impacted the human beings in a very significant way. The overall sense of well being is impacted prominently in financial institutions in India due to work pressure and the routine work involved in these institutions. The employee’s well being and organization’s wellness is to be investigated to mitigate these impacts. The efficacy of the organization is affected by the employees who are stable and healthy both at mental and physical levels. The well being of the employee has been accepted since long past and more importance is now laid on the task of organization behaviour as it is more related to the strength and wellness of the employees in the organization.

According to Luthans and Youssef (2004), human capital is one of the important success factors for sustaining organization’s performance to face the environmental challenges of change in technology, modernization and competition which, in turn, can effectively develop and manage employees knowledge, experiences, skills, and expertise. Pfeffer (1998) substantially supported that globally only half of the organizations believe that human resources are important which makes it very serious issue that requires to be investigated thoroughly. The emergence of work related health diseases has led to demand the pressing need to invest in well being of the employees and institutions worldwide are in dilemma about the activities for the well being of its employees. Further, employee well being has not only organizational affect, it has a significant social impact, in terms of cost in relation to workplace safety, early retirement, health diseases and absenteeism among employees (Sanderson et al 2008). Thus, without the considerable actions taken from the employees the well-being in the organization can seldom be achieved.

A concept of organizational citizenship behaviour originally grew from the work of Bateman and Organ (1983), when they attempted to connect job satisfaction with organizational functioning. They called it as “A Good Soldier Syndrome”. Behaviours related with most explanation of being a “Good soldier” include pro-
social behaviours, punctuality, helping others, innovating and volunteering as well as the lack of undesirable actions such as complaining, arguing and finding faults with others (Organ, 1990). Later, Organ (1988, 1997) defined organizational citizenship behaviour as being voluntary and discretionary behaviour of individual organizational members that, in that aggregate, is expected to promote overall organizational efficiency.

To sustain in the competitive world it is imperative that the organizations use and create the benefits from their employees which form the internal resource of the organization. The success and efficacy of the organization in today’s world is affected by organizational citizenship behaviour which impact the performance of its employees (Farahbod et al., 2012). The success of the organization depends upon the extra work the employees perform apart from the regular job as expected in the organization. According to Murphy et al (2002) organizational citizenship behaviour can increase the efficacy of the organization thus making it a prerequisite for the success of the organization. Thus, organizational citizenship behaviour is taken as a positive organizational outcome.

1.1 Positive Psychology Movement

A concept of Positive Psychology was given Dr. Martin Seligman who was the President of the American Psychological Society. He emphasized on focusing on developing the positive qualities of individuals rather than the negative qualities. Seligman (1990), highlighted the various positive qualities like optimism, courage, work ethic, future-mindedness, interpersonal skill, the capacity for pleasure and insight, and social responsibility. Psychology had shifted from curing the mental illness to satisfying the lives of individuals by focusing on developing these traits.

Led by Seligman and a core group of other well known research-oriented positive psychologists such as Ed Diener (2000), Christopher Peterson (2000), and Rick Snyder (2000), the aim of positive psychology is to shift the emphasis away from what is wrong with people to what is right with people— to focus on strengths (as opposed to weaknesses), to be interested in resilience (as opposed to vulnerability), and to be concerned with enhancing and developing wellness, prosperity and the good life (as opposed to the remediation of pathology). The levels of analysis have been summarized by Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) to be at
the subjective level (i.e., positive subjective experience such as well being and contentment with the past, flow and happiness in the present, and hope and optimism into the future); the micro, individual level (i.e., positive traits such as the capacity for love, courage, aesthetic sensibility, perseverance, forgiveness, spirituality, high talent, and wisdom); and the macro group and institutional level (i.e., positive civic virtues and the institutions that move individuals toward better citizenship such as responsibility, altruism, civility, moderation, tolerance, and a strong work ethic).

The aim of Positive Psychology is to use scientific methodology to discover and promote the factors that allow individuals, groups, organizations and communities to thrive. It is concerned with optimal human functioning instead of pathological human functioning. Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (200) have summarized the field of Positive Psychology as follows:

Fig. 1.1: Mind map of positive psychology (Smith, C., 2008)
Positive Psychology is the scientific study which has strengthened the individuals to thrive and develop new society. The concept of positive psychology is based on the belief that people want to have meaningful and fulfilling lives to cultivate what is best within them and to enhance their experiences of love, work, and play. Thus Positive psychology is the branch of psychology that uses scientific understanding and effective intervention to aid in the achievement of a satisfactory life rather than treating mental illness (Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). The positive psychology is focused on personal growth rather than on pathology which is seen common among other frameworks within the field of psychology. The positive psychology indicated that happiness is improved and affected in a large number of different ways such as social ties with a spouse, family, friends and wider networks through work, clubs or social organisations. Although happiness increases with increasing financial income but at a certain point no further increase in financial income can have impact on happiness. Thus the positive psychology is more focussed on enhancing the overall well being of the employee which is a key factor for the success of the organization.

In the past years, business, academics and various practitioners had believed that competitive advantage can arise from a variety of industry level entry barriers, such as technological supremacy, patent protections, and government regulations. But these barriers have been removed by new technological change and diffusion with increase in rapid innovation. In today’s world human capital which collectively involved employees knowledge, experience, skills and expertise plays a key success factor for the overall performance of the organizations.

According to Avolio (2005), the full potential of human resources had not been realized by most of the organizations. In today’s world organizations are not realizing the true value of human resources and are not investing in their development. This led the development of the concept of positive psychology. The positive psychology movement emerged as a reaction to preoccupation of psychology with what is wrong and dysfunctional with people. This negativity also penetrated into the organizational behaviour and human resource management fields and exposes individuals and organizations to the danger of shifting to a fight or flight mode, where scarce time, energy and resources are only invested in basic tried and true survival mechanism (Luthans et al. 2007).
Two major parallel and complementary positive movements, being observed in the Industrial organizational world are Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) and Positive Organizational Behaviour (POB). POS tends to concentrate more on the macro, organizational level, while POB at micro, individual level. Positive organizational scholarship emphasizes the positive characteristics of the organization to facilitate its ability to function during crisis. Positive organizational behaviour focuses on positive psychological abilities of the employees.

1.2 Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS)

The term positive organizational scholarship was coined by Cameron et al (2003) as a concept based on rigor, theory and scientific process in organizational research which involved the study of positive outcomes, processes and attributes of organizations and their members. The core values of POS can be explained by its name, which reflects the affirmative predisposition of the movement as follows:

**Positive:** The word positive looks at extraordinary or spectacular performance, which is referred to as „positive deviance” . It also has an affirmative bias, which focuses on strengths and not weaknesses. Lastly, it considers virtuousness, which extracts the best of the human condition.

**Organizational:** This refers to looking at the organization and how to improve it.

**Scholarship:** The word scholarship implies that this is an academic exercise which is underpinned by rigorous research that is valid. Further to this, the research is captured in a large database with overwhelming evidence to indicate that POS has a positive impact on the bottom line.

This perspective highlighted the positive phenomenon which is associated with positive human potential and there is a focus on the notion of goodness among individuals (Cameron et al., 2003). Positive organizational scholarship examined the positivity in the organization which in turn is reflected on the ways in which organizations and their members flourish and prosper in extraordinary ways (Karp, 2004). It is based on the foundation that improvement in human conditions is required which is inherent in most organizations (Cameron et al., 2003). The other assumption of positive organizational behaviour is based on the principle of heliotropism, which is the view that human beings are logically drawn towards the positive (Caza and Cameron, 2008).
By increasing the human potential in organisations will help in unlocking the potential, exposing various possibilities and aid in developing a more positive route of both individual and organisational wellbeing. The positive organizational scholarship is not only about optimism it acknowledge the negative issues or problems in the workplace; however it chooses to develop both the individual and the organisation to their full potential by focussing on strengths.

1.2.1 Positive Organizational Behaviour

Following the lead of positive psychology which is based on the concept of giving equal attention to both good and bad in one’s life a recent field of positive organizational behaviour emerged. Positive organizational behaviour recognizes that over the years there have been many positive constructs in organizational research such as positive affectivity, positive reinforcement, procedural justice, job satisfaction and commitment, pro-social and organizational citizenship behaviours, core self-evaluations, and many others. Instead, positive psychology, and now its application to the workplace as positive organizational behaviour which simply attempts to give a renewed emphasis (not a revolution or paradigm shift) to the importance of a positive approach.

According to Luthans (2002b), positive organizational behaviour is the process of analyzing the positive strengths in human beings along with their psychological capabilities that can be developed and managed effectively to improve the efficacy of the organizations. Besides positivity, to be included as a psychological resource capacity within this defined positive organizational behaviour framework, it must meet the following criteria:

a) The capacity must be theory and research based and validly measurable, and

b) The capacity must also be “state-like” (i.e., open to change and development) and have a demonstrated performance impact (Luthans and Youssef 2007).

These criteria separate positive organizational behaviour from other related phenomenon of distinctive positive approaches for organizational behaviour. The above criteria of positive organizational behaviour differentiated and clarified it from other positive approaches, as it is based on scientific criteria of being theory, is research based and measurable trait.
Further, positive organizational behaviour exclusively focuses on psychological resource capacities that are state-like, which means that the POB capacity is readily open and malleable to change and development (Youssef, et al., 2007). By contrast, the other positive approaches and constructs most often depend on dispositional, relatively stable, more trait-like characteristics that tend to be developed (a) over time, across one’s lifespan (b) through the presence of the appropriate enabling factors and the absence of various inhibiting factors or (c) through long-term professional interventions and intensive treatments (Linley and Joseph, 2004; C. Peterson and Seligman, 2004). Such approaches to development do not as readily lend themselves to the pace of change, limited time, and scarce financial resources that characterize today’s workplace.

Over the years, empirical evidence has supported that positive states (e.g., positive emotions) and state-like constructs (e.g., specific self-efficacy) have a relationship with and impact on organizational behaviours and their outcomes (Stajkovic and Luthans, 1998). These states tend to be more spontaneous and thus are often induced by situational factors. On the other hand, although positive traits and trait-like characteristics may be predictive of more transient positive states, the contribution of traits to organizational behaviours and performance and attitudinal outcomes generally tends to be more indirect in nature and interactive with the more direct impact of positive states and state-like characteristics (Cropanzano et al. 1993; George, 1991; Ilies et al, 2006; Wright, 2005; Wright et al, 2004).

The state-like nature of positive organizational behaviour capacities distinguished it from positive organizational scholarship, which tends to focus mostly on the creation of an optimum range of organizational factors that can help facilitate the necessary upward spirals for positive change (Cameron and Caza, 2004). Besides the long-term, incremental nature of the processes involved in the development of such upward spirals, the positive organizational scholarship approach also tends to focus more on the organizational or institutional and macro level as opposed to the individual and micro level of analysis that characterizes the psychological capacities that meet the positive organizational behaviour inclusion criteria (Cameron and Caza, 2004; Cameron et al., 2003; Fineman, 2006; Roberts, 2006). Finally, most of the character strengths and virtues identified in positive psychology and positive organizational scholarship are intended to have terminal value in and of themselves and do not necessarily have an impact on work-related outcomes, as in the case of positive organizational behaviour (Peterson and Seligman, 2004).
Unlike positive psychology, positive organizational scholarship, or many human resource management approaches that emphasize factors such as positive personality traits and individual differences, positive organizational behaviour focuses on state-like (as opposed to dispositional, fixed, and trait-like) variables that can be developed within organizational members through workplace interventions and proactive management. Moreover, positive organizational behaviour incorporates only psychological states that are validly measurable, and that can result in performance improvement. In other words, interventions can be developed for enhancing managers’ and employees confidence, hope, optimism, and resiliency. Thus, positive psychological capital can be managed and its effectiveness can be objectively assessed, both in terms of enhanced positive psychological capital and bottom-line impact. Similar to traditional forms of capital, positive psychological capital can be assessed as to the return on investment and impact on competitive advantage.

### 1.3 Psychological Capital

Luthans et al. (2007) defined psychological capital as “an individual’s positive psychological state of development and is characterized by:

1. having confidence (self-efficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks;
2. making a positive attribution (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future;
3. persevering toward goals and, when necessary, redirecting paths to goals (hope) in order to succeed; and
4. when beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond (resilience) to attain success”.

Avey et al. (2009) further asserted that psychological capital has developmental potential. Also, psychological capital as well as its component capacities is considered to be state-like as opposed to trait-like. (Luthans and Youssef,
2007) described this distinction along a trait-state continuum whereas trait-like constructs refer to relatively stable psychological characteristics, at the other end of the continuum, Psychological Capital and its components tend to be malleable and open to development (Luthans et al., 2007; Avey et al. 2009).

Traditionally, economic capital (both financial and tangible assets such as plant and equipment) has received all the attention. But enlightened managers today recognized the importance not only of tangible assets, data, and physical resources, but also of this intangible human capital (sometimes called intellectual capital)—“human” referring to the people working at all levels of the organization, and the economic term “capital” referring to the resources withdrawn from consumption that are invested for future anticipated returns.

The value is created when human capital is aligned with corporate strategy and fully engaged in making the enterprise effective which a significant positive impact on performance outcomes (Harter et al 2002). The social capital which is referred to resources of trust, relationship and contact networks is a cousin of human capital and is considerably more subtle or intangible and difficult to measure. As shown in Figure 1, human capital is simply “what you know,” whereas social capital is “who you know.” Social capital can be used both inside a firm (“Whom can I turn to for help in solving this problem?”) and outside it (“Who can advise me on finding the best price and quality in making this purchasing decision?”). Some suggested ways to measure and evaluate social capital involve the size, structure, and composition of networks. Adler and Kwon (2002) found that social capital has a positive impact both on HR areas, such as career success, turnover, executive compensation, and job search help, and on organizational areas, such as inter-unit resource exchange, entrepreneurship, supplier relations, regional production networks, and intercompany learning. Like human capital, the recognition of and investment in social capital seems vital to the success and competitive advantage of organizations both today and tomorrow.
Just as the other forms of capital are made up of certain components, i.e., traditional (financial, structural/physical, technological), human (explicit and tacit knowledge), and social (networks, norms/values, and trust), positive psychological capital also contains some basic capacities. Those that best meet the positive organizational behaviour criteria of being positive, unique, measurable, developable, and performance related are self-efficacy/confidence, hope, optimism, and resiliency.

According to Avey et al (2009), the integration of hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism represents the core construct Psychological Capital. Luthans et al (2007) found that psychological capital is based on positive psychology and as a construct emerged from positive psychological literature and the study of positive organisational behaviour. (Luthans 2002) defined positive organisational behaviour as “the study and application of positively oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed, and effectively managed for performance improvement”. Therefore positive organisational behaviour aims to understand the relationship between positive psychological capacities and performance in the organisational context. However, the distinction between the natures of the affective states that comprise psychological capital has been unclear; as optimism and hope are sometimes taken interchangeably.
Avey et al. (2010) have provided a detail description on the trait-state continuum as follows:

- **Pure positive traits**: These are at one extreme of the continuum and are characterized by stability over time and across situations, including traits that are believed to be hardwired, such as intelligence or hereditary characteristics.

- **Trait-like constructs**: These are closer to the trait end of the continuum and refer to relatively stable psychological characteristics such as conscientiousness, extroversion, and core self-evaluations.

- **State-like psychological resources**: These are closer to the opposite (state) end of the continuum and include Psychological Capital and its constituents of efficacy, hope, optimism, and resiliency (the focus of this study), which tend to be malleable and thus open to the development and are particularly relevant to the workplace.

- **Positive states**: These are at the other extreme of the continuum and include momentary and highly variable states such as moods and emotions.

The various dimension of psychological capital are shown in Figure 1.3 there are four dimensions of psychological capital. It is depicted by the figure that positive psychological capital is a core construct goes beyond human, social and social capital.

![Psychological Capital Dimensions](image)

**Fig. 1.3**: Psychological capital dimensions as given by Luthans and Youssef (2004)
Hope

Hope is a commonly used term in everyday life. However, According to Luthans and Youssef (2004), in positive psychological capital, to achieve individual’s targets hope is the will power and pathways to achieve those targets. Further, Snyder et al. (1991) defined hope as "a positive Motivational state that is based on an interactively derived sense of successful (1) agency (goal-directed energy) and (2) Pathways (Planning to meet goals)."

Hope is an enduring psychological state when a person attributes permanent and universal causes to good events along with temporary and specific causes to bad events (Seligman, 2002). Hope has been shown to have a positive effect on leadership and workplace performance. Hope is cognitive or thinking state in which individual is capable of setting realistic but challenging goals and then reaching out for those goals through self directed determination, energy and perception of internalized control, which is defined as "agency" or "willpower". The equally important and integral component of hope is "Pathways" or "way power", as capability of generating alternative paths to their desired destinations when the original ones become blocked (Snyder et al, 1994; 1995a, 2000, 2002).

According to Snyder (1993, 2000, 2002), there is a continuous reiteration between agency and pathways, in which one's will power motivated the search for new pathways, while creativity, innovation, and resourcefulness involved in developing pathways in term ignites one's energy and sense of control, which when taken together, result in an upward spiral on their hope. As long as there is some possibility for forward momentum, down an alternative pathway, there is the potential for a positive contagion effect, where one advance leads to another and another.

As per the Luthans and Youssef (2004) psychological model, hope is required to achieve individual’s target through his willpower and pathways. In fact hopeful people experience more positive feelings than those who have a more miserable approach towards life. This description is derived from Snyder et al. (1991), who described hope to be a motivational state whereby two elements as goal-directed strength of mind and planning to achieve those goals interact. Hope is the wish to achieve the individuals targets that makes a motivational relationship and also includes the capabilities to make various ways to achieve those targets. In hope scheduling or planning to attain various targets involve psychological capacity having
the wish to achieve those targets that can be explained by this psychological and emotional phenomenon. According to Snyder et al (2002) that hope is considered as quantifiable, having clear impact on performance and can be enhanced.

Luthans (2003) indicated that hope is a positive emotional state based on the possession of willpower and pathways to attain goals. Snyder et al (2003) suggested that hope is divided into pathways and agency. Pathways point to how the individual is going to achieve the goal, whereas agency considers the individual’s motivation to begin and continue towards their goal. Cooperrider and Sekerka, (2006) indicated that high levels of hope typically result in high performing work units, greater employee satisfaction and lower levels of turnover which are all critical components in keeping customers satisfied.

Self-efficacy

The other dimension of psychological capital is efficacy that is founded on the extensive work of Bandura (1997) and is defined as an individual’s conviction (or confidence) about his or her abilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context. He further stated that it increases effort and motivation to complete a task and leads to perseverance in the face of obstacles. According to Maddurx, (2002), having the self efficacy notions are the biggest factors in individual’s psychological capacity to make a decision to keep on involved and make efforts when adversary occurs. In other words, efficacy offers a person beneficial cognitive process with determination against adversaries, and a readiness for applying to achieve the targets even though the person expects a positive return on that investment.

According to Luthans et al. (2007), self-efficacious people are distinguished by five characteristics, which help them to develop independently and perform effectively even with little help from external sources. The important five characteristics are setting high goals for one, thriving on challenge, high self-motivation, investing the necessary effort to accomplish ones goals and persevere when faced with obstacles. Instead, self-efficacy gives advantages to any person not as some cognitive process but as a tool to make some attempts to achieve targets.
successfully. In psychological model of Luthans and Youssef (2004), self-efficacy is a belief by an individual in his ability to organize all resources in his psychological capacity to achieve the success of the desired targets.

According to Craig (2007) efficacy can be taken as being certain in your own abilities and about have trust in people, plans or the future. Further, Bandura (1997) defined perceived self-efficacy as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments". Evenson (2007) suggested that confidence in one's own ability is valuable in achieving high performance and attaining world class customer service.

**Resilience**

The other dimension of psychological capital is resilience, a person's ability to overcome and often flourish from some substantial life events. In psychological capital model developed by Luthans and Youssef (2004), resilience is defined as ability to bounce back from failure, adversaries also from positive but overpowering psychological changes for example higher level of accountability. In the research literature pertaining to organizational behaviour, the research on resilience has been given the slightest attention. Such events are often shocking—tragedy, disaster, accident, breakdown, failure, loss, or catastrophe causes an individual to confront and cope with a situation that often psychologically as well as negatively affects others.

Resilience is an observable fact resulting from normal human adaptation responses and according to Masten, (2001) it is "characterized by good outcomes in spite of serious threats to adaptation or development". Building resilience should therefore require the development of the adaptive systems along with cognitive and learning processes. Luthans et al. (2004) said that adding to the adaptive process both a logical perception of reality, allowing for effective and rational responses to given circumstances and the inclination to seek or make meaning from events, permitting them to "build bridges from present-day hardships to a fuller, better constructed future". Further, Luthans and Youssef (2004), asserted that resilience can be developed and measured at individual level having impact on the job performance at the individual level. Resiliency is the process of adapting well in the face of adversity, trauma, tragedy, threats, or even significant sources of stress, such as business failure (Luhans, et al. 2004).
The resiliency has state like nature as it is defined as the capability of individuals to cope successfully in the face of significant change, adversity, or risk. This capability changes over time and is enhanced by protective factors in the individual and environment (Stewart et al 1997). Resilience goes beyond simple adaptation, but does seem to include resources found in basic human adaptation systems (e.g., attachment, self-regulation, relations to competent and caring support, and motivation to be effective in the environment, Masten, 2001). In simple, but accurate terms, resiliency is the positive psychological capacity to rebound, to ‘bounce back’ from adversity, uncertainty, conflict, failure or even positive change, progress and increased responsibility (Luthans 2002).

Like confidence and hope, the word resilience is so commonly used and on the surface so similar to the other positive capacities, it needs to be conceptually differentiated. In simple terms, the main difference between self-efficacy and resiliency is that resiliency tends to have a smaller domain and is reactive rather than proactive (Huey and Weisz, 1997; Hunter and Chandler, 1999). In relation to hope (Snyder, 2000), resiliency is quite similar to the pathways component of hope, but does not include the agency dimension of hope. Resiliency, as a positive bounce-back reaction to either an adverse or stressful event, seems to be more closely aligned than the other positive organizational behaviour.

Resiliency asset is defined as a measurable characteristic in a group of individuals or their situation that predicts a positive outcome in the future on a specific outcome criterion (Masten and Reed, 2002). Further, Masten (2001) identified cognitive abilities, temperament, positive self-perceptions, faith, a positive outlook on life, emotional stability, and self-regulation, sense of humour, and general appeal or attractiveness as potential assets that can contribute to higher resiliency. Resilience refers to the continuance of positive adjustment under challenging conditions (Sutcliffe and Vogus, 2003). Lastly, (Evenson 2007) suggested that resilience is a critical quality to possess in the demanding working environment of customer service.
Optimism

The last dimension of psychological capital model is optimism, as defined by Luthans and Youssef, (2004), it is a positive attribution of internal permanency to various positive events and external transitory to various negative events in individual’s life. The concept has be derived from Seligman (1998) who defined optimism as a style that is related to having internal positivity to various positive events and eternal temporary beliefs to negative events in individual’s life. Individuals with optimistic explanatory style expect that the causes of the desirable events would continue to exist in future and would also be useful in handing other situations across life span. Thus, optimists positively view and internalize the good aspects of their lives not only to past and present, but also into future (Luthans et al 2007). On the other hand optimism is defined as the positive side of an emotional that is utilized to explain good and bad events (Seligman, 1998).

Optimism is the inclination to always see the best in every circumstance, while expecting the best outcomes (Seckinger et al. 2010). It does not require that the event is influenced by an individual’s own actions, but rather is the belief that the situation is likely to turn out reasonably well (Semmer and Meier, 2009). Further (Carr, 2004), proposed that optimism is a good predictor of performance in certain jobs and sales is one such example.

Optimism has explanatory style having two important dimensions: permanence and pervasiveness.

Permanence is in regard to time, when a bad event occurs; the optimist will see it only as a temporary situation, whereas a pessimist will view it as permanent. For example, assume an entrepreneur lost a key employee. Now consider the following two statements: "We need to find out why she left so we can prevent other employees from leaving," versus "We'll never be able to keep good employees." The first statement is temporary in nature, while the second statement is permanent, as the first one incorporates a sense that things can improve.
Pervasiveness is about space. People who make specific explanation about bad events are optimistic, while who make universal explanations about bad events are pessimistic. However, a non scrutinizing optimistic explanations style may have some undesirable side effects like under estimating the potential danger of the risks, optimistic are less likely to learn from their mistakes. Optimistic may also try to exert too much control over their lives and destines, thinking that if they try hard enough, they will always be successful and that they should take credit for their success (Luthans et al., 2007).

Luthans et al. (2007) emphasized the need for the strength of optimism to be realistic and flexible for effective psychological capital optimism one should not take extremes, either in internalizing success or in externalizing failures. The realistic, flexible optimists can enjoy and learn from various life and work place event to the fullest (Avolio and Luthans, 2006). This state is illustrated in psychological capital model of Luthans and Youssef (2004) as a positive attribution of internal permanency to various positive events and external transitory to various negative events in individual’s life. It represented the definition employed by Seligman (2002), who described two dimensions of optimism in terms of the degree of durableness one perceives in a variable, and pervasiveness. Peterson and Luthans (2003) found that participants with an optimistic explanatory style improved in performance on a test after a failure feedback, while those with a pessimistic style did not. Evidence suggests that optimism defined as above can be developed within individuals (Seligman, 1990).

**Defining the various distinctions of the Psychology Capital dimensions**

A lot of overlapping exists in the definition of the psychological capital dimensions. Table 1, below, summarises the primary value contributed to psychological capital by each component affective state.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective State</th>
<th>Directionality</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Present-to-future focussed</td>
<td>Provides for openness to challenges and a willingness to expend effort on the pursuit of a goal (perhaps because of the expected return on that investment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Future focussed</td>
<td>Provides goals and desire to attain those goals (implying a link to motivation), as well as planning or strategic response to enable the attainment of those goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>Future focussed</td>
<td>Provides buffers between negative impact of unfavourable events and (a persistently positive) expectation for the future, and enhances or capitalises on the positive impact of favourable events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Past-to-present focussed</td>
<td>Provides for recovery from previous or present unfavourable events or stressors and maintains (or exceeds) the status quo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between the factors of psychological capital is very subtle but each factor when added becomes a unique value which can be measured. Take an example of hope and optimism which are closely related but when measured in totality can give unique value. Further, hope and optimism are related to each other as internal resources through which one can achieve the desired targets. However, the difference in the two existed as hope is more future oriented (for both short and long term targets and strategies) and optimism is more present oriented towards various challenges. Also, hope is having internal oriented motivation to achieve targets and optimism is preparing oneself for the present and future challenges, which is external driven motivation.

The same difference between self-efficacy and optimism is very subtle. According to Carver and Scheier (2003), in self-efficacy the individual’s self is defining agent, thus for a successful outcome the internal resources of the individual is to be judged for the outcome. But in the case of optimism, an individual can be confident of the positive outcome and they need not to be internal. Also, self-efficacy is an intention to take actions to meet the challenges whereas optimism is only a
future orientation for the challenge. Thus, even with these subtle distinctions, the psychological capital determinants when taken into totality give a unique advantage in measuring the value of the organization along with human and social capital.

1.4 Subjective Wellbeing

Researchers in positive psychology focused not only on the negative but also on the positive mental states of human experiences in contrast to clinical psychologists which focus only on mental illness (Diener et al. 1997). From a clinical psychological perspective, happiness has conventionally been seen as a state simply with an absence of mental problems (Diener et al. 1997, Diener and Biswas-Diener 2000). Subjective Wellbeing derived from positive psychology field and is focused on finest functioning of individuals by developing the positive emotions in them (Ryan and Deci, 2001). Subjective well being is individual’s self described happiness and the overall experience in his life (Diener, 1984). According to Lyubomirsky et al. (2005), the other meaning of happiness is presence of as joy, interest, pride etc. which are positive traits over sadness, anxiety, anger etc. which are negative traits in an individual’s life.

In recent years, two perspectives concerning happiness have emerged as the primary ones (Ryan and Deci 2001). Firstly, the hedonic perspective emphasizes the importance of subjectivity in happiness and is usually measured with Subjective well being. A person is happy if, and only if, he subjectively feel satisfied with his life and experience more positive than negative emotions (Samela-Aro and Schoon 2006, Kahneman et al. 1999). The other perspective to the hedonic is the eudaimonistic. For an eudaimonian, subjective thoughts and feelings are not the main interest. Instead, well-being is seen as to realize your true self and to strive after important goals in life (Ryff and Keyes 1995). From the eudaimonic perspective, subjective happiness are not an intrinsic goal, but is believed to be an effect of a functional and “true” life (Ryan and Deci 2001). Psychological well-being (PWB) is one of the most common ways to measure eudaimonian happiness (Ryff 1989). Both subjective well being and psychological well being are overlapping constructs, and believed to measure similar, but not identical, mental states (Ryan and Deci 2001).
The two constructs subjective wellbeing and happiness are used interchangeably but must be distinguished as they are distinctly different. According to Uchida et al., 2004 happiness is the high ratio of positive to negative feelings. (Diener et al. 1999) defined subjective wellbeing as individual’s emotional response, domain satisfaction and life satisfaction. As both constructs focus on emotional aspects of wellbeing they create confusion and are used interchangeably. Further, subjective wellbeing focuses on both the affective and the cognitive aspects of individuals (Ozmete, 2011). Subjective wellbeing focuses on self-evaluation of individual about how they think about their lives and feeling about wellbeing. According to Diener (2000), the four dimensions viz. positive affect, negative affect, domain satisfaction and cognitive life satisfaction, when taken together resulted in subjective well being. According to (Luhmann et al., 2011) absence of unpleasant emotions and presence of positive emotions is referred to positive affect and negative affect. According to (Lyubomirsky et al 2005) positive affect included optimism, self-efficacy and confidence, which is linked with the dimensions of psychological capital. Thus subjective wellbeing included cognitive evaluation of individual’s life. The cognitive evaluation is information based appraisal of one’s life and the affective aspect is a hedonic evaluation guided by emotions and feelings (Van Hoon, 2007). According to (Diener et al 1991) that a person having satisfaction with his life, experiencing more positive emotions than negative emotions have high subjective wellbeing.

According to Bakker and Oerlemans (2011), when an individual felt his life measure up to his expectation he/she achieves satisfaction and by measuring an individual’s life it becomes a platform for his/her life satisfaction. Also this measure can be taken from the experiencing the positive and negative emotions individual goes in his life. According to Diener et al. (1991), the subjective well being is experienced by an individual when he/she is satisfied with his/her life and having more positive emotional experience than negative emotional experience in his/her life. According to Ozmete (2011), subjective well being is not just a judgment about individual’s about his/her life, it is a how much satisfaction an individual gets from various domains of his life for example family, job, marriage etc.
Individual's relationship between external world and his /her internal state makes well-being complex. Thus the field of subjective wellbeing comprises the scientific analysis of how people evaluate their lives, both at the moment and for longer periods such as for the past year and internal satisfaction with life. These evaluations include people's emotional reactions to events, their moods, and judgments they form about their life satisfaction, fulfillment, and satisfaction with domains such as marriage and work. Thus, subjective wellbeing concerns the study of what people might call happiness or satisfaction. According to the general reviews of subjective wellbeing found by Argyle, (2001); Diener, (1984); Diener et al (1999); and Kahneman et al (1999) the evaluations included evaluation of moods and emotions along with the judgments of life satisfaction by an individual about his/her life. If an individual reported his/her life is satisfying, that he/she is experiencing frequent pleasant affect, and that he/she is infrequently experiencing unpleasant affect, he/she is said to have high subjective well-being. According to Lucas et al (1996), to gain the complete picture of overall subjective well being the life satisfaction, pleasant affect and unpleasant affect which are related to each can be empirically separated and studied at individually. In the similar vein Argyle and Crossland (1987) portrayed subjective wellbeing as a judgement, an evaluation, and appraisal of one’s life.

Further, (Schwartz and Strack, 1999), defined subjective well-being as the individual’s current evaluation of his/her happiness. Diener (1984) argued that subjective well-being, defined by ratings of life satisfaction and positive emotional experience, was critical component of well-being that was missing from equation. From subjective well-being perspective, economic and social indicators are incomplete because they do not directly asses how happy or satisfied people are with their lives (Diener and Suh, 1997). Although these indicators describe the —facts of a person’s life, they do not reflect how a person thinks and feels about these facts. Personal, subjective evaluations are important for several reasons: First, different individuals may react to same circumstance (as described by economic and social statistics) in very different ways because of the different in the expenditures, values and personal histories. Subjective evaluations help psychologists to interpret the —facts|| from an individual’s point of view. Second, happiness and life satisfaction are important goals in their own right.
The evaluation of how an individual felt about his life is the measuring criteria which is globally used and is defined as subjective well being. The subjective well being measures the individual’s experience about his/her life in a direct way rather than measuring the indirect measure in the form of social predictor’s about the success of one’s life. According to Veenhoven, (1991) and Diener et al (1997) subjective wellbeing comprised two measured, a cognitive evaluation of life satisfaction and a measure of positive and negative affects in an individual’s life. Further, Bradburn (1969), proposed that subjective well being is summing up of individual’s various life experiences and various positive and negative affects individual experience in his/her life span. Thus, subjective well being is evaluated as a balance between various positive and negative affects one experience in his/her life. An individual can either experience positive affects such as joy, contentment or pleasure or negative affects such as sadness, depression, anxiety or anger as a measure of subjective well being. Lastly, Watson et al (1988), assessed the both positive and negative affects of subjective well being through the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) scale to measure the overall subjective well being individual experiences in his/her life.

Another term which is globally used for affective components of subjective well being is happiness. It can be measured by asking the overall evaluation of an individual about his life or having the experience of positive and negative affects in an individual’s life which are taken as independent and different bipolar dimension. According to Cummins et al. (2002) there was no clear cut distinction depicting whether positive and negative affects are independent construct or should be taken as bipolar opposites of the same construct. Further, Russell and Carroll, (1999); Watson and Clark, (1997) in their respective studies agreed to the same dilemma in measuring subjective well being in an individual. Diener and Lucas (1999) argued that the three interrelated components of subjective well being are life satisfaction, pleasant affect and unpleasant affect. Thus, subjective well being is referred to the cognitive evaluation of life satisfaction, a judgment individual makes about his life or various moods and emotions that individual undergoes in his/her life. These three dimensions are though theoretically related to each other but must be studied independently to have an overall evaluation of subjective well being.
Thus, Diener et al. (1999) defined subjective well-being as an area of scientific interest rather than studying the single specific construct to measure subjective well-being. While studying subjective well-being as a general construct it can be divided into number of components. As life satisfaction can be divided into satisfaction of an individual with his present affairs in his/her life, past life or future expectations. However in specific domains, satisfaction can be examined as satisfaction with respect to job, family, marriage, friendship etc. The explicit emotions for the pleasant affect can be joy, happiness, and affection. Lastly the explicit emotions for the pleasant affect can be guilt, sadness and anger. According to Andrews and Withey (1976), to measure subjective well-being a single question can be asked

“How satisfied are you with your life-as-a-whole” and further by asking clearly about the level of satisfaction in different domains of life like job satisfaction, marital satisfaction, family life satisfaction etc.

1.4.1 Components of Subjective Well-Being

Diener's model (hedonic well-being consists of positive affect, negative affect, and life satisfaction) was supported, "it appears that negative affect is in fact a component of hedonic well-being and the larger structure of well-being. It would therefore appear that just as high negative affect and low positive affect are together indicative of mental illnesses such as Major Depressive Disorder (American Psychiatric Association, 2000), low negative affect and high positive affect may together be indicative of flourishing mental health". When the 14 components of well-being are assessed using reliable measures, they can be successfully integrated into a hierarchical structure of well-being that maintains the theoretical distinctions between the hedonic, eudaimonic, and social dimensions of well-being. (Gallagher et al 2009).
Fig. 1.4: Hierarchical structure of well-being model containing three second-order factors (hedonic well-being, social well-being, eudaimonic well-being).


A. Life Satisfaction

Life satisfaction (global judgments of one's life) and satisfaction with specific life domains (e.g. work satisfaction) are considered cognitive components of subjective well being (Diener, 2004). It implies a contentment with or acceptance of one’s life circumstances or fulfilment of one’s wants and needs for his/her life in totality. In essence a subjective assessment of the quality of one’s life is life satisfaction. As it is an inherently an evaluation, judgment of life satisfaction has a large cognitive component.

Life satisfaction can also be known as the "stable" component in one's life as it has been considered over long durations, up to one's lifetime (Steel et al., 2008). Quality of life has also been studied as a conceptualization of subjective well being. Although its exact definition varies, it is usually measured as an aggregation of well-being across several life domains and may include both subjective and objective components.

Further, Andrews and Withey (1976), conceptualized the life satisfaction as the cognitive component of subjective well being. Pavot et al (1991) defined life satisfaction is as a universal measure by the person on his or her life as a whole. The
universal measure of life satisfaction is reliable and consistent when assessed in various western countries (Cummins, 1995). According to Larsen, et al., (1985) when one individual made assessment about his life’s quality based on his own criteria and experiences he/she is measuring life satisfaction. Thus, when an individual according to his/her unique standards measure his/her life based on judging various life circumstances he/she is measuring life satisfaction. The more one is experiencing or judging the events of life to the unique standards the higher is the life satisfaction he/she experienced. Thus, instead of having any external objective measure/judgment of life experiences, the life satisfaction is a subjective measure/judgement by an individual about his/her life. This similarity of individual’s perception towards his/her life to the set standards has been explained by using discrepancy theory. Michalos (1985) proposed through his multiple discrepancy theory that the life satisfaction of an individual is a difference in the functions of seven gaps or comparisons which are the difference in the perception of what one has or wants to what others have or the best he/she has had in the past or expectations for the future; what he/she deserves and lastly his/her needs or wants. It is due to the difference in the individual’s personality and experiences of life the outcome of the desired circumstances and standards differ creating a difference in the perception towards these determinants of life satisfaction.

Lucas et al. (1996) argued that when an individual measures his/her life satisfaction it is more tended towards the reply towards the mood of the individual rather than on the positive and negative affects an individual experience in his/her life which are a separate distinctive constructs to measure life satisfaction. However, there is widespread irregularities in measuring the subjective well being as happiness is taken as measure of subjective well being which measures only positive and negative affects of subjective well being, thus making both the terms interchangeable. According to Veenhoven (1991) life satisfaction, is the assessment of an individual’s overall quality of his/her life as a whole for the favourable conditions in his/her life and has used life satisfaction and happiness interchangeably. But there is distinctive difference between life satisfaction and happiness. According to Lewinsohn et al (1991), life satisfaction is cognitive measuring process but happiness is an assessment of emotional feeling or state of an individual. This is supported by the study done by Campbell et al. (1976) which argued that life satisfaction is both cognitive measure and affective response to measure the overall satisfaction an individual experience in
his/her life but happiness is just a feeling or emotion of elation and gaiety. Andrews and Robinson (1991) also argued that happiness when measured only show the positive affect but not cognitive measure of individual’s life satisfaction whereas life satisfaction is cognitive measure of satisfaction individual has in his/her life. Thus, life satisfaction is cognitive measure/judgment of life which has affective background in measuring the life satisfaction of an individual.

B. Affect Balance

Well-being is often viewed in overall terms along a single dimension, roughly feeling bad to feeling good. Affect refers to the emotions, moods, and feelings a person has. These can be all positive, all negative, or a combination of both positive and negative (Diener, 2008). The affective component consists of, how frequently an individual reports experiencing positive and negative affect. An affective component of subjective well being can be considered in terms of momentary emotional states as well as in terms of long-term moods and tendencies, i.e. how much positive and/or negative affect a person generally experiences over any given period of time (Diener et al., 1999).

The affective component of subjective well being is defined as a hedonic balance of pleasant and unpleasant experiences, happiness and sadness. An individual with many pleasant experiences and few unpleasant experiences has high subjective well being. In contrast, an individual with many unpleasant experiences and few pleasant experiences has low subjective well being.

According to Bradburn (1969) an individual who is higher in positive affect is high in psychological well-being while an individual high in negative affect is low in psychological well-being. Warr (1990) argued that positive and negative affect were orthogonal: a person’s position in one of the two dimensions was not predictable from the position on the other. Costa and McCrae (1992) pointed out that positive and negative affect are balanced by a person, achieving a global subjective well being index and thus, positive and negative affect contributes independently to subjective well being.
The affective part of subjective well being measure both the amount of positive affects and the amount of negative affects a person experience during a limited time (Diener and Lucas 1999). The most common and simple method is to use a self-rating test and let the respondents subjectively evaluate to what extent they experience different emotions. Still this procedure has a theoretical bias, as the memory might be selective. This can mean that a pessimistic person recall the negative emotions to a higher degree than the positive, although they were experienced to a similar extent (Diener et al. 1997). A more advanced method is to let the participants keep a diary over experienced emotions (Oishi et al 2001), or even better, report their present emotional state every time an alarm beeps (Diener et al 1997). Despite the shortcomings, self-rating test shows similar results to other methods when compared (Diener and Seligman 2002). The affect balance of a person is calculated by simply subtracting the mean negative affect from the mean positive affect (Diener and Seligman 2002). The affect balance is rather stable over time, even though not as stable as the life satisfaction (Diener and Lucas 1999). Larsen and Fredrickson (1999) present several methods to measure emotions, but the Positive Affect, Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) by Watson and Clark (1988) is one of the more well-known instruments to measure positive and negative affects (e.g Rusting and Larsen 1997, Urry et al. 2004, Egloff 1997). PANAS show good psychometrical results even between nations (Diener and Suh 1999). The cognitive and affective parts summarized together represent a person’s Subjective well-being score (Diener and Biswas-Diener 2000). According to this theory a person get happier in the following circumstances: a) when being more satisfied with ones own life, b) when experiencing more positive affects, or c) when experiencing less negative emotions. Because of the life satisfaction component, subjective well being is not reducible to pure physical hedonism (Ryan and Deci 2001).

Both the life satisfaction and the affect balance are generally measured separately and independently, using a self-report method to represent the overall subjective well being of an individual on these two dimensions.
1.5 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

The constructs of organizational citizenship behaviour have been studied since 1990’s and definitions following different perspectives such as individual, organizational and social exchange perspectives. In recent years it has become an interesting construct for both researchers and managers, in order to better understand employees' behaviours which contribute to organizational effectiveness; and find out the potential antecedents and consequences of it. Organizational citizenship behaviour has been associated with overall organizational effectiveness and improvement in productivity of the employees.

In the dynamic world of business it is crucial that employees stay on top of their game in order for organisations to remain successful. This may mean that employees have to perform above and beyond what is required of them. Contextual performance, discretionary behaviours and OCBs have become a necessity in the workplace these days and will continue to do so for a number of reasons. According to Borman and Motowidlo (1997) some of these reasons are that global competition continues to increase the effort levels required of employees to produce the best products and deliver the best service. Further to this, employee adaptability and willingness to exhibit extra exertion is crucial during times of downsizing. Finally, customer service is increasingly emphasised, particularly because customers can usually buy equivalent products for comparable prices at similar establishments. Employees need to utilise their organizational citizenship behaviours to set themselves and their organisations apart from other organisations.

Katz’s (1964) seminal framework to assist in understanding the motivational problems in organisations has become a factor influencing the thinking about organizational citizenship behaviours. Further, Bateman and Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983; Organ, (1988b) studied that the job satisfaction is related to performance which has the roots for the organizational citizenship behaviours in the organization. Thus the job satisfaction shall lead to employee’s enthusiasm in the organization which is reflected as organizational citizenship behaviours. Others who at an early stage researched the topic of organizational citizenship behaviours include Brief and Motowidlo (1986) on pro-social behaviours and George and Brief’s (1992) work-related organisational spontaneity. Although these constructs bear similarities, there
are some evident differences. What is evident is that these constructs were all blocks in laying the organizational citizenship behaviours foundation. Dennis Organ is generally considered the father of organizational citizenship behaviour. Organ expanded upon Katz's (1964) original work. Organizational citizenship behaviour is a unique aspect of individual activity at work, first mentioned in the early 1980s. Organ (1988) defined organizational citizenship behaviour as behaviour of the individual which is discretionary not directly explained by reward system and promotes efficacy of the organization. This special behaviour has become a lively research field investigated by organizational sociologists, psychologists, and management researchers. However, whereas most of the studies appear to deal with the phenomenon from a behavioural/functional perspective the natural orientation of citizenship to the political science arena is overlooked.

Organisational citizenship behaviours are a special type of work behaviours that are defined as individual behaviours that are beneficial to the organisation and are discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognised by the formal reward system (Lo and Ramayah, 2009 and Organ, 1997). These behaviours are primarily matter of personnel choice as such their omission is not considered as punishable in the organisations. In other words, it is the extra role behaviour that is demonstrated by an individual, and is not a compulsory part of the job requirements but if existed boosts the organisational performance (Comeau and Griffith, 2005). Organisational citizenship behaviours can be analysed from both individual and organisational perspectives. If the Organisational citizenship behaviours of the employee is high then he will help the other employees in completion of the tasks, facilitate and support his colleagues in performing effectively where as from organisational perspective, employees exhibiting high Organisational citizenship behaviours are more strategically aligned with the organisation goals and objectives and put their maximum potential and go beyond the limits in achieving the goals and objectives of the organisation. So, Organisational citizenship behaviours can be termed as the synergistic behaviour that intensify the employee positive attitude towards the organisation and excels the individual effort level that is beneficiary for the organisation (Williams and Anderson, 1991).

Conceptually, organizational citizenship behaviour has been associated with social responsibility or communal work, for which no monetary benefits are attached. Organizational citizenship behaviour is job related behaviour but is not tied to formal
reward system, and is done to increase the effective operation of the organization. Organizational citizenship behaviour is a form of extra role behaviour which contributes to increase individual effectiveness in the service of overall organizational effectiveness.

Organizational citizenship behaviour is defined as set of discretionary workplace behaviours that exceed one’s basic job requirements. They are often called as behaviours that go beyond the call of duty. Organizational citizenship behaviours are more like psychological contracts and play very important role in improving the general health and well being of the organization thereby creating an impact on efficiency and effectiveness of work teams and organizations. Organ and Ryan (1995) referred to organizational citizenship behaviour as the individual contributions in the workplace that go beyond the role requirement and contractually rewarded job achievements. Examples of organizational citizenship behaviour include helping co-workers, performing extra job activities and acting according to organizational policies and rules regardless of personal inconvenience.

Organizational citizenship behaviours are a special type of work behaviour that are defined as individual behaviour that are beneficial to the organization and are discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system. These behaviours are rather a matter of personal choice, such that their omission is not generally understood as punishable. Organisational citizenship behaviours are thought to have an important impact on the effectiveness and efficiency of work teams and organizations, therefore contributing to the overall productivity of the organization. Organizational citizenship behaviour has been linked to overall organizational effectiveness, thus these types of employee behaviours have important consequences in the workplace. It implies more of a "good soldier" or "good citizen" syndrome of doing things that are "right and proper", but doing them for the sake of the system rather than for specific persons (Organ and Ryan 1995).

Smith et al (1983) categorized organizational citizenship behaviours into two categories viz. altruistic behaviours or generalized compliance behaviours. In the altruistic behaviours an individual aimed at helping others such as helping a co-worker with his job, helping when he/she is absent from work and other helping
behaviours when it is not a formality to help others as part of his duty. Generalized compliance behaviours included more of the compliance with organization’s rules, regulations, policies etc. such as giving support to organizational policies and always on time for work.

Coleman and Borman, (2000) proposed that the effectiveness of the organization can be achieved by task behaviour which is in-role behaviour of the individual to extra-role behaviour on the job. According to Organ (1988) the in-role behaviour included the work activities listed in the job list and extra-role behaviour are the activities outside the job life and these extra activities increase the effectiveness of the organization.

Further, Williams and Anderson (1991) proposed two dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour which determine by whom the behaviours were intended for viz; Organizational citizenship behaviour-individuals (OCBI) referred to behaviours which are only for individuals in the organizations and have advantages to individuals only. The two dimensions included in organizational citizenship behaviour-individual are altruism and courtesy. For example taking the step forward in a meeting for the colleague who is absent from the job.

Organizational citizenship behaviour-organisational (OCBO) referred to behaviours which are for the whole of the organization and have advantages to the organization. The three dimensions included in organizational citizenship behaviour-organizational are conscientiousness, civic virtue and sportsmanship. For example performing extra work to complete an important assignment or giving the detail of the work when one is unable to do the work.

While these behaviours are based on the direct target of organizational citizenship behaviour (i.e. the individual or the organization), it should be noted that if an individual is targeted with this behaviour so that it directly benefits the individual, it may also indirectly benefit the organization and vice versa (Williams and Anderson, 1991). For example, if one assists a colleague who has been absent from work to complete a report before the imminent deadline, then one is directly helping the colleague but at the same time, the organization benefits as its deadlines are being met.
1.5.1 Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

In attempting to further describe the organizational citizenship behaviour construct, Organ’s (1988) classification of organizational citizenship behaviour has been widely used by researchers across the world in diverse perspective and is found a valid tool for measuring organizational citizenship behaviour construct. The dimensions are as follows: (a) altruism, (b) conscientiousness, (c) sportsmanship, (d) courtesy, and (e) civic virtue.

Various empirical and conceptual works has been done in the area of organizational citizenship behaviour and different researchers have different view regarding the dimensionality of this construct. Researchers have conceptualized organizational citizenship behaviour as a multidimensional construct. But originally, Organ and his colleagues (Smith, et al 1983) classified organizational citizenship behaviour into two dimensions: altruism and generalized compliance. Later on compliance was renamed as conscientiousness.

Altruism is a voluntary behaviour directed to help another specific individual. When a person have specific problem, needs help or assistance then altruistic people go the extra mile to help them. DiPaola and Hoy (2005a) described altruism behaviour as “going the extra mile” to help specific individuals. The other dimension generalized compliance is more impersonal conscientiousness; it refers to the behaviour of an individual that shows compliance with general rules, norms and expectation. The employee acts upon the lines of what is considered moral and proper. For example, proper use of time at workplace is an act of generalized compliance.

The various dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour are altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue (Bateman and Organ 1983) which are explained as follows:

**Altruism** referred to intentional measures that an individual take to help others in the organization. For example aiding the employee who is absent from the job or is not able to finish the assignment in time.
Conscientiousness referred to alacrity in obeying the rules and regulations, proper use of work time and regular attending to the job in the organization. In this type of behaviour an individual goes out the expected job requirements to help others.

Sportsmanship referred to standing up against the challenges and not always finding mistakes in others in the organization. Also, it involved not to criticize and protest for small problems in the organization, as regular criticizing and protests to undue matters can affect the efficacy of the organization.

Courtesypressed considered seeking others who are to be affected by decisions of the organization or informing people in advance of such decisions in the organization. It involves both politeness and showing consideration to others in the organization. For example, to inform the supervisor of the organization about the functions or meetings to be held on specific date or agenda, when he/she is not aware of the same.

Civic virtue involved taking part actively in the political growth of the organization and having concern with the overall life of the organization. In this the individual participates and takes responsibility for various concerns that affect the growth of the organization. Summarizing of the dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour lead to the following theoretical model:

Fig. 1.5: The theoretical model of organizational citizenship behaviour (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 1990; MacKenzie et al., 1993 and Jung and Hong, 2008)
Altruism

Taehee et al., (2011) opine that altruism is the most frequently studied form in the organizational citizenship behaviour literature because of its strong impact on organizational functioning. Altruism in the context of an organization has been developing in terms of the definition from time to time. It is about taking the initiative to help members of an organization resolve problems and helping each other. It need not be confined only to fellow workmen; it can be extended to the customers, vendors, suppliers and any stake holder (Turnipseed and Rassuli, 2005; Lähdesmäki and Takala, 2012; and Chiang and Hsieh, 2012). Altruism is usually interpreted as an individual’s willingness of an employee to help a co-worker without concerning for own interests (Organ, 1988). Additionally, altruism involves going above and beyond job requirements to help others with whom an individual comes into contact (Organ et al., 2006). Thus, altruistic behaviour may include helping a colleague who has been absent from work, helping others who have heavy workloads, being mindful of how one’s own behaviour affects others’ jobs, and providing help and support to new employees represent clear indications of an employee’s interest for its work environment (Underwood et al., 1977). Given the nature of altruism, it is argued that altruism makes the work system more efficient because slack time may be allocated to urgent tasks (Yen and Neihoff, 2004).

The context of this research is to find the influence of altruism on overall performance of the service organization. There are many researchers who have attempted to relate these two constructs. Altruistic behaviour plays an important role in determining organizational performance and the research on altruism has paid much attention to factors affecting an individual’s willingness to engage in altruistic behaviour. Ryan (2001) found that an employee’s level of moral reasoning was a significant predictor of his or her altruistic behaviour. Van Dyne et al. (2008) discovered that part-time work status negatively affected employees willingness to exhibit altruistic behaviour. Drawing upon the social exchange theory that an employee’s altruistic behaviour was determined by how much OCB the employee has received from co-workers (Noblet et al., 2006) determined that job control and social support were significant predictors of altruistic behaviour. Tang, et al., (2008) established that both intrinsic and extrinsic motives contributed significantly to
altruistic behaviour. Glomb et al. (2011) revealed that negative emotion resulted in altruism, which in turn created positive moods leading towards better performance. So, as gathered from the research literature there is a bearing of altruism on performance.

Altruism (e.g. helping a newly appointed co-worker and freely giving time to other workers) is mainly concerned with behaviours which are directed towards helping a specific individual in completing his job related work but indirectly it contributes to group efficiency by increasing individual performance.

**Courtesy**

Courtesy is to avoid work problems, remind and inform other co-workers in advance (Ravichandran and Gilmore, 2007; Chou and Pearson, 2012). Courtesy has several dimensions to it such as the politeness, respect and propriety shown by the service, usually contact staff, in dealing with the customer and his or her property. This includes the ability of staff to be unobtrusive and un-interfering when appropriate (Suliman and Alobaidly, 2013. Courtesy means treating others with respect. According to (González et al., 2006) courtesy also includes preventing problems deriving from the work relationship such as encouraging other co-workers when they are discouraged about their professional development. Courtesy or complaisance is also defined as a set of behaviours which help to prevent tensions and other similar problems in the workplace (Seyed Javadin et al., 2012). Courtesy has been defined as discretionary behaviours that aim at preventing work-related conflicts with others (Law et al., 2005). This dimension is a form of helping behaviour, but one that works to prevent problems from arising. It also includes the word’s literal definition of being polite and considerate of others (Organ et al., 2006). Examples of courteous behaviours are asking fellow employees if they would like a cup of coffee while you are getting one for yourself, making extra copies of the meeting agenda for your teammates, and giving a colleague ample notice when you alter something that will affect them.

Dickinson and McIntyre, (1997) concluded that providing early notification to another department for the completion of a certain part of a project is considered coordination in a teamwork setting but this same behaviour may be considered a courtesy in an individual setting (Organ, 1988), thus courtesy contributes to the performance. When the employees in the organization treat each other with respect,
they would be comfortable working with each other. In addition, it would make things easier for them to work in a team. This supports the dimension of learning organization which is team learning. Several researchers have identified the importance of team learning in the enhancement of organizational performance.

Courtesy is shown by preventing organization problems through communication and general consideration for others. For example, giving advance notices, reminders and giving appropriate information to others, or letting co-workers know how they can reach an employee who is on vacation. The courteous behaviours help to prevent other employees from facing unpleasant surprises.

**Sportsmanship**

Obeying organizational regulations, tolerating imperfect situations without complaint and refraining from actions which may lead to unfavourable tension at the workplace and maintaining synergistic atmosphere within the organization against any adverse incidents (Witt and Ferris, 2003 and Chou and Pearson, 2012). Sportsmanship is about accepting less than ideal circumstances, for example petty grievances, real or imagined slights (González et al., 2006). Sportsmanship of employees is to tolerate circumstances unexpected or less preferable without complaining (Jung and Hong, 2008). Accordingly Javadin et al (2012) opined that sportsmanship includes such traits as: the ability to tolerate criticism, the flare not to complain frivolously, and the wisdom to promote meritorious individuals.

Sportsmanship is basically derived from the team games where a collective effort is required to succeed and the same is applicable to the organizations as ultimately it is the coordination between the individuals that makes the teams in the organization to excel may it be a marketing team or an research and development team. The reason for this is, sportsmanship gives the employees the ability to put aside petty grievances and divert attention towards quality work with the corporate objectives in the focus. It needs a special effort from the employee to tolerate less than ideal circumstances without complaining, not offended when others do not follow their suggestion, willing to sacrifice their personal interest for the good of the work-group. Empirical research that has included this construct in the context of other forms of citizenship behaviour has shown it to be distinct from them, and to have
somewhat different antecedents and consequences (MacKenzie, et al., 1993). It is also observed that sportsmanship is a form of citizenship behaviour that received much less attention in the literature.

Wat and Shaffer (2005) found that the competence dimension of psychological empowerment was significantly related to both conscientiousness and sportsmanship. The influence of competence on conscientiousness was explained by the fact that individuals who believe they have capability to achieve goals do what is required to achieve them. It is unlikely that those who lack self-confidence will go beyond minimum role requirements. Organ (1990) opines that sportsmanship is a form of citizenship behaviour that has received much less attention in the literature in comparison to the other dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour. It refers to the willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining as mentioned before, however, according to Organ this definition seems somewhat narrower than the label of this construct would imply. For example, “good sports” are people who not only do not complain when they are inconvenienced by others, but also maintain a positive attitude even when things do not go their way, are not offended when others do not follow their suggestions, are willing to sacrifice their personal interest for the good of the work group, and do not take the rejection of their ideas personally. Empirical research has included this construct in the context of other forms of citizenship behaviour and has shown it to be distinct from them, and to have somewhat different antecedents and consequences but invariably influence the performance of the organization (MacKenzie et al., 1993).

Sportsmanship is an employee’s readiness to deal with poor situations without complaining. Employee is ready to accept organizational standards, organizational resources and have flexibility. This behaviour improves the time spent on constructive work done in the organization.

Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness involves employees going beyond the minimum requirements of the organization. This is extra-role behaviour, meaning that it involves engaging in task related behaviours at a level that is far beyond minimal
requirement (MacKenzie et al., 1993). This factor was initially labelled as ‘generalized compliance’ and later changed ‘conscientiousness’, because it did not have an immediate effect of helping a specific person, but a more impersonal, generalized to the group effect. Roberts et al. (2005) defined conscientiousness in various ways and suggested that there was little agreement about the specific facets that make up each of the Big Five traits. Further, Roberts et al. (2005) indicated that a possible reason for this inconsistency may be the relative newness of the Big Five model of personality.

Mount and Barrick (1995) attempted to define conscientiousness by separating it into achievement and dependability. Achievement is the ability of an employee to work hard and meet goals, whereas dependability is the interpersonal component of conscientiousness that involves responsibility and dutifulness. Kaplan and Saccuzzo (2001) defined conscientiousness as the degree to which an individual perseveres, is responsible and is organised. Conscientiousness more than complying with organizational rules and going beyond minimum requirements through hard work (Hechanova et al., 2006).

According to Chiang and Hsieh, 2008; Chou and Pearson, 2012; and Zacher and Jimmieson, 2013, conscientiousness is the dedication to the job and desire to exceed formal requirements in aspects such as, punctuality or conservation of resources, for example working long days, voluntarily doing things besides duties, keeping the organization’s rules and never wasting work time (González et al., 2006). Zacher and Jimmieson, (2013) found that conscientiousness that does not provide immediate aid to any one specific person, but rather is indirectly helpful to others involved in the system. The behaviour (e.g., punctuality, not wasting time) seems to represent something akin to compliance with internalized norms defining what a good employee ought to do. So, this behaviour of employees would definitely lead to the better performance of the organization.

Conscientiousness means going beyond the minimum expectation. In other words, it denotes the behaviour that is not directed at another individual. Examples of conscientiousness include an employee adhering to an organization’s rules and regulations or a worker not using all of his vacation or sick leaves.
Civic Virtue

High level interest and loyalty to the organization and remaining attentive and proactive when participating in organizational activities (Jin and Drozdenko, 2010; Chou and Pearson, 2012; and Zacher and Jimmieson, 2013). Civic virtue is responsibly participating in the life of the firm for example, attending meetings/functions that are not required but that help the firm, keeping up with changes in the organization, taking the initiative to recommend how procedures can be improved. Civic virtue is the responsible, constructive involvement in the political process of the organization, including not just expressing opinions but reading one’s mail, attending meetings, and keeping abreast of larger issues involving the organization (Chou and Pearson, 2012). The civic virtue refers to the macro level of interest or commitment to the organization as a whole. It is demonstrated by the willing participation in the governance of the organization. It is about expressing openly the right strategy that would elevate the operational standards of the organization. It may even include the analysing of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges of the organization by the employee so that it may sustain the business endeavour. To put in a nutshell, it could be the expression of the employee as a part of the whole organization thus responsible and committed to the actions which he/she undertakes. All these actions from the employee are positive towards the growth of the organization in terms of its financial or non-financial performance or even operational performance.

Civic virtue means participating in the life and culture of the organization; this behaviour is not targeted at individuals, rather, this behaviour targets the organization. For example, voluntarily attending meetings and functions of the organization. It also includes contributing opinions on important organizational issues like policy, strategy formation etc. This dimension also includes positive involvement in the concerns of the organization (Organ et al 2006).

Thus, each distinctive dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour put forward a different basis for this relationship. As altruism creates the work system more efficient as when one worker is free he/she can utilize his/her time to help others
on more important job. The various ways of civic virtue may include offering ideas for saving resources or decreasing cost which has direct impact on the efficiency of the organization. The employees whose level is high in conscientious behaviour tend to avoid negative behaviour or having personal benefits and show compliance to organization’s policies and norms which resulted in work discipline, reliability and consistency in the work affecting efficacy of the organization (Berry and Parasuraman, 1991).

Most of the studies examining the structure of organizational citizenship behaviour have agreed that it is a multidimensional concept (Graham, 1989; Podsakoff, et al 1990). Later, Graham (1989) after extensive research emerged with a four-dimension model of organizational citizenship behaviour consisting of individual initiative, interpersonal helping, personal industry, and loyal boosterism. Interpersonal helping involves helping co-workers in their jobs when they need help. Individual initiative indicates communicating to other employees in the workplace to improve individual and group performance. Personal industry includes the performance of specific job above and beyond the call of duty, whereas loyal boosterism shows the promotion of the organizational image to outsiders (Moorman and Blakely, 1995).

Borman and Motowidlo (1993) categorized organizational citizenship behaviour into five dimensions which are as follows- volunteering to do tasks that are not formally part of their job, following organizational procedures, endorsing and supporting, helping and cooperating with workers, defending the objectives of the organization. They explained these dimensions as perseverance combined with enthusiasm and extraordinary efforts which are essential to complete the task / work.

Podsakoff and Mackenzie (1997) categorized organizational citizenship behaviour in three dimensions, namely, helping Behaviour, sportsmanship and civic virtue. Hannam and Jimmieson (2002) proposed that organization compliance, individual initiative, altruism, conscientiousness and civic virtue are the significant factors in explaining organizational citizenship behaviour.

By comparing the previous models of organizational citizenship behaviour and other concepts associated to organizational citizenship behaviour, Coleman and Borman (2000) built up a “three-dimension integrated model of citizenship behaviour
Borman and Motowidlo, 1993; Organ, 1988; Smith et al 1983). They divided the organizational citizenship behaviour into three dimensions: interpersonal citizenship performance, organizational citizenship performance, and job/task citizenship performance. The interpersonal dimension refers to behaviours that benefit members of the organization, relates with OCB-I by Williams and Anderson (1991), altruism and courtesy by Organ (1988), and partly the altruism of Smith, et al (1983) and Morrison (1994). The second dimension, organizational citizenship performance, may be defined as behaviours that benefit the organization, characterize the dimensions such as OCB-O by Williams and Anderson (1991), the sportsmanship, civic virtue, and conscientiousness by Organ (1988), generalized compliance of Smith et al (1983). The third dimension, job/task citizenship performance is defined as behaviours that benefit the job/task, and is associated with functional participation of the employee (Van Dyne et al 1994).

Markoczy and Katherine (2004) explained organizational citizenship behaviour following two dimensional model. The two dimensional model includes positive assistance and active assistance and avoiding these behaviours can hurt the co-workers or the organization itself. Citizenship behaviour includes helping others to do their work, supporting the organization and volunteering in doing necessary tasks or taking responsibility. Politeness and Generosity are the two important indicators, which show avoidance behaviour that can harm organization. Politeness involves thinking about the fact that may influence the co-workers. Whereas generosity indicates the patience with which the individual faces the unavoidable situations without any complain. A more extensive approach was adopted by Oplatka (2006). He found seven dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour which include helping behaviour, organizational loyalty, sportsmanship, organizational compliance individual initiative, civic virtue and self development.

1.6 Justification of the study

As from the above discussion now organizations are shifting towards a positive paradigm which makes it critical to reflect upon on how psychological capital, subjective well being and organisational citizenship behaviour can be used to
the benefit of Indian banking sector. As banking sector is greatly affected by customer service which requires excellent customer service representatives to deliver high service quality this shift towards a positive paradigm can’t be ignored.

Organisations are heavily dependent on their human resources to provide a good service to their customers (Yeo, 2009) and for ensuring excellent organisational performance. In India the customer services in banking sector is not highly regarded, highlighting the weak service culture in the country. This is contrary to what is required when competing for business in both the local and the global arena. Today, customers are educated, refined and self-assured, have high expectations, require a wider selection and will not be manipulated (Cook, 2002). Customers will insist on high levels of service and good quality products, and for this reason first-rate performance is an important goal for organisations and their employees. This would assist in the attainment of organisational goals such as efficiency, profitability, customer attraction and retention and the maintenance of a good reputation. Investigating positive constructs such as psychological capital, subjective well being and organisational citizenship behaviour might well be instrumental in improving the customer services industry and performance in banking sector.

1.7 Problem Statement

According to Blem (2005) bad customer service has severe consequences, some of which include the cost of managing complaints, legal expenses, reimbursing customers and carrying out remedial public relations. The indirect consequences were more costly and may result in lost sales, negative word-of-mouth and the cost of obtaining new customers. Further, Blem (2005) concluded that the direct and indirect costs of bad customer service was far greater than the cost of retaining existing customers through high-quality service.

Further, Cook (2002) suggested that on average it can cost an organisation up to five times as much to attract a new customer as it does to keep an existing customer and in the vehicle market it costs as much as seventeen times more to attract a new customer. Evenson (2007) suggested that the cost of altering the attitudes of disillusioned customers is far greater than the costs of pleasing customers from the
outset. It is therefore imperative to keep customers satisfied, so as to ensure their repeat business and positive reviews of the organization, their products and services. Furthermore, the majority of customers took their business elsewhere if they experience an indifferent attitude toward them which highlights the necessity for extraordinary customer service.

Effective frontline service employees hold the key to organizational success, but when they do not have the organization or the their own interests at heart they may be responsible for organizational disaster. There is a dire need for employee well being, employee satisfaction and service quality in organizations, because it is the employee who keeps the organization’s doors open. When employees are engaged in their work and display organizational citizenship behaviours, they are more likely to contribute positively to the organization’s success, particularly when compared to those who are disengaged and exhibit deviant work behaviours. The employee can only be engaged in his work if has high level of well being with efficacy in his work.

In light of the role of employee well being and organisational performance, organisations may want to consider giving specific attention to those employees who work directly with their customers, particularly in the banking sector. It is imperative now that organisations should explore the notion of positivity in the workplace, which could well be the answer to employee well being and organisational performance. Attracting the right people for the job is a large part of winning the battle for extraordinary performance in any industry, which relies on employees going the extra mile and achieving his well being. The difficulty, however, is that service jobs are typically poorly paid and those who apply traditionally have low self-esteem, little education and skills (Blem, 2005). Although it should be noted that with adequate training and guidance, many of these employees adjust very well to service jobs (Blem, 2005). Understanding the relationships between the constructs discussed could go a long way in developing the correct training for employees in banking sector.

As mentioned in the preceding sections, research suggests that employee well being can be improved through organizational citizenship behaviours. Further to this, subjective well being has shown to increase organizational citizenship behaviours.
Lastly, psychological capital is positively linked to organizational citizenship behaviours. If this is the case, as shown in separate research studies, the relationships between these constructs should be investigated and with that in mind the problem statement is: “What is the relationship between psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour for employees in banking sector in India?”

1.8 Research Objectives

The primary aim of this study was to contribute to the body of knowledge on positive constructs in the banking sector in India, by investigating the relationships psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour. By understanding the relationships between psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour, it is implied that measuring high psychological capital and subjective well being levels in employees may indicate higher organizational citizenship behaviour; leading to greater efforts and performance in the workplace. It is anticipated that employees who embody these constructs will likely perform better and by doing so have a constructive impact on efficacy of their organization.

With the primary objectives of this study in mind, the research questions are summarized as follows:

**Primary objectives included:**

- What are the relationships between psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour in the banking sector in India?

- What are the relationships between the demographic characteristics and other variables included in the study?

- Is it possible to predict any of the variables in the study? For example, can psychological capital and subjective well being predict organizational citizenship?
Secondary objectives included:

Examining the literature on psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour which included exploring the factors that comprise these constructs and examining previous studies to find out how these constructs influence the well being of individuals and efficacy of organizations and relate to one another.

Developing a theoretical model of psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour based on literature, reflecting on the possible relationships between these constructs and the various factors that underpin the constructs. This will potentially give greater understanding to organizations in managing well being and organizational behaviour who exemplify these constructs. Conducting an empirical investigation to test the proposed theoretical model and to investigate the potential relationships between psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour. Providing knowledge to support the banking sector in selecting and developing employees well being and organizational behaviour who are engaged in their work and go beyond what the job requires, which may assist in increasing their well being and organisational performance.

1.9 Scope of the study

It is evident from the research that positive factors are being considered to a greater degree in both research and development of employees in the organizations. For this reason, the study was based on the concept of positive organizational behaviour. The empirical research was limited to employees in banking sector for two prominent reasons. The first was the increase in competition both at domestic level and international level in banking sector in India. Secondly, India is not having good employee well being and customer services and organisations need to take heed of the factors, such as psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour as these may be key to providing excellent service.

This research was being conducted in a salutogenic paradigm that mainly focuses on the wellness of the employee and the organization. Salutogenesis refers to a study whereby the research question considers what causes wellbeing (Lindström and Eriksson, 2006). In other words, what value can psychological capital, subjective
well being and organizational citizenship behaviour bring to the organization? This study took place in a positivistic paradigm which is quantitative in nature, whereby the data was derived from measurement of the constructs and realities were established by analyzing the data (Krauss, 2005), which forms the foundation of knowledge. Obtaining and verifying such data is commonly known as empirical evidence. Furthermore, the researcher built and tested a model based on theory and, in addition, developed and tested a model based on empirical evidence.

1.10 Framework of the Study

While the first chapter gave a brief introduction to this study, the second chapter reflects on the literature and previous studies surrounding the main constructs in this study. Further to this, the third chapter describes the research methodology employed in this study and the fourth chapter is dedicated to analyzing the demographic results. The fifth and sixth chapter focuses on relationship of psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour. The final chapter focuses on a discussion of the results, the limitations of the study, as well as recommendations and suggestions for the banking sector involved and recommendations for future research.

1.11 Conclusion

In light of all the negativity and low level of well being among the employees at their workplaces, it is imperative to shift the focus from the negativity to positivity at workplace. The Indian banking sector, which is undergoing tough competition both at national and international level it has become crucial to remove this negativity and improve the level of well being among banking employees. In the next chapter, the researcher will review the literature on psychological capital, subjective well being and organizational citizenship behaviour, so as to draw the links between the above variables and highlight the possible relationships that may exist.