RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

The current study proposes to extend the psychological capital, transformational leadership and work-life balance research work into the police organization. Police officials are expected to be available at all times and are required to be prompt in their responses. The advancements in information technology has made it difficult for them to take complete time-off from their work duties. There is always an information overload that comes along with the pressure of providing quality service to the citizens. The police officials are also always in the limelight thanks to media exposure. People leave no stone unturned in highlighting how the police officials are incapable of performing their duties. With such pressures and negativity surrounding the officials, there is a need to understand the positive psychological capacities that help them in continuing their work despite the adversities and how psychological capital can be improved for the police officials. A police official is also required to lead by example, encourage subordinates towards innovative ideas and higher ethical and moral codes. The expectations from an officer to have the quality to understand the needs of the followers and help them elevate their maturity levels and reach for self-actualization are an important aspect of the service. Police officers lead a life in which there are numerous uncertainties. The organization expects them to serve the nation first and not let personal interests interfere with the duty. They are expected to be calm and composed in times of disturbances in society and lead by example. An officer is willing to put his life at stake to save the lives of the citizens.
The pressures of work have been intensifying over the years and it has effects on the work as well as life beyond work of the police personnel, and there are times when work begins to dominate life and a sense of work-life imbalance seeps in.

Psychological capital and transformational leadership both variables have positive aspects imbibed in them. It is important to see whether these positive variables have an effect on the stressful demands of work as well as responsibilities in personal life of the officers. All three variables which are part of the study, form an integral part of the lives of police personnel.

In the past decade, the focus on positive forms of leadership has received increasing attention (Avolio & Luthans, 2006; Ehrhart, 2004; Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005; Hess & Cameron, 2006; Ilies, Morgeson, & Nahrgang, 2005; Yammarino, Dionne, Schriesheim, & Dansereau, 2008) due to the mounting evidence supporting the central role of positivity in enhancing human wellbeing and performance at work (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004; Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003; Fredrickson, 2009; Luthans et al, 2007; Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Subsequent research has also suggested that leaders who possess a variety of positive states or traits, goals, values, and character strengths are able to positively influence followers’ states, behavior, and performance (Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008; Peterson et al, 2008; Walumbwa, Luthans, Avey & Oke, 2011).

Although few attempts have been made to amplify attention towards the need to focus on positive capacities, (Duncan, 2007; Dvir et al, 2002; Vigoda-Gadot, 2007; Walumbwa et al, 2010) only limited progress has been made in understanding
the role of these variables in context to organizations working in high risk environments.

Psychological capital has emerged as a positive oriented higher order construct (Luthans 2002; Luthans & Youssef, 2007). The focus on positive psychological capacities is based on theory and research suggesting positive and enduring workplace outcomes (Luthans, et al, 2005; Peterson & Luthans, 2003) and further suggesting important role in leadership (Luthans & Avolio, 2003). Avolio and Luthans (2006) proposed that leaders who are more authentic and transformational will have a more positive impact on their followers’ motivational tendencies and Luthans et al (2007) observed that a great deal of the research on leadership has focused on correcting what’s wrong with leaders, as opposed to examining the degree of psychological capital associated with effective leadership. The police organization could do with more findings which focus on higher levels of positivity.

There is growing awareness of work-life issues in developing countries (Joplin, Shaffer, Lau, & Francesco, 2003). Work-life balance remains one of the least studied concepts of work-life research (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011) and hence encouraging future research on work-life balance as a way to better understand a complex work-life interface. Recent trends in work-life research have emphasized work-life balance to be a broad issue relevant for all working people (Haar, 2013; Kossek, Valcour & Lirio, 2014).

The present study was undertaken in order to investigate the relationship of psychological capital and transformational leadership with work-life balance. An exploratory aspect of the study proposes to focus on examining whether positivity
provided for the effects of transformational style of leadership on the work-life balance. The exploratory analysis aims to address this gap in the literature.

AIMS

1. To study the relationship between psychological capital & work-life balance.
2. To investigate the relationship between transformational leadership and work-life balance.
3. To explore the contribution of psychological capital and transformational leadership in relation to work-life balance.

HYPOTHESES

In order to fulfill the above objective of the study the following hypotheses were formulated:

H₁ There will be no significant relationship between psychological capital & work-life balance.

H₂ There will be no significant relationship between transformational leadership & work-life balance.

H₃ The two measures (psychological capital and transformational leadership) of the study will not significantly contribute to predict work-life balance.

SAMPLE OF THE STUDY

The sample size of the study consists of 150 Indian Police Officers posted in the State of Rajasthan.
Inclusion Criteria

1. Officers between the age group of 26 years to 55 years.
2. Officers who are posted as or equivalent to Superintendent of Police, Additional Superintendent of Police and Deputy Superintendent of Police.
3. Officers with a minimum work experience of 5 years.

Exclusion Criteria

1. Officers who have been suspended
2. Officers who have been sent on deputation to other states/countries.
3. Officers under the age of 26 years and above the age of 55 years.
4. Officers who have less than 5 years of work experience.

PROCEDURE

The research work required collecting data from government organization, a systematic plan was devised to get necessary approvals and ease the process of data collection from high ranked police officials in Rajasthan. The research was conducted in the following manner:

The Psychological capital questionnaire and Multi leadership Questionnaire (5x short) were purchased from www.mindgarden.com. (copyright issues – refer appendices for copyright certificate). The permission to use the work-life balance survey was also procured from Queensland Law society, Australia. This was followed by applying for permission to the Director General of Police, Government of Rajasthan to conduct research work in the police organization.
On receiving approval in principle, the application was forwarded to the Inspector General of Police handling the training department (Please refer appendices for police organizational structure in Rajasthan). The research proposal and the questionnaires were submitted to the Inspector General of Police – Training department for his kind perusal. Upon receiving permission to conduct the research work, the training department identified the following districts - Jaipur, Ajmer, Jodhpur and Udaipur from where data could be collected. (Please refer appendices for police organizational structure in Rajasthan and map of districts of Rajasthan).

The Assistant Inspector General of Police – Training department, issued letters to the officers heading the Range/Commissionerate mentioned above (Additional Commissioner of Police – I – Jaipur, Additional Commissioner of Police – II – Jaipur, Inspector General of Police – Jaipur Range, Inspector General of Police – Jodhpur Range, Commissioner of Police – Jodhpur, Inspector General of Police – Ajmer Range and Inspector General of Police – Udaipur Range) in order to collect data from Superintendent of Police, Additional Superintendent of Police and Deputy Superintendent of Police. The permission to collect data for research purpose was granted with the understanding that since the officers (SP, Addl. SP and Dy. SP) have yearly CR (confidential report) performance assessment by their immediate senior officer, therefore, they shall not provide any such data that may have an effect on their work/performance assessment.

The range/commissionerate heads (mentioned above) were approached individually and research proposal and the questionnaires were submitted explaining the relevance and scope of the research work. This was followed by identifying
officers at department level and a list was issued with their phone numbers to contact them personally. A letter of permission from each officer heading range/commissionerate was also issued to approach them individually.

From October 2012 and till July 2015 –150 police officials were approached individually in order to administer the questionnaires of the study. Every officer was given a brief introduction about the questionnaires and the relevance of the study. The questionnaires were easy to understand and the officers were able to relate them to the current work place scenario. It took 15 – 20 minutes to complete all the questionnaires (PCQ, MLQ (5X short)and WLB) of this research work.

For the purpose of analysis of the data collected, a total of 150 duly filled forms were selected in which the sample population was above 25 years and below 55 years of age. The following rank divisions were observed in the data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Ajmer Range</th>
<th>Jaipur Range</th>
<th>Jodhpur Range</th>
<th>Udaipur Range</th>
<th>Jaipur Commissionerate</th>
<th>Jodhpur Commissionerate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Police</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Superintendent of Police</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Superintendent of Police</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data was classified as per the aims and objectives of the current research work (refer scoring sheet which provides the raw scores) and subsequently the scoring for each variable (PCQ, MLQ (5X short)and WLB) was done as per the manual provided by the authors.
In the case of MLQ (5X short), composite score of transformational leadership is not provided since the past research work treat the dimensions as indicators of transformational leadership (Antokanis, Avolio & Sivasubramanium, 2003; Peterson et al, 2008). The researcher conducted confirmatory factor analysis which shows that the subscales of transformational leadership (Idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration) as measured by MLQ (5X short) showed strong significant contribution of the scores of 5 subscales for the sample of this study (refer Figure 4.1 and Table 4.6).

**MEASURES OF THE STUDY**

**PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL QUESTIONNAIRE**

(Only 5 items reproduced in the appendices due to copyright terms & conditions, please refer certificate in appendices)

The PCQ was developed by Luthans et al (2007) to measure the positive organizational behavior construct of psychological capital. The instrument contains 24 items that measure the current state of an individual’s psychological capital through the dimensions of hope, efficacy, resilience and optimism. Items 1-6 measure efficacy and have been adapted from the scale developed by Parker (1998); items 7-12 consist of the subscale which measures hope and has been adapted from Snyder’s (1996) instrument for measuring hope. Resiliency subscale has been adapted from Wagnild and Young (1993) and comprise of items 13-18 on the PCQ scale and finally, items 19-24 represent the optimism subscale adapted from Scheier and Carver (1985).
A six-point scale for rating agreement is used. The anchors used to assess the PCQ items are presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scoring of the subscales of PCQ scale is calculated by taking out the average of all the items in that scale. The total PCQ score is calculated by taking the mean of all the items in the scale. For example, all the ratings are added and then divided by 24 is equal to the mean PCQ score. The items 13, 20, 23 are reverse scored items in the scale. The range of score is 1-6, with 1 indicating low levels of psychological capital and 6 indicating high score on the questionnaire. The reliability of the overall psychological capital measure in all samples has been reported to be consistently above conventional standards (Luthans et al., 2007). Each of the four dimensions of Psychological capital scales has an interpretation based on the construct measured (details provided in the manual). Luthans et al. (2007) calculated the reliability estimates for the total psychological capital and each adapted measure from four sample populations and found reliability of the overall psychological capital measure in all samples to be above conventional standards. The Cronbach alphas were as follows: hope (.72, .75, .80, .76); efficacy (.75, .84, .85, .75); resilience (.71, .71, .66, .72); optimism (.74, .69, .76, .79); and overall Psychological Capital (.88, .89, .89, .89). Discriminant/Convergent Validity: Each of the four positive constructs has been shown to have empirically based discriminant validity in previous studies (Bryant & Cvengros, 2004; Carifio & Rhodes, 2002; Magaletta & Oliver, 1999; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). Luthans et al. (2007) found that Psychological Capital was not related to age or education.
demographics and was also not related to the personality dimensions of Agreeableness or Openness. Psychological Capital had a strong positive relationship with core self-evaluations (.60) and a moderate relationship with Extraversion (.36) and Conscientiousness (.39) (Luthans et al, 2007). Criterion Validity: Results of research by Luthans et al (2007) showed that Psychological Capital had a slightly stronger relationship to job satisfaction, yet not significant (p < .10), than core self-evaluations, but that Psychological Capital was significantly stronger (p < .001) than Conscientiousness and Extraversion. In addition, this research indicated that Psychological Capital was more strongly related to affective organizational commitment (p < .001) than core self-evaluations, Conscientiousness, and Extraversion (Luthans et al, 2007). PCQ has been used across multiple samples in Indian context. The questionnaire was bought from www.mingarden.com and the terms restrict reproducing more than 5 items of the test. (Please refer letter attached in the appendices).

**MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE**

(Only 5 items reproduced in the appendices due to copyright terms & conditions, please refer certificate in appendices)

The MLQ has been used for the past 25 years to identify the effective leadership characteristics (Bass & Avolio, 1993, Bass & Avolio 1999; 2004). Various forms of the MLQ have been used in over 30 countries and in numerous languages, business and industrial firms, hospitals, religious institutions, military organizations, government agencies, colleges, primary schools, and secondary schools. For the purpose of this study, only the subscales of transformational leadership (MLQ 5X
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Short) consisting of 20 items were used. A composite score of transformational leadership is not provided since the past research work treat the dimensions as indicators of transformational leadership (Antokanis, Avolio & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Peterson et al, 2008). The dimensions of transformational leadership were measured through the following items. Idealized influence (attributed) is measured by items 10,18,21, 25 and idealized influence (behavior) is measured by items 6,14,23,24. Items 9,13,26,36 measured the construct of inspirational motivation. The questionnaire measures intellectual stimulation through items 2,8,30, 32 and individual consideration through items 15,19,29, 31. Consistent with past research, we treated these dimensions as indicators of transformational leadership (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003).

The questionnaire uses a five point scale for rating the frequency of observed leadership behavior and the rating scale bears the magnitude estimation based ratio of 4:3:2:1:0, according to a tested list of anchors provided by Bass, Cascio, and O’Connor (1974). The anchors used to evaluate the MLQ (5X short) factors are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Once in a while</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Fairly often</td>
<td>Frequently, if not always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MLQ (5X short) scale scores are average scores for the items on the scale. The score can be derived by summing the items and dividing by the number of items that make up the scale. For example, if the subscale of idealized influence (attributed) has four (4) items then the score will be derived by summing up the ratings on the items that make the subscale and then dividing it by the number of
items in the subscale. If any item is left blank, the manual instructs to divide the total for that scale by the number of items answered. The range of score is 0-4, with 0 indicating no behavior consistent with that subscale and 4 indicating high score on that subscale. The MLQ (5X short) manual reports strong positive correlations between all components of transformational leadership, and both objective and subjective measures of performance. Construct validity values for the total items and for each leadership factor scale ranged from .74 to .94. All of the scales' reliabilities were generally high, exceeding standard cut-offs for internal consistency recommended in the literature. The reliabilities within each data set generally indicated that the MLQ (5X short) was reliably measuring each of the leadership factors. The transformational scales reported high reliability scores: IIA – 0.70, IIB – 0.64, IM – 0.76, IS – 0.64 and IC – 0.62 (N = 3755).

The questionnaire was bought from www.mingarden.com and the terms restrict reproducing more than 5 items of the test. (Please refer letter attached in the appendices)

WORK-LIFE BALANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

(15 item scale attached in appendices)

The work-life balance scale used for this research work has been developed by Haddon and Hede (2010) for the Queensland law Society, Australia. This scale assesses “the individual abilities to perform activities in both work and family domains effectively” (Vaydanoff, 2005). Haddon and Hede (2010) used 15 item scale developed by Joplin et al (2003) which provided different life situations and work-family structure which were diverse and hence, providing generalizability by
using data from three international locations (Hong Kong, China & US). The scale includes three sub-scales measuring the following perceptions: i) equilibrium – focus on maintaining priorities; ii) control – focus on organizing and scheduling life activities and iii) synchrony – focus on multi-tasking and the ability to conduct multiple roles in a complementary fashion.

Haddon changed a few terms in the scale as some words had a better connotation than the ones used by Joplin *et al* (2003). For item 9, the term “juggle” was replaced by “integrate”. Item 13 was rephrased to “I feel that I can successfully balance the different aspect of my life”. And finally, item 15 used the phrase “I have the resources to” instead of “I am able to”.

The coding responses were done on the standard likert scale pattern, i.e.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Tend to Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Tend to Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A raw score above 50 represents more desirable level of balance between work-life and life beyond work for the individual. The Cronbach’s alpha indicated a very acceptable internal consistency reliabilities for the questionnaire ($\alpha= 0.95$). In the exploratory factor analysis, all questions correlated highly with synchrony, control and equilibrium ranging from .622 - .920.
METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

RESEARCH DESIGN OF THE STUDY

FIGURE 3.1
CORRELATIONAL DESIGN
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STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The following statistical tools were used in order to deploy the results:

1. Mean
2. Standard Deviation
3. Correlation
4. Multiple Regression
5. Path Analysis (AMOS)
6. Sobel Test

MEAN

\[ x = \frac{\text{Sum of the observation } n}{\text{Number of observation } n} \]

\[ M = \frac{\sum fX}{N} \]
Where,

\[ x = \text{Arithmetic Mean} \]

\[ \sum f \chi = \text{Sum of the products of the values of } x \text{ and the corresponding frequencies} \]

\[ N = \text{Total frequency} \]

**STANDARD DEVIATION**

The most stable index of variability was also calculated:

The formula for standard deviation is:

\[
\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\sum d^2}{N}} \quad \text{or} \quad \sqrt{\frac{\sum (x - \chi)^2}{N}}
\]

Where,

\[ \sigma = \text{Standard deviation} \]

\[ \chi = \text{Arithmetic mean} \]

\[ d^2 = \text{Square of the deviation from arithmetic mean} \]

\[ N = \text{Number of observation} \]

**KARL PEARSON'S COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION**

\[
r = \frac{\sum dx dy}{N \sigma_x \sigma_y} = \frac{\sqrt{\sum dx dy}}{\sqrt{\sum dx^2 x \sum dy^2}} = \frac{\sqrt{\sum dx^2 x \sum d^2 y}}{N}
\]

Where,

\[ r = \text{Coefficient of Correlation} \]

\[ dx = X - X \]

\[ dy = Y - Y \]

\[ \sigma_x = \text{Standard deviation of } X \text{ series} \]

\[ \sigma_y = \text{Standard deviation of } Y \text{ series} \]

\[ N = \text{Number of Pairs of observation} \]
ASSUMED MEAN METHOD

\[ r = \frac{\sum d_x d_y - (\sum d_x)(\sum d_y)}{\sqrt{\sum d^2_x} \cdot \frac{\sum d^2_x}{N} \cdot \sqrt{\sum d^2_y} \cdot \frac{\sum d^2_y}{N}} \]

Where,

\[ d_x = X - Ax \]
\[ d_y = Y - Ay \]
\[ Ax = \text{Assumed Mean of } X \text{ series} \]
\[ Ay = \text{Assumed Mean of } Y \text{ series} \]
\[ \sum d_x d_y = \sum (d_x d_y) \]
\[ \sum d^2_x = \sum (d_x)^2 \]

MULTIPLE REGRESSION

\[ Y' = a + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + \ldots + b_n X_n \]
\[ Y' = \text{A predicted value of } Y \]
\[ a = \text{The } Y \text{ intercept} \]
\[ b_1 = \text{The change in } Y \text{ for each increment change in } X_1 \]
\[ b_2 = \text{The change in } Y \text{ for each increment change in } X_2 \]
\[ X = \text{X score for which you are trying to predict a value} \]
PATH ANALYSIS

Path analysis with Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is a multivariate technique specifying relationship between observed (measured) variables. Multiple, related equations are solved simultaneously to determine parameter estimates. In order to evaluate model fit under path analysis, multiple tests (CFI, GFI, AGFI, RMSEA) are examined. It allows the researcher to recognize the imperfect nature of the undertaken measures and helps to explicitly specify error variance. Also, a graphical language provides a convenient and powerful way to present complex relationship between the variables under path analysis. A diagram, a pictorial representation of a model is transformed into a set of equations and the set of equations are solved immediately to test model fit and estimate parameters.

FIGURE 3.2
DIAGRAM SYMBOLS OF PATH ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V₁</td>
<td>Measured variable is denoted by a rectangle/square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Causal relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covariance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-V₁</td>
<td>Error associated with measured variables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOBEL TEST

Sobel test is used to examine the significance of a mediation effect. In the mediation effect, it is assumed that the independent variable has a significant indirect effect (through mediating variable) on the dependent variable. The mediation effect is said to be significant if the following conditions are achieved.
FIGURE 3.3
DIRECT EFFECT (a)

Independent variable (X) has a significant impact on mediating variable (M).

FIGURE 3.4
DIRECT EFFECT (c)

Independent variable (X) has a significant impact on the dependent variable (Y) in the absence of mediation variable (M).

FIGURE 3.5
DIRECT EFFECT (b)

Mediating variable (M) has a significant impact on dependent variable (Y).

FIGURE 3.6
MEDIATING MODEL
The impact of independent variable (X) on the dependent variable (Y) reduces significantly when mediating variable (M) is added to the model.

A simple mediation relationship exists when an independent variable (X) affects a dependent variable (Y) through mediator (M). Total effect of X on Y is represented by C and the direct effect on Y after introducing Mediator variable (M) is expressed as c’. Path a represents the effect of X on Y and path b represents the effect of M on Y controlling for the effect of X. The indirect effect between X and Y is defined as \( ab \). Generally, the indirect effect (\( ab \)) and c and c’. Therefore, the total effect can be calculated as a sum total of \( ab \) and c’ mediator. The estimates of c-c’ and the \( ab \) effect can be obtained from the estimates list in AMOS.

To set up a z test statistic, an estimate of the standard error of this ab product (SE\(^{ab}\)) is needed. Sobel (1982) provided the following approximate estimate for SE\(^{ab}\)

\[
SE_{ab} = \sqrt{\left(b^2 S_a^2\right) + \left(a^2 S_b^2\right)}
\]

Where,

\[ a \text{ and } b \] = Raw (unstandardized) regression coefficients that represent the effect of \( X_1 \) on \( X_2 \) and the effect of \( X_2 \) on \( Y \), respectively.

\[ S_a \] = Standard error of the \( a \) regression coefficient

\[ S_b \] = Standard error of the \( b \) regression coefficient

The indirect effect (ab) represent the difference between c and c’. Using the standard error (SE) as the divisor, the following z ratio for the Sobel (1982) test can be set up to test the mediation effect:

\[
z = c - c’ / SE_{ab}
\]
When, $z > 1.96$ the mediation value is still significant which symbolizes partial mediation. When, $z < 1.96$ mediation value is insignificant which symbolizes full mediation. The Sobel (1982) test is relatively conservative, and among the procedures reviewed by Fritz and MacKinnon (2007), it had moderately good statistical power.

**FIGURE 3.7**

**MEDIATING MODEL (FULL/PARTIAL)**

Reduced + Not Significant = Full Mediation

Reduced + Significant = Partial Mediation