Great attention has been paid to the importance of Psychological Capital, Social Anxiety, Attributions and variables related to it for success in any organization (Seligman & Schulman, 1986; Furnham, Sadka & Brewin, 1992; Furnham et al., 1994; Corr & Gray, 1995; Chung, 2002; Martinko et al., 2006; Welbourne, Eggerth, Hartley, Andrew, & Sanchez, 2007; Martinko et al., 2011). A variety of factors have been found to influence Psychological Capital, Social Anxiety and Attributions. A brief review of these factors is presented in the following sections:

**Psychological Capital and Attribution**

Researchers (Peterson, 1990) believe that attributional style helps to provide a better awareness of behaviors and consequences that affect one’s performance and actions. Individual differences in attributional style add to motivational, performance, and affective reactions to various life events (Anderson, Jennings, & Arnoult, 1988). Attributions have been studied in a wide variety of achievement settings including academic, athletic, and work settings whereas research in PsyCap is in its early years. There are no direct researches on the relationship among psychological capital and attributions. But the previous literature shows some evidence of relationship between attributions with the different components of Psychological capital (Hope, Efficacy, Resilience and Optimism).

**Hope and attributions:**

Hope has been conceptualized by Snyder and his colleagues (1996) as a journey which has need of a destination, a map and a means of transportation. They emphasized that this journey of hope “lives first and foremost in our minds”. Hopefulness is the product of the synergy between mental representation of goals, pathways to goals and mental
energy (Snyder et al., 1996). It is stated by Abramson and colleagues (1989), that attributions and expectations of negative occurrences are crucial to hopelessness. The stability dimensions of the Weiner’s framework (1985) have been linked to feelings of hopelessness (attributing losing to stable causes) and hopefulness (attributing winning to stable causes). A negative attributional style is characterized by a tendency to attribute negative events as being due to a characteristic of the individual while also attributing positive events to external causes (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978). A negative explanatory style has been found to be clearly correlated with a wide range of negative social and emotional outcomes including depression (e.g., Gladstone & Kaslow, 1995; Peterson & Seligman, 1984), low acceptance by peers (Ames, Ames, & Garrison, 1977), hopelessness, loneliness and social anxiety (Feldman, Davidson, & Margalit, 2014; Crick & Ladd, 1993). The hopelessness theory (Abramson, Metalsky, & Alloy, 1989) is a cognitive diathesis-stress model which stated that dysfunctional attributional style interacts with negative life events to produce hopelessness. In turn, low hope individuals exhibit a general predisposition to assume that negative life events are due to stable (i.e., enduring/not likely to change) and global (i.e., likely to affect many outcomes) causes (negative attributions) which lead in negative consequences, or imply negative characteristics about themselves (e.g., that they are deficient or unworthy). At workplace individuals with low hope believe that the causes of their problems will be around them forever and will ruin everything they attempt.

Needles and Abramson (1990) examined adolescents who exhibited low levels of hope i.e. hopelessness for 6 weeks. They proposed that positive life events would relate with functional attributional style (stable and global attributions for positive life events) to instigate the development of high levels of hope i.e. hopefulness, which may then lead
to a reduction in depression. The findings were consistent with this model, it was found that participants who displayed enhancing attributional style and experienced an increase in positive life events exhibited significantly restored hopefulness (i.e. reduction in hopelessness). Additionally, increased hopefulness resulted in the succeeding amelioration of depressive symptoms. Likewise, Edelman, Ahrens, and Haaga (1994) examined 94 college students and found that high levels of hope were related with interaction of enhancing attributional style and presence of positive events. Furthermore, Voelz, Haeffel, Joiner & Wagner (2003) observed that individuals displaying high degree of depressogenic attributional style and a low degree of enhancing attributional style reported the highest levels of hopelessness. On the other hand, individuals having a low degree of depressogenic attributional style and a high degree of enhancing attributional style reported lower levels of hopelessness.

Hopeless individuals have an expectation that highly desired outcomes will not occur or that aversive ones will occur (negative outcome expectancy), and that nothing is going to change things for the better (helplessness expectancy). The reformulated helplessness theory put forward that individuals who attribute negative life events to internal, stable, and global causes will be more vulnerable to depression than those who make external, unstable, and specific attributions. The tendency to attribute negative events to internal, stable, and global causes is viewed as a contributory cause of hopelessness. Various researchers (Alloy, Albright, Reilly, Fresco, & Whitehouse, 1996; Needles & Abramson, 1990) suggested that the individuals who tend to attribute positive events to stable and global causes, infer positive consequences, or positive characteristics about themselves when good events occur are especially likely to develop positive mood states in response to good
events. This further endows them with an opportunity to develop positive mood states and become more hopeful.

To promote hope and prevent hopelessness, cognitions of an individual need to be addressed. This can be done with the help of reattribution training. A number of researches (Abramson et al, 1989; Metalsky et al, 1982) show that depression, loneliness, shyness can be reduced with the help of RAT. One basic underlying aim of these therapists has been to instill hope in the participants. By way of changing an individual’s pattern of attribution, reattribution training aims to reduce negative reactions such as lack of motivation and a perceived state of learned helplessness. Thus, RAT can prove to be a useful technique in enhancing hope in subjects by altering their dysfunctional attributional style in functional attributional style.

**Self-efficacy and attributions:**

Self-efficacy is commonly defined as a person’s belief or perception of “how well one can execute courses of action required to deal with prospective situations” (Bandura, 1982). Applied to the workplace, it is defined by Stajkovic & Luthans (1998) as “one’s conviction (or confidence) about his or her abilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources or courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context”. Self-efficacy is a belief in one’s capability to perform chosen tasks; this belief influences one’s choice of activities, the degree of effort expended, and the persistence of effort (Bandura, 1986). Theoretical and empirical evidence suggests that self-efficacy serve as a powerful construct for predicting behavior and task performance (Barbeite & Weiss, 2004; Luszczynska, Scholz, & Schwarzer, 2005; Yin & Boyd, 2000). Low self-efficacy beliefs, unfortunately, obstruct
achievement and, in the long run, generate self fulfilling prophecies of failure and learned helplessness that can devastate future performance. Meta-analysis from various studies (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998a; Bandura, 2000; Bandura & Locke, 2003; Howard, 2008) depicts that self-efficacy has a strong positive relationship with work-related performance. Self-efficacy is closely bound up with an individual's capacity to identify the causes of his or her successes and failure (attributional style) (Tabassam & Grainger, 2002). Various researches (Klassen, 2002b; Rathus & Nevid, 1986) have revealed that self efficacy beliefs were related to attributions, because people who attributed success to internal, stable factors (e.g., ability) experienced greater self efficacy than people who attributed their success to external, unstable factors (e.g. luck).

The association between attributional analysis and self-efficacy is rooted on the assertion that causal attributions have been linked with attitudinal and behavioral changes (Andrews & Debus, 1978). Attributions have also been connected with responses such as persistence (Andrews & Debus, 1978). Self-efficacy is significantly related with how individuals attribute general outcomes (Bandura, 1977; Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2002). Individuals with low self efficacy tend to internalize locus of control over negative outcomes (attribute outcomes to character flaws), whereas individuals with high self-efficacy tend to externalize their rationale for negative outcomes (i.e., attribute outcomes to environmental factors; Bandura, 1977; Judge et al., 2002). Further, Bandura, (1997) found that locus of control mediate self-efficacy beliefs, the expenditure of effort toward goal attainment, and the motivation to endure the goal attainment process.
The first study was done by Schunk (1982) who found that effort attributions influenced self-efficacy. Later, Schunk and Cox (1986) found that students’ self-efficacy was related to effort-attributional feedback. The results of their study propounded that when students received effort-attributional feedback for problem-solving successes their level of self efficacy increased. Attributional variables represent a major influence on self-efficacy. Attributional theories hypothesize that people make causal ascriptions for the outcomes of their actions (Heider, 1958; Kelley, 1967). In achievement contexts, outcomes often are attributed to ability, effort, task difficulty, and luck (Frieze, 1980; Weiner, 1979; Weiner, Frieze, Kukla, Reed, Rest, & Rosenbaum, 1971).

Research (Martocchio & Dulebohn, 1994; Quinones, 1995) has demonstrated that attributions influence self-efficacy. Schunk and Ertmer (1999) took 44 students. They combined attribution and feedback and found that the attributional feedback on effort in the previous task improved self-efficacy expectancy and that the attributional feedback on ability had stronger influence on self-efficacy.

Results revealed that when a teacher told students that their performance was as a result of their talent or intelligence, they experienced considerably greater self-efficacy than their counterparts. Results also showed that such feedback strengthened perceived competency, internalized locus of control, and goal orientation by validating student attributions of success or failure (Schunk, 1982). Yet there is another study (Weiner & Graham, 1999) which suggested that attributional feedback not only comprise direct influence on conduct but also had stronger indirect impression on it by affecting self-efficacy. Furthermore, Silver, Mitchell, and Gist (1995) examined the relationship
between self-efficacy and attributions under both conditions of success and failure.

A research was done by Weiner's (2000) to examine how attribution influenced self efficacy. He found that lack of ability attribution to failure showed decrease in individual's sense of self efficacy and resulted in the lowering of the motivation level of subsequent behavior. The findings are consistent across cultures. Aiging and Qian (2002) found a significant interaction between self-efficacy and attributional feedback of ability among 146 Chinese students where as Narciss (2004) found that academic achievement depended on both self-efficacy of students and the type of feedback given to them among 168 German students. Recently, in Indian context, Jain and Srivastava (2007) investigated the effect of attributional feedback on self efficacy. The results revealed that improvement in self efficacy judgments was significantly more for attributional feedback conditions as compared to no attributional feedback conditions. While comparing different feedback conditions, it was found that the effort feedback affected the self efficacy judgments most positively; ability feedback was second, and ability + effort was in the third position. Yoau-Chau and Hsin-hua (2009) conducted a study and found that individuals who internalized feelings of personal reward for their contribution to group success reported higher levels of self-efficacy, and afterward demonstrated higher technical proficiencies and a greater likelihood of establishing more challenging goals than individuals with lower self efficacy.

Consequently, in an organization employees with low level of self efficacy do not believe in themselves to take up tasks. There is a need to enhance there their level of efficacy which can be done with the help of attributional feedback. Various studies support that by providing reattribution training, the efficacy level can be enhanced. For instance,
Cole and Chan, (1990) used attribution retraining to enhance self efficacy beliefs of subjects with low self efficacy. It was shown that by changing attribution patterns, self efficacy was enhanced. More specifically the author tried to reduce internal attributions for failure, which resulted in higher levels of efficacy. He used reattribution training to train individuals to attribute success to internal, unstable factors, like effort, rather than external, unstable factors like luck, or internal stable factors like ability, which resulted in increased levels of self efficacy.

Resiliency and attributions:

Resilience refers to one’s ability to endure exceptional stresses and demands (Howard, 2008). When beset by problems and adversity sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond to attain success is called resiliency. Applied to the workplace, Luthans (2002) defines PsyCap resilience as “the developable capacity to rebound or bounce back from adversity, uncertainty, conflict, failure, or even positive events, progress, and increased responsibility.” Weiner (1985) proposed that causal attributions shape our perceptions, understanding, emotional reactions, and behavior regarding our experiences as well as attributions play an active role in overcoming adverse experiences (Janoff-Bulman, 1992). Therefore, causal attributions play an important role in resiliency processes (Weiner, 1985; Betancourt, 1990; Krieglmeyer, Wittstadt, & Strack, 2009).

There is evidence that causal attributions are related to various factors under the cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains of resiliency. Causal attributions are cognitive in nature, providing cognitive rationales of past events. Causal attributions are often used to modify people’s understanding of events and beliefs about the world. This is somewhat analogous to the coherence-generating function of cognitive
self-regulatory processes in resiliency as both factors work to generate a coherent understanding of oneself and the world according to interpretations of context (King & Rothstein, 2010). Furthermore, as first proposed by Weiner (1985), causal attributions have been demonstrated to influence our emotions and thoughts about others via these cognitive processes (Krieglmeier, Wittstadt, & Strack, 2009; Betancourt, 1990). This is similar to the emotion-regulating function of affective self-regulatory processes in the King-Rothstein (2010) model of resiliency, as both constructs are associated with the generation of positive (constructive) or negative (unconstructive) emotions due to either high or low levels of resiliency or having protective or vulnerable attributional styles respectively (McLarnon & Rothstein, 2013; Betancourt, 1990).

Garmezy (1974) stated that individuals with high levels of resilience reported high expectations, self-efficacy, internal locus of control, self-esteem and autonomy regardless of disadvantages. On the other hand, Non-resilient individuals were not able to cope from stressful events due to which were more likely to suffer from depression. Sweeny, Anderson & Bailey (1986) stated that level of depression increased when an individual attributed bad events to internal, stable and global causes. Schulman, Seligman and Amsterdam (1987) revealed in their study that non-resilient individuals displayed a classic pattern of depressive attributional style which involved an individual explaining their negative outcomes (failure) as internal (one's own fault) versus external (the environment’s fault); as stable (unchanging) versus unstable (variable); and as global (happening all the time across all situations) versus specific (happening one time in a specific situation). Conversely, resilient individuals showed an optimistic attributional style i.e. tendency to interpret negative outcomes (failure) as due to external, unstable, and specific factors (Peterson & Seligman, 1984).
In order to boost resilience, attention should be paid on how to increase constructive thought, perceived control and success under adversity (Seligman, 1991; Gillham et.al., 2000). Several researches (Seligman, Revich, Jaycox & Gillham, 1995; Seligman, 1998) have endorsed that resilience can be enhanced through a change in explanatory style which can be done with the help of Reattribution training. Fosterling (1985) stated that RAT helps to develop resilience in order to foster expectation of future regulatory abilities to those with debilitating thought patterns.

**Optimism and attributions:**

Luthans (2002a) asserted that optimism as a component of Psychological capital is related with a positive outlook or attribution of events, including positive emotions and motivation. Drawing from attribution theory, Seligman (1998) defined that optimistic individuals are those who make internal, stable, and global attributions regarding positive events (e.g., task accomplishment) and attribute external, unstable, and specific reasons for negative events (e.g., a missed deadline). On the similar lines, researches (Abramson, Seligman, Te Asdale, 1978; Scheier & Carver, 1987; Taylor & Brown, 1988; Dougall, Hyman, Hayward, McFeeley, & Baum, 2001; Ruthing et.al, 2004) have shown that optimistic individuals depict functional attributional style in which they are likely to attribute negative events to external causes such as bad luck, at the same time as explaining positive outcomes in terms of internal causes such as effort. As a result, they experienced less traumatic stress and increased motivation as well as physical and psychological well-being.

Carr (2004) stated in his study that individuals high on optimism attributed successful events with pervasiveness, stability and internality
and unsuccessful events as temporary, non-pervasive and due to causes of self. They exhibited positive reframing and problem solving behaviors. In contrast, individuals low on optimism focused more on negative information and showed passivity, defiance and avoidance.

Seligman & Schulman (1986) carried out a study on life insurance sales agents to study the relationship between optimism and attributional style. Results of the study revealed that employees with functional attributional style were highly optimistic. They stayed at the company for longer duration and sold more insurance policies than their pessimistic counterparts. Thus, employees with optimism showed a tendency towards goal commitment, where the aim was to achieve the end result (Zhang, Fishbach & Dhar, 2007) and they based their decisions on prior experiences well as accessible information to make swift efficient decisions (Hmieleski, 2007).

Various researches (Peterson, Semmel, von Baeyer, Abramson, Metalsky, & Seligman, 1982; Rettew & Reivich, 1995) have been done in the area of sports such as swimming, soccer, and baseball to study optimism, attributional style and performance. More particularly, Seligman, Nolen-Hoeksema, Thornton, and Thornton (1990) administered the Attributional Style Questionnaire to UC-Berkley swimmers. They gave swimmers the false time for completing their swim which led them to believe they swam slower than their actual performance. The swimmers were next asked to repeat the event. The results showed that swimmers who were high on optimism used the negative feedback to encourage their actions and swim significantly faster on their second trial, whereas the swimmers low on optimism used the negative feedback to further reduce their actions, resulting in slower times.
Gordon and Kane (2001) conducted a study analyzing optimism and performance in the game of soccer at team level. A total of eight games were videotaped and coded for analysis. The data revealed a highly significant positive relationship between optimism (ASQ scores) and performance. The findings revealed that the performance of pessimistic soccer players varied as a function of the teams’ performance (i.e., when the team was winning these players performed well, but their performance was worse in losing matches). However, there was little variability among the players high on optimism (they performed at a high level across both wins and losses. Thus, people with an optimistic attributional style not only try harder, but actually enhancing their performance after receiving negative feedback.

Findings of different researches (Ruthing et.al, 2004; Abramson, Seligman, Te Asdale, 1978; Gillham, Shatte, Reivich, & Seligman, 2000) claim that Reattributional Training is successful in replacing dysfunctional attributions with functional attributions. It helps to substitute the dysfunctional attributional style of pessimistic individuals with functional attributional style which helps them to become high on optimism. It helps to enhance problem solving skills which make possible them to make accurate attributions.

In this manner, it can be said that each component of psychological capital with overall PsyCap is developable (Luthans, Avey, Avolio, Norman, & Combs, 2006; Luthans et al., 2010; Luthans, Avey, & Patera, 2008; Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). Previous studies state that all these components can be developed with the help of various interventions (e.g. for efficacy, Bandura 1997; Hope, Snyder 2002; Resilience, Masten & Reed, 2002; Optimism, Seligman, 1998). These developmental components create positive expectancies which trigger the
creation of goals with an approach orientation and motivate self regulatory mechanisms that increase the probability of perseverance and success in particular, situation (Avey, Luthans & Youssef, 2010). RAT is one effective intervention which can enhance psychological capital and its all components. The key aim of reattribution training is to substitute maladaptive self-defeating attributions with more adaptive, self-helping attributions and helping individuals to emphasize favorable aspects of situations, actions, and events while believing in the best possible outcomes in the future.

**Psychological Capital and other variables related to it**

Prior research has suggested that PsyCap is positively associated to desirable employee behaviors and negatively related to undesirable employee behaviors at workplace. According to Luthans and colleagues (2005) a primary explanatory mechanism for the effect of PsyCap on employee behaviors is that those higher in PsyCap anticipate good things to happen at work (optimism), consider they create their own success (efficacy and hope), and are more unreceptive to setbacks (resilience) when compared with those lower in PsyCap. A number of variables have been studied in relation to PsyCap. A brief review of some variables is given below:

**Performance:** Employee performance has been the most investigated outcome variable in research on PsyCap. The positive relationship between performance and psychological capital is described by suggesting that when the four components namely, hope, efficacy, resilience and optimism, combine to form an individual’s level of psychological capital, they activate a system inside a person which is considered to be significant to goal accomplishment, success, motivation
and results in higher performance (Hobfoll, 2002; Stajkovic, 2006). Similarly, it is suggested by Fredrickson (2001) in her broaden-and-build theory of individual potential that higher levels of positivity will play an important role to maintain higher levels of individual motivation and performance. Fredrickson makes this assertion on the basis of the postulation that higher levels of positivity can ‘build’ an individual’s intellectual, social, physical, and psychological resources to assist them cope with numerous challenges in situations faced at workplace, in this manner enhancing their performance. Psycap has been studied with numerous types of performance (creative tasks, referrals, sales, quality and quantity of manufacturing, supervisor rated) and various sample characteristics (cross-sectional, manufacturing, service, and the highly educated).

Various researches (Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Li, 2005; Luthans, Avey, Clapp-Smith & Li, 2008) have been conducted on Chinese population to study PsyCap and work performance. Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Li (2005) conducted an exploratory study within the context of three factories (two private and one state-owned) in the People’s Republic of China (N = 422) with an aim to examine the relationship of Chinese workers’ psychological capital states and their performance. An analysis of workers in one of the factories (N =272) showed a significant relationship between their psychological capital and the performance outcome. Findings of the complete study revealed that the workers’ positive states of hope, optimism, and resiliency, separately as well as when the three were merged into a core construct of psychological capital, showed significant correlation with their performance, as rated by their supervisors and merit salary increases (Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Li, 2005). Similarly, Luthans, Avey, Clapp-Smith & Li (2008) surveyed 456 workers from two copper refining
firms in China. The technological process and demographics of the two factories were not significantly different; therefore they were combined into one sample. Out of the 456 participants, there were 367 males and 86 females (three individuals did not indicate gender) with average age 39.8 years and average work experience of 9.42 years. Results indicated that the workers’ PsyCap, education and tenure were all significantly related to manager rated performance as well as regression analysis showed that PsyCap predicted performance above and beyond the demographic variables.

Empirical evidence showed that levels of hope, optimism, and resilience showed about the same levels of performance outcomes separately. However, the combination of these four components indicated the shared mechanisms between them which showed a higher relationship with rated performance than any one of them individually. To investigate this, two studies were conducted by Luthans, Avolio, Avey & Norman (2007). Study 1 comprised of three samples of management students. Results of the study provided psychometric support for a new survey measure which was designed to assess each of these 4 components, as well as a composite factor. Study 2 comprised of two separate samples of employees. Results of the 2nd study indicated a significant positive relationship regarding the composite of the 4 components with performance. Results also indicated that the composite factor proved to be a better predictor of performance than the 4 individual components.

Utilizing three diverse samples, Luthans, Norman, Avolio & Avey (2008) investigated whether the core construct of psychological capital (consisting of hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism) plays a role in mediating the effects of a supportive organizational climate with employee outcomes. Results of their study depicted that employees’
psychological capital was significantly positively related to their performance. Across two heterogeneous samples i.e., sample 1 \((r = .25, p < .01)\) and sample 3 \((r = .25, p < .01)\), psychological capital was found to be positively related to performance. The results also stated that employees’ psychological capital is an important mediating link between supportive climate and employee performance. Employees who realized the organizational climate to be more supportive were more likely to have higher levels of PsyCap which certainly influenced their performance positively in both service and high-tech manufacturing.

Similarly, another study was done by Norman, Avey, Nimnicht & Pigeon (2010). They collected multi-method data from two field samples. Sample one was from banking firm. Findings depicted that PsyCap was positively related to manager rated performance \((r = .34, p < .01)\) stronger than for referrals \((r = .13, p < .01)\) although both relations were significant. Study 2 sample comprised of 109 franchisees. In this PsyCap was found to be positively related to manager rated performance \((r = .23, p < .05)\) as well as to sales performance \((r = .24, p < .01)\). Results from these two field studies indicated that psychological capital (hope, resilience, self-efficacy and optimism) was associated with higher levels of manager rated performance, customer referrals (as an objective performance criterion) and sales performance. More particularly, employees who reported higher levels of PsyCap were later rated by their managers as representing higher in role performance. Recently, Plessis and Barkhuizen (2012) studied Psychological Capital and performance in South Africa \((N=131)\). This exploratory research revealed that South African Human Resource practitioners and managers embraced psychological capital to successfully generate caring workplaces by understanding the broader economic and social issues which affected employees and their performance.
Apart from employees of different organizations, the relationship between PsyCap and performance has been studied in police personnel also. The researchers (Walumbwa, Peterson, Avolio & Hartnell, 2010) used a sample of 79 police leaders and their direct reports (264 police followers), to investigate the relationships of leader and follower psychological capital, service climate, and job performance. In line with previous theoretical framework (Avolio & Luthans, 2006), findings revealed that leader psychological capital was positively connected to follower performance. Moreover this relationship was mediated by follower psychological capital. Furthermore, the follower psychological capital performance relationship was found to be moderated by service climate such that the association was stronger when service climate was observed to be high opposed to low. Followers’ psychological capital impacted their job performance to a greater amount when service climate was more positive.

A Meta analysis was done by Avey, Reichard, Luthans, & Mhatre (2011) which included 51 independent samples (corresponding to a total of N = 12,567 employees). Results of the Meta analysis indicated significant positive relationships between PsyCap and multiple measures of performance (self, supervisor evaluations, and objective). In each case, the components of PsyCap acted as individual motivational predispositions and effort was made to succeed which resulted in increasing performance output.

It can be said on the basis of aforementioned studies that PsyCap is a significant predictor of performance. Individuals higher in PsyCap are likely to put forth effort which marks higher performance over extended periods of time. This happens because those higher in efficacy employ effort toward goals. Further, they hold willpower and produce multiple solutions to problems (hope), form internal attributions and
maintain positive expectations about results (optimism), and react positively and persist in the face of setbacks and adversity (resilience). Overall, higher PsyCap facilitates the motivational behaviors toward successfully achieving goals and tasks which leads to better performance.

**Creativity:** Creative ideas act as the base for innovations in organizations (Woodman, Sawyer, & Griffin, 1993; Scott & Bruce, 1994; Amabile, et al., 1996), which are obligatory for nearly all jobs (Shalley, Gilson, & Blum, 2000; Shalley & Gilson, 2004), for all types of organizations (Damanpour, 1991) and at last are imperative for stable organizational performance and effectiveness (Nonaka, 1991; Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Several studies have displayed the significance of creativity in organizations to gain competitive advantage (Amabile, 1996; Argyris & Schon, 1978; Nonaka, 1991; Oldham, 2002; McAdam & Keogh, 2004) and stated that lack of creativity on all levels can gravely destabilize an organization’s competitiveness (House, 2003). In addition, organizations need creative people to guarantee their competitive positions in the market (Kanter, 1988). Creativity has an extensive literature, much of which has explored individual predictors of creativity. Certain personality factors such as innovativeness (Flynn & Goldsmith, 1993), creative self-efficacy (Tierney, & Farmer, 2002), extraversion (Furnham, & Bachtiar, 2008) openness to experience (Feist, 1998, 1999; Furnham, & Bachtiar, 2008; George, & Zhou, 2001), emotional creativity (Averill, 1999) and positive affect (Isen, Daubman & Nowickia, 1987) have been found to be related to creative behaviors at the workplace. Few attempts have been made to explore the relationship between components of psychological capital and creativity or innovation related outcomes. For example, Tierney, & Farmer, (2002) inspected the connection between efficacy and creative performance.
Likewise, Rego, Machado, Leal, & Cunha, (2009) examined the relationship between hope and creativity. Rego, Sousa, Marques, & Cunha (2011) looked into the association between optimism and creativity. In the same way, Babalola (2009) assessed the influence of two components of psychological capital on women entrepreneurs’ innovative behavior. She selected 405 women business owners in service cum product sector in Ibadan, Nigeria. This category encompassed of women designers, interior decorators, and producer and decorator of bridal materials, school proprietors and fashion designers. The findings of the study indicated that women having high self-efficacy and internal locus of control scored higher on entrepreneurial innovative behavior than women having low self-efficacy and external locus of control. According to Gist (1989), those with a strong internal locus of control have a tendency to see opportunities to expand their skills and have the confidence to try new methods and technologies. The results also led weight to Wood and Bandura, (1989) statement that high self efficacy expectations concerning performance in a particular behavioral setting lead individuals to approach a situation in an innovative manner.

Sweetman, Luthans, Avey, & Luthans, (2010) used a heterogeneous sample (N = 899) of working adults to examine the relationship between adults’ specific positive psychological resources (i.e., efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience) and their overall level of psychological capital with their performance in a creative exercise. The results of the study showed PsyCap and each of its components (i.e., efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience) related positively to creative performance and that overall PsyCap predicted creative performance over and above each of the four PsyCap components. Findings evidently support the assertion that high PsyCap individuals were more likely to show signs of creative or innovative behaviors at the workplace, than
their low PsyCap counterparts. High PsyCap individuals showed a built-in tendency to creatively develop numerous ways to complete their goals and devote their efforts in generating, promoting, and realizing job-related creative or innovative behaviors. Efficacy is a generative ability that influences performance with the use of inventiveness and resourcefulness (Bandura, 1986). In other words, higher levels of efficacy are related with increased creative performance (Amabile, 1996; Tierney & Farmer, 2002). Hopeful individuals are usually independent thinkers and highly self-governing (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007) because they have high willpower (taking motivated action) and high way power (generating alternative pathways) which further helps them to generate pathways into the mental strategies of creative problem solving and in turn increase their potential for creative performance (Snyder, Irving, and Anderson, 1991; Snyder, 1994; Amabile, 1996). Individuals with an optimistic explanatory style have a feeling that they are in control of their destiny; it produces a self-fulfilling prophecy wherein positive explanations become reality (Peterson & Chang, 2002). Creativity requires a persistent internal force to move ahead of the challenges and setbacks inbuilt in creative work, as well as to become accustomed to a changing environment in general (Amabile, 1983; Cameron, 2008; Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). Resilience may provide the needed mechanism by which one can persist in the face of challenges (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007).

Several other researches (Avey, Wernsing, & Luthans, 2008; Luthans et al., 2007; Abbas & Raja, 2011) have investigated the relationship between psychological capital and innovative behavior on diverse samples. The findings are in line with the previous researches that psychological capital was found to be positively related to innovative job performance. Individuals with high levels of PsyCap were rated as
showing more innovative behaviors, by their supervisors, than individuals with low levels of PsyCap. Results revealed that high PsyCap individuals, due to their natural propensity towards exhibiting innovative behaviors, took initiatives in initiation, endorsement, and comprehension of new ideas at their workplace.

Thus, taken together each of the four components of PsyCap is found to be positively related to creativity. These four resources help employees to successfully build and put into practice creative ideas at their workplace by expanding the options they perceive, and assisting them to put on efforts to attain goals. Therefore, they are able to build up new path ways (hope) to accomplish their goals with the confidence (efficacy) required to be successful at desired goals through these alternative paths, possess positive attribution and outlook for future (optimism) and are capable to bounce back from setbacks (resilience) in case of any complexity or failure that may take place due to implementing innovative ideas.

**Organizational commitment and Job Satisfaction:** Organizational commitment has been defined by Bateman and Strasser (1984) as employee’s loyalty to the organization, keenness to attempt in support of the organization, extent of goal and value importance with the organization, and wish to uphold membership. In simple terms, Mowday and colleagues (1982) stated that organizational commitment is the strength of an employee’s identification with, and involvement in, a certain organization. Organizational commitment is a desirable employee attitude. Few studies have investigated the relationship between psychological capital and organizational commitment (Youssef & Luthans, 2007; Luthans et al, 2008; Avey et al., 2009). PsyCap, as indicated by Luthans et al. (2004) is ahead of economic, human and social capital. As proposed by them, Larson and Luthans (2006) found
that PsyCap significantly increased the amount of variance in satisfaction and commitment, and that too beyond human and social capital. The hope levels of production workers in a small Midwestern factory were linked to their organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Larson & Luthans, 2006). Using a sample of 74 manufacturing employees, they found a significant relationship between PsyCap and job satisfaction \((r=.373)\) and organization commitment \((r=.313)\).

Two studies were carried out by Luthans, Avolio, Avey & Norman (2007) to examine how hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism independently and as a composite higher-order factor helps to predict satisfaction at the workplace. Results from both the studies indicated a significant positive relationship between PsyCap and job satisfaction. PsyCap has also been proved to be a better predictor of satisfaction than its four dimensions individually.

Correspondingly, Shahnawaz & Jafri (2009) explored how psychological capital has some bearing on organizational commitment in public and private organizations. The sample encompassed 160 junior and middle level managers, 80 each from two organizations with mean age 30.25 years and the mean experience 5.6 years. Results clearly revealed that except the resiliency all the three dimensions of psychological capital were significantly different from each other in the two organizations. Self efficacy was perceived more by the employees of public sector than the employees of private sector. Hope & Optimism were reported more in the private as compared to public sector organization. The results from the multiple regression revealed that psychological capital added to 6% variance in commitment in public sector and 9% variance among commitment of employees in private sector.
Çetin (2011) surveyed 213 employees (120 females and 93 males) with a purpose to discover the relation of sub dimensions of the psychological capital with organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The results showed that significant positive relationship was seen among organizational commitment and two dimensions of the psychological capital, i.e., hope and optimism. On the other hand, job satisfaction had positive relationship with three dimensions of the psychological capital (hope, resilience and optimism).

Likewise, in a trade organization in Iran, Etebarian, Tavakoli & Abzari (2012) conducted a survey to determine the relationship between psychological capital and organizational commitment of employees (n = 132). The results showed that organizational commitment and hope correlated positively but organizational commitment had a negative relation with resiliency. No significant relationship was found between optimism and self-efficacy with organizational commitment. Further among the three dimensions of organizational commitment, (affective commitment, continuous commitment and normative commitment) only affective commitment showed a significant positive relationship with psychological capital while no significant relationship was found among other dimensions of organizational commitment (continuous commitment, normative commitment) and psychological capital. Regression analysis demonstrated that only hope & resiliency were able to predict organizational commitment.

From all the studies in this context, it can be concluded that psychological capital acts as a significant predictor of organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Employees with high levels of psychological capital (self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resiliency) are
found to be more satisfied and committed to their organization by the virtue of their cognitions, motivations and behaviors.

**Leadership:** In the literature, the relationship of Psychological capital has been seen with two types of leadership, namely, authentic leadership and transformational leadership.

**Authentic Leadership:** Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, (2008) described Authentic leadership as “a pattern of leader behavior that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater self awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development”. Various studies throw light on the relationship between authentic leadership and PsyCap. Walumbwa, Luthans, Avey, & Oke, (2009) conducted a study on several groups from a large financial institution, to examine the role played by collective psychological capital and trust in the relationship between authentic leadership and work groups’ desired outcomes. The results pointed to a significant relationship between both their collective psychological capital and trust with their group level performance and OCB. It was found that authentic leadership of group’s supervisor influenced their group’s performance and citizenship behavior through their collective psychological capital and group trust. It was because of the collective positive psychological capacities of the followers and the trust among them for their leader, the effect of authentic leadership got translated into the performance of the group and OCB. In the similar vein, Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang & Avey (2009) investigated the relationship between authentic leadership, trust, psychological capital, and performance at the group level of a small Midwestern chain of retail clothing stores. Results
showed that trust in management mediated the relationship between performance and PsyCap and partially mediated the relationship between authentic leadership and performance. Wooley, Caza, and Levy (2010) also found a positive relationship between authentic leadership and followers’ psychological capital which was partially mediated by positive work climate, bringing about that authentic leader can sway their follower’s PsyCap provided they perceived a positive work climate. In Iranian context, Zamahani, Ghorbani & Rezaei (2011) studied the impact of authentic leadership and psychological capital on followers’ trust and performance. The findings revealed a direct positive relationship between leaders’ authenticity and psychological capital and subordinates’ trust and performance. Higher level of leaders’ authenticity and positivity amplified their followers’ trust and performance.

Thus, higher levels of psychological capital make leaders to have a more optimistic view of themselves and the world around them. They do not avoid responsibility and involve in procrastination of major decisions. As well as these leaders yield a positive influence on followers’ effort and performance.

Transformational Leadership: According to Bass (1985), transformational leaders inspire their followers to look beyond their self-interests and give them a collective vision that helps them to perform at higher levels. Previous research indicated that transformational leadership positively and significantly related to various work outcomes such as performance and job satisfaction. Gooty, Gavin, Johnson, Frazier, & Snow, (2009) found that follower’s PsyCap fully mediated the connection between their perception of leader’s transformational leadership and their in-role performance. Specifically, follower’s got encouraged by their leader’s transformational leadership due to their positive psychological capacities and based on their strength of perception and their level of PsyCap; they
showed signs of positive work behaviors. Ismail, Khurram, Hussain & Jafri (2011) collected data from 149 respondents in Pakistan. Results of their study showed that most of the employees with high levels of perceptions for transformational leader were stronger in terms of their psychological capacities of hope, efficacy, resilience and optimism, than their counterparts. Findings also revealed that intents to leave among the employees of Pakistan might be reduced by developing their psychological capital by means of motivational capacity of transformational leadership.

In this manner it can be said that the positive attitude and behavior of leaders has an effective impact on how the followers act in the organization. The findings shed light on the importance of psychological capital and transformational leadership for creating trust on followers and reducing their intentions to leave the organization.

**Employee Engagement:** Employee Engagement is an individual’s involvement, satisfaction and enthusiasm for work (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002). According to Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova, (2006), Engagement is viewed as, “a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption.” Little attention has been paid on PsyCap and engagement but it is noted that employee’s PsyCap has been found to be significantly related to engagement by means of their positive emotions (Avey et al., 2008), which states that the positive resources of employees (PsyCap and positive emotions) are linked with the desired attitude of engagement at workplace. Sweetman & Luthans (2010) anticipated that Psychological Capital would be positively associated to work engagement. Their proposition was based on Job Demands- Resource model (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001) which proposed that job &
personal resources would interact with job demands to predict work engagement. Hodges (2010) in the same year gave an important finding that had not been established before. He subjected his sample into 2 groups, namely, treatment and control group and PsyCap micro-intervention was delivered to managers in treatment group. He found that PsyCap had a direct positive relationship with employee engagement. The relation of these variables have been studied in South African Context also, where Herbert (2011) conducted an exploratory survey study to explore the relationships between Burnout, Employee Engagement, Occupational stress and Psychological Capital on employees (N=209) of a construction company. Occupational Stress and Burnout were found to be negatively related to Employee Engagement. The results further exposed that higher levels of PsyCap was related to higher Engagement levels. Furthermore, two dimensions of PsyCap (Optimism and Self-efficacy) emerged as the strongest predictors of Employee Engagement.

To conclude, the presence of higher PsyCap lead to increased engagement among employees which in turn lowers the level of various negative outcomes at workplace such as stress, burnout and turnover. It helps the employees to maintain a positive attitude in the workplace and contribute more.

**Psychological Well-Being:** The relationship of PsyCap with psychological well-being has been researched only lately. The term, Psychological Well-being (PWB) is generally defined by researchers (Gechman & Weiner, 1975; Martin, 1984; Wright & Cropanzano, 2000) as the overall effectiveness of an individual’s psychological functioning. Avey, Luthans, Smith, and Palmer (2010) recognized that eventually PsyCap added small but noteworthy variance in Psychological Well-being.
They analyzed the relationship between level of PsyCap of a broad cross-section of employees’ (N = 280) and two measures of psychological well-being in due course. Findings indicated that employees’ PsyCap was connected to both measures of well-being.

Well-being can be differentiated into hedonic and eudaimonic wellbeing (Ryff & Keyes, 1995; Ryan & Deci, 2001). Hedonic wellbeing consists of subjective happiness and the experience of pleasure (Ryan & Deci, 2001), though eudaimonic well-being is more cognition-based (Waterman, 2008) and focuses on striving for self-realization. Culbertson, Fullagar, & Mills (2010) examined the relationship between employee’s eudaimonic and hedonic well-being and psychological capital. Results indicated that variance in eudaimonic well-being was predicted by psychological capital, which meant that self-realization was dependent upon psychological capital. Two weeks later, relation was measured between psychological capital and hedonic well-being, which was mediated by eudaimonic well-being. Results revealed that employee’s positive PsyCap attached with their self-realization directed to subjective happiness.

In India, Singh and Mansi (2009) conducted study on a sample 250 students and stated in the findings that Self-efficacy, optimism and Locus of Control have an effect on the well being in a meaning full way. They declared psychological capital as a significant predictor of psychological well being. On the similar lines, Rahimniaa, Mazidib & Mohammadzadeh (2013) investigated multiple factors which influenced social, emotional, and psychological well-being among nurses (N=296). Results demonstrated that nurses' with high levels of psychological capital showed an increase in their constructive emotions, decrease in their destructive emotions and eventually leading to a higher level of well-being.
These findings contributed that the psychological capital helps in maintaining the higher levels of psychological wellbeing by enhancing constructive emotions because psychological wellbeing is marked by the presence of positive affect and the absence of negative affect. The presence of higher hope, efficacy, resilience and optimism in an employee serve as a reservoir from which they can draw from to influence their wellbeing.

**Quality of life:** Quality of work life (QWL) has been documented in the literature as a multi-dimensional construct. It is defined as "a course by which an organization responds to employee needs by developing mechanisms to allow them to share fully in making the decisions that design their lives at work" (Robbins, 1989). Literature has suggested that the key elements of QWL consist of better reward system, job satisfaction, employee benefits, job security, employee involvement and organizational performance (Havlovic, 1991). Research shows a positive relationship between PsyCap and job performance (Luthans et al., 2008; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998; Legal & Meyer, 2009; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). However, there is little empirical evidence on the relationships among PsyCap and QWL. Mortazavi and his colleagues (2012) did a cross-section survey to assess the impact of PsyCap on quality of work life in health organizations i.e., hospitals. The sample comprised of 207 nurses of four hospitals (two private and two public hospitals). Results pointed out that PsyCap played a vital role for the enrichment of QWL in organizations such as hospital. Findings revealed that higher levels of PsyCap in framework of its dimensions (e.g. self-efficacy, hope, and resilience) and in totality indicated an increase in needs of continued existence, belonging and knowledge (i.e. QWL) which consequently improved their performance in workplace.
Citizenship and Deviance Behaviors: Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) refers to those desirable behaviors which are not set by or enforced in the existing job role but may be accomplished by individual employee on his own will. Opposing the positive OCBs are the negatively oriented CWBs (counterproductive work behaviors) which are defined as “voluntary behaviors that violate significant organizational norms, and in doing so threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both” (Bennett & Robinson, 2000).

Avey, Luthans & Youssef (2010) conducted a study on 336 employees from a wide cross section of organizations and jobs to see the effect of Psychological Capital on citizenship and deviance behaviors. It was inferred from the findings that PsyCap was positively related to OCBs, which meant that employees higher in PsyCap were more likely to take on highly desirable extra role behaviors that proved to be beneficial to their organizations. Results also revealed that employees with higher levels of PsyCap engaged in not only more desirable behaviors (OCBs) but also fewer undesirable behaviors (CWBs). They also suggested that the composite PsyCap had higher positive effects than the individual dimensions (hope, self efficacy, resilience, and optimism) when related to desirable employee behaviors. This finding is supported by Fredrickson’s (2003) model which states that when people experience positive emotions, they use broader thought–action repertoires, which increases the potential for extra role behaviors.

In the United States, Norman, Avey, Nimnicht & Graber-Pigeon (2010) studied 199 working adults to examine the relationship between psychological capital and organizational identity on employee deviance and organizational citizenship behaviors from a cross section of organizations. It was found that organizational identity moderate the relationship between psychological capital (PsyCap) and both employee
deviance and organizational citizenship behaviors. It was inferred that employees high in psychological capital identified strongly with their organizations and were likely to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors and at the same time least likely to engage in deviance behaviors. A Meta analysis was done by Avey, Reichard, Luthans, & Mhatre (2011) which included 51 independent samples (corresponding to a total of N = 12,567 employees). Results of the Meta analysis indicated a positive relationship between Psychological Capital and desirable employee behaviors (OCB) and a negative relationship between Psychological Capital and undesirable employee behaviors (CWB).

As a result, it can be inferred that rather than responding to negative events with CWBs, higher PsyCap individuals react by positively adjusting to the circumstances and becoming successful and show signs of fewer CWBs. Additionally, it is also observed that high PsyCap people when exposed to stressful events remain optimistic and maintain a belief that the situation will improve. They make plans and pathways to alter the situation for the better (Snyder et al., 2000), and feel efficacious in their own capacities to persist in the situation and keep on being successful regardless of the adversity (Bandura, 1997).

**Stress:** Massive research has focused on recognizing various stressors (Colligan & Higgins, 2006), coping mechanisms, (Nelson & Sutton, 1990) and means by which individuals and organizations can manage workplace stress (Kram & Hall, 1989). Stressful work environments lead to a variety of health problems, increased accidents, and burnout (Bernard & Krupat, 1994; Maudgalya et al., 2006); reduced levels of employee performance (Jamal, 1990); less organizational effectiveness (Motowildo et al., 1986) and towering organizational health care costs (Manning, et al., 1996). There are very few researches stating the effect of
PsyCap on stress. Avey, Luthans, and Jensen (2009) found that individuals with lower levels of PsyCap were more prone to perception of stress symptoms, thus leading to intentions to quit and job search behavior. They conducted a survey on a heterogeneous sample of 416 working adults (males=203, females=204, 9 did not list their gender) from a wide variety of jobs and industries. The results showed a significant negative relationship between psychological capital and stress symptoms ($\beta = -.35; p < .01$) which indicated that psychological capital helped employees to combat the dysfunctional effects of stress in their workplace. In the similar fashion, Abbas & Raja (2011) studied a sample of 237 employees, from a range of organizations in Pakistan to investigate the effects of psychological capital on job stress. Findings revealed that individuals with high psychological capital reported lower levels of job stress as compared to their low PsyCap counterparts.

It has been identified that psychological capital may work as a key cognitive resource to better understand how employees respond to stressors in the workplace. Jensen (2008) studied psychological capital and entrepreneurial stress. She provided theoretical background of psychological capital and proposed its linkages with stress at workplace. She stated that PsyCap is of malleable nature which can be changed to strengthen employees from the effects of stress. It could help them to fight with the stress levels.

Thus, as a whole, high PsyCap individuals fight with stress at workplace by maintaining positive outlook for future and possessing the cognitive capacity of self-regulation (Bandura, 1997) that impart initiative, and self-discipline which is necessary to reach goals (Luthans & Youssef, 2007) and fight with job stress. Thus, employees with higher levels of PsyCap are less vulnerable to the negative pressure of stressors and are more resilient to failures, stressful events, stressors, and
setbacks (Masten & Reed, 2002) and do not go through the negative consequences as strongly.

**Burnout:** Burnout explains a state of physical, emotional and mental exhaustion that takes place after continuing exposure to circumstances that are emotionally challenging. According to Zapf (2002) abundant pioneers of Burnout have been recognized in various studies and contexts. It was found in a meta-analysis (Lee & Ashforth, 1996) that role stress, role conflict, and workload, can be stated as the best predictors of Burnout. However, it was also noticed that some employees, in spite of high job demands and long working hours, did not develop Burnout (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2001). This implied that Burnout may be due to individual differences (such as personality, emotional intelligence or personal attributes). There might be certain psychological strengths and characteristics which could hamper Burnout (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2001). Only few studies have explored the relation between burnout and psychological strengths (PsyCap). In a study by Skaalvik & Skaalvik, (2010) among 2249 Norwegian teachers in elementary school and middle school, Self-efficacy came out to be negatively related to Burnout (emotional exhaustion, $r = -.29$; and depersonalization, $r = -.41$). Herbert (2011) did an exploratory survey study on 209 permanent employees and support staff of a construction company in South Africa to search the relationships between Burnout and PsyCap as well as to determine whether PsyCap shows a moderating role in the Occupational stress - Burnout relationship. In this study, Burnout was categorized into Personal Burnout, Work-related Burnout and Client-related Burnout. The findings revealed that higher levels of Hope, Optimism, Self-efficacy and Resilience (and the PsyCap total score) were related with lower levels of Occupational stress and Burnout. Results implied that as a respondents’ PsyCap (total score) increased, their experiences of
Personal, Work and Client Burnout significantly decreased. The significant correlations suggested that individuals with high hope believed they can find pathways to their aims, and were inspired to make use of those pathways, so that they could experience less physical- and emotional exhaustion and tiredness. Higher self efficacy individuals commenced and continued goal-directed actions which made them experience less Burnout on their job as they had the ability to make plans and get themselves activated to follow those plans in order to meet their job responsibilities, requirements, and expected job performance levels. The strongest relationships appeared between the sub-dimensions of Burnout and Optimism. These results proposed that individuals with positive expectations remained certain about the future. Furthermore, these individuals reported to not experience their work as tiring. Optimism acted as an important role in the adjustment to stressful life events (Scheier et al., 2001). Higher Resilience lessened the effects of negative stressful events on the individual, and over time reduced the tendency to develop Burnout (Bonanno, Papa & O’Neill, 2001; Tudgade & Frederickson, 2004).

Two studies have been done in the Chinese context on different samples. Hou & Zhang (2004) studied job burnout in China’s university teachers. They highlighted various causes of burnout among teachers and proposed psychological capital intervention in order to enhance various psychological factors (hope, efficacy, resilience and optimism) to prevent and reduce job burnout. They stated that by developing psychological capital, the universities can strengthen psychological capital management, and avoid and lessen job burnout. Recently, Wang, Liu, Wang & Wang (2012) did a cross-sectional study on Chinese doctors to investigate the relationship between work-family conflict and burnout, and the intervening role of psychological capital (PsyCap) in the
relationship between work-family conflict and burnout. The sample comprised of 1011 doctors (males=447 and females=564). Findings indicated that the relationship of PsyCap with the two dimensions of work-family conflict, work interfering family conflict (WIF) and family interfering work conflict (FIW), were different among female and male doctors. Results revealed that both work interfering family conflict (WIF) and family interfering work conflict (FIW) were positively associated with emotional exhaustion and cynicism among both male and female doctors. However, WIF was positively associated with professional efficacy only among male doctors, whereas FIW was negatively associated with professional efficacy among both male and female doctors. PsyCap was found to be a mediator between work-family conflict and burnout. It acted as a positive resource to reduce the negative effect of work-family conflict on burnout of doctors, especially female doctors. These findings contribute to the understanding that PsyCap has a positive effect on combating burnout among doctors.

Absenteism: Organizations deal with direct and indirect costs related to absenteeism. A 20-year review on absenteeism by Harrison and Martocchio (1998) revealed that the focus has been upon attitudinal determinants of absenteeism, for instance job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job involvement. Not much attention has been placed upon the relationship between PsyCap and absenteeism. There is only one study which addressed a potentially significant gap in the literature by emphasizing the importance of considering both voluntary (e.g., vacation, deviance) and involuntary (e.g., sickness, funeral attendance) components of absenteeism. Avey, Patera, & West, (2006) did an exploratory study (n= 105, engineering managers) with an aim to examine relationship of Overall PsyCap as well as individual components
of PsyCap with voluntary and involuntary absenteeism. The results of the study depicted that all the components of PsyCap were negatively related to both involuntary as well as voluntary absenteeism. But the composite PsyCap showed a stronger relationship with absenteeism that any of the components. Overall, PsyCap out-predicted most components on both dimensions of absenteeism. It was seen that individuals with higher levels of PsyCap showed lower levels of illness, had the ability to fight through and return quickly from illness, which further resulted in less involuntary absenteeism within the organizational context. People with higher PsyCap tend to generate pathways to effectively pursue and attain personal goals in the workplace (Snyder et al., 2002b). They pursue those goals (Bandura, 1997) to achieve success (Carver & Scheier, 2003) and become resilient to setbacks (Masten & Reed, 2002). Engaging in stimulating work and maintaining a perception that the organization represents the infrastructure within which he/she can obtain success of personal goals generate a desire to participate in the organization, thus lending credence to impact of the composite PsyCap on voluntary absenteeism.

**Cynicism & Intentions to Quit:** Research has shown Psychological Capital to be negatively related to cynicism or turnover intentions. Avey, Luthans & Jensen (2009) took a heterogeneous sample (n=416) of working adults from a various jobs and industries and found that employees high in PsyCap were less likely to have turnover intentions. The study discovered a negative relationship between PsyCap and intentions to quit. Similarly, Avey, Luthans, and Youssef (2010) have thrown light on the relation between organizational cynicism, intentions to quit and PsyCap. They used a sample of 336 employees, from a wide cross section of organizations and jobs. The findings of the study revealed that PsyCap was significantly negatively related to both
organizational cynicism as well as intentions to quit. Thus, employees higher in PsyCap tend to be more supportive of organizational change, more elastic in the change process, and become accustomed to change better than those lower in PsyCap. Intention to quit generally predicts turnover (Crossley, Bennet, Jex, & Burnfield, 2007), this study stated that by developing PsyCap turnover may be reduced. Individuals with higher levels of PsyCap (specifically, hope and optimism) experience more positive emotions (Snyder, Harris, et al., 1991) and fewer negative emotions (Snyder, Ilardi, Michael, & Cheavens, 2000).

Appollis (2010) studied psychological capital and turnover intentions among employees in the Tourism Industry of South Africa. The results stemming from the study revealed that a statistically significant, inverse relationship existed between psychological capital and turnover intention. PsyCap significantly explained the variance in turnover intention of employees.

Altogether, individuals with higher PsyCap showed lower turnover intentions for several reasons. Their higher optimistic nature regarding future and confidence in their capacity to succeed motivated them to take responsibility of their own destinies (Seligman, 1998), they engaged themselves in necessary efforts in the face of obstacles (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998), rather than becoming “quitters.” In addition, due to higher levels of resilience, they positively fought with challenges preventing the development of intentions to quit.

Along these lines, it can be concluded on the basis of aforementioned researches that PsyCap refers to the individuals’ positive state of mind, which mainly includes the four aspects of hope, self-efficacy, resilience and optimism. These positive mental states lead individuals meticulously do the right thing and get hold of higher
performance. Each of the components of PsyCap has been explored within the organizational literature (Petersons & Luthans, 2003; Schepman & Richmond, 2003). A clear linkage can be seen between psychological strengths and positive workplace outcomes in a variety of contexts and industries as it helps to enhance internalization and determination among employees which further helps in increasing various desirable behaviors at workplace such as creativity, performance, leadership, work engagement, citizenship behaviors, well being and quality of life. On the other hand psychological capital helps in decreasing various undesirable behaviors at workplace such as stress, burnout, absenteeism, cynicism, turnover intentions and counterproductive work behaviors (Nafei, 2015). PsyCap bring into line the pursuit of positivity, flourishing, and human fulfillment at work. The more developed an employees’ psychological capital, the higher they are able to deal with the increasing pressures and demands of today’s organizations.

Social Anxiety and Attributions

The past researches (Turner et al., 1986; Holt, Heimberg, Hope, & Liebowitz, 1992; Stopa & Clark, 1993, 2000) put forward that socially anxious individuals experience negative cognitions in more than one social condition. Cognitions occupy a very important place in social anxiety. Various researchers (Spielberger & Vagg, 1987; Hagtvet & Sharma, 1995; Hagtvet, Man & Sharma, 2001) have reported that individuals with social anxiety take over a different pattern of cognitions; they are typically worried with negative self evaluative thoughts throughout social situations and this manner of thinking about themselves has a considerable bearing on their level of social anxiety. To examine cognitions across various social situations, Turner and
colleagues (1986) found that beliefs were influenced by situation-specific demands. Participants stated that they experienced more positive thoughts during interactions with same-sex than during different-sex interactions, and least positive thoughts during an unprepared speech. Participants high on social anxiety reported having more negative thoughts during interactions with different-sex than same-sex and had more negative thoughts in the unprepared speech.

Researchers (Beck, Emery & Greenberg, 1996; Leary & Kowalski, 1995) tag the term social anxiety also as evaluation anxiety. Clark and Wells (1995) asserted that fear of negative evaluation, exposure in social situations and social avoidance are the characteristics of individuals with high social anxiety. It has been noted by various researchers (Beck, Emery & Greenberg, 1985; Clark & Wells, 1995; Amir, Foa, & Coles, 1998; Stopa & Clark, 2000; Hirsch & Mathews, 2000) that socially anxious individuals interpret ambiguous social events in a negative manner and mildly negative social events in a catastrophic manner. When anxious in social situations, individuals with high social anxiety showed enhanced self focused attention. Fenigstein, Scheier, and Buss (1975) reported a significant positive correlation between public self-consciousness and social anxiety. This finding has been supported by various researches (Hope & Heimberg, 1988; Bruch, Heimberg, Berger, & Collins, 1989; Bruch & Heimberg, 1994; Mellings & Alden; 2000; Bogels & Lamers, 2002). Dysfunctional and alarming cognitions play a vital role in maintaining social anxiety (Glass, Merluzzi, Biever, & Larsen, 1982; Beck & Emery, 1985). Previous researches (Johnson & Miller, 1990; Alden & Wallace, 1995; Ahrens & Haaga, 1993; Wallace & Alden, 1997; Ralph & Mineka, 1998; Martin-Krumm, Sarrazin, Peterson, & Famose, 2003) depicted that individuals high on social anxiety reported more dysfunctional attributions as they repeatedly doubt their capability to
generate desired impression on others and anticipated their performance to fall through other people’s expectations of them.

Various studies (Hope, Gransler & Heimberg, 1989; Arkin, Appelman, & Burger, 1980) have revealed that socially anxious individuals display a reversal of the Self-Serving Bias. According to Campbell & Sedikides (1999), Self-Serving Bias (SSB) is described as “the explanatory pattern that involves external attributions (task difficulty, luck, or uncooperative others) for outcomes that disfavor the self but internal attributions (one’s own ability, effort, or determination) for outcomes that favor the self.” SSB is very common among non-anxious individuals but its reversal is found in socially anxious individuals. This can be seen by the work of Arkin, Appelman, & Burger (1980) who conducted two experiments. The findings from the both experiments suggested that low social anxiety individuals took more responsibility for success than for failure (i.e., SSB) where as high social anxiety individuals portrayed more responsibility for failure than for success outcomes. The reason for this kind of behavior of socially anxious can be derived from their severely unbearable responses to the evaluative social situations. Campbell & Sedikides, (1999) stated that among non anxious individuals, Self Serving Bias was intense in self-threatening contexts and when the task was believed to be important. The support for this can be found in Brockner’s (1979) work. He stated that highly anxious individuals were overly self preoccupied. They were more nervous and performed less than their low social anxiety counterparts. Cobb (2007) in his study had also examined that social anxiety correlated with external attributions for positive outcomes and internal, stable attributions for negative outcomes. Various studies have compared social anxiety subjects with non anxiety subjects but Taylor and Wald (2003) compared
socially anxious individuals with individuals having other forms of anxiety (PTSD, phobia) and found similar results that is socially anxious individuals were prone to make external attributions for positive outcomes and more stable and internal attributions for negative outcomes. In other terms, it can be said that high social anxiety people were more expected to attribute failures to internal causes such as poor ability/ effort as well as they were more likely to attribute successes to external factors (luck) instead their own ability. Thus, high social anxiety individuals stay away from taking credit for social successes while at the same time take responsibility for their social failures.

Coles, Turk, Heimberg, & Fresco (2001) compared 30 socially anxious individuals with 24 non anxious controls. They made their subjects to recall high and medium socially anxious situations. The results put forward that as the anxiety level of the situation increased; individuals in the socially anxious group were gradually more likely to look at their memories from an observer point of view. By contrast, the individuals in non-anxious group used the field perspective more frequently as the anxiety level of the situation increased. They also focused on attributions in the study and found that as anxiety increased, socially anxious individuals were more likely to make attributions which became more internal, stable and global. On the other hand, control participants showed the contrary pattern: as threat increased their attributions turned out to be more situational (external, unstable and specific). After recalling, socially anxious individuals made more dispositional attributions rather than situational. The findings of this study were consistent with previous studies which indicated the reversal in self serving bias in people with high social anxiety. Thus, in the course of their most anxious moments, individuals high on social anxiety were more likely to demonstrate Self Deprecating Bias which, apparently,
helps keep up social anxiety. Past research reported similar findings. Hackmann, Surawy & Clark (1998) inquired socially anxious individuals and normal controls to bring to mind a recent episode of social anxiety. Participants were then inquired whether a spontaneous image had passed all the way through their mind at the moment they were most anxious. Individuals with social anxiety were more apt than participants in non-anxious control group to report spontaneous images or impressions (96.6% vs 75.0%, respectively). The individuals with social anxiety were more likely to involve seeing themselves from an observer’s perspective than the normal controls. Similarly, Wells, Clark, & Ahmad (1998) investigated memories for anxiety-evoking social and non-social situations. The participants were told to form an image of a recent social situation in which they felt really anxious and uncomfortable. It was found that individuals with social anxiety rated their image from an observer’s perspective as compared to participants in the control group. On the other hand, when participants were asked to form an image of a recent non-social situation in which they felt really anxious and uncomfortable, it was found that both groups rated their images as from a field perspective (as if looking out through one’s own eyes). It was noted by Teglasi and Fagin (1984) that Self Deprecating Bias (SDB) was not present if individuals with social anxiety have to choose attributions for circumstances involving other people, but the bias turn out to be evident for circumstances involving the self. Nonetheless, the socially anxious individuals appraised the negative situations as more apt for both themselves and others than did the non-anxious individuals. A number of studies (Teglasi & Hoffman, 1982; Peterson et al., 1982; Anderson & Arnoult, 1985; Turner, Beidel, Dancu, & Stanley, 1989; Johnson, Petzel, & Johnson, 1991; Johnson, Aikman, Danner & Glling, 1995; Taylor et al., 1997) have provided strong support for a self-deprecating attributional bias (SDB) specific to high levels of social anxiety. Thus, it
can be said that socially anxious individuals see themselves as they visualize others see them and are "locked in a loop of self-generated negative information" (Wells & Papageorgiou, 1999).

More to the point, there are researches (Alfano, Joiner, & Perry, 1994; Ishiyama, 1984; Turner, Beidel, & Larkin, 1986) which establish the relation of social anxiety with different attributional dimensions. William (1997) theorized that in explaining or interpreting events, anxious individuals were more likely to use attributions that are internal (due to the individual rather than external forces), stable (the cause will be same over time), and global (the cause will apply to other circumstances rather than the specific circumstances). In contrast, individuals with low levels of social anxiety were more likely to use attributions that are external and specific. The attributional dimension ‘Stability’ has turned up as an important factor involved in the attributional style of individuals with social anxiety (Telglasi & Hoffman, 1982; Anderson & Arnoult, 1985). This dimension is related with temporal consistency which means if a person believes that the cause is stable then she would anticipate the same outcome on different occasions. If she believes that the cause is unstable then she would anticipate different outcomes on other occasions. Bell Dolan and Wessler, (1994) stated the stability dimension was consistently related to anxiety. Thinking about failures as stable and internal, individuals tend to fear or avoid those situations. They become more self conscious. Higher self consciousness has been shown to be related with social anxiety. High socially anxious individuals reported higher levels of self focused attention than low socially anxious individuals (Bruch, Heimberg, Berger, & Collins, 1989; Bruch & Heimberg, 1994; Mellings & Alden, 2000). Apart from the stability dimension, controllability and internality dimension have also been found important in attributional
styles of socially anxious individuals. Studies have represented link between social anxiety and decreased controllable attributions for both positive (Bruch & Pearl, 1995; Anderson & Arnoult, 1985) as well as negative social events (Bruch & Belkin, 2001). Furthermore, lack of controllability (picking ability and trait explanations versus strategy or effort explanations) on failure situations also predicted loneliness along with social anxiety (Anderson, Jennings, & Arnoult, 1988). It was found by Bruch and Pearl (1995) that participants attributing both successful and failed social encounters to controllable causes were associated with less social anxiety where as attributing it to uncontrollable causes made them highly anxious. On the other hand, an internal attribution for success, however, was associated with less anxiety. Participants endorsing more internal attributions for failures reported greater anxiety. Individuals with social anxiety are high on self focus. Hope, Gansler, & Heimberg (1989) evaluated studies that support an association between self-focus and internal attributions; they proposed that the excessive self-focus might endorse internal attributions. Anderson & Arnoult (1985) considered controllability and internality as important attributional dimensions engaged in social anxiety and those stability correlations with social anxiety were simply a result of this dimension inter correlating with controllability and internality. Thus, the attributional dimensions, internality, stability, and controllability, for social successes and failures have all been related with social anxiety. As anxiety increases, socially anxious individuals more and more tend to attribute the alarming situations to internal, stable, and global causes, and non-anxious individuals are more apt to consider the cause of alarming situations as more specific, variable, and external to themselves.
Several studies (Turner, Beidel, & Larkin, 1986; Dodge, Hope, Heimberg, & Becker, 1988; Stopa & Clark, 1993) have discovered that socially anxious individuals reported more negative and less positive beliefs than non-anxious controls, and that beliefs are connected to impairment in functioning leading to greater reported and observed anxiety. Social anxiety was connected with the tendency to consider that negative social events would result in negative assessment by others. Trower & Gilbert (1989) had found that socially anxious individuals are of such a belief system which magnifies the competitive aspects of interpersonal relationships but minimizes the cooperative, supportive aspects of them. Further, Moscovitch and colleagues (2009) did a comparison of self-attributions between 67 socially anxious and 60 non-anxious individuals to investigate the degree of certainty to which the attribution was accurate and its estimated significance. The results revealed that the control group described much certainty in and significance of positive self-views. Conversely, the socially anxious group described neutral levels of certainty and significance pertaining to both positive and negative self-views. Therefore, people high on social anxiety lack the tendency to attribute more certainty and significance to positive self-judgments.

Thus, it can be concluded that individuals who attribute their failure to internal, stable, global causes and attribute their success to external, unstable, specific causes, and not take credit for success showed a faulty cognitive pattern which contributes in maintenance of social anxiety. Research (Butler, Cullington, Mumby, Amies, & Gelder, 1984; Heimberg, Dodge et al., 1990) has suggested that to reduce social anxiety maladaptive thoughts need to be restructured. Previous researches (Heimberg, Dodge et al., 1990; Gelertner et al., 1991; Bruch, Heimberg, & Hope, 1991; Foa, Franklin, Perry, & Herbert, 1996; Stein &
Stein, 2008) have found that cognitive-behavioral interventions bring significant changes in socially anxious individuals. After intervention a significant decrease in negative thoughts and increase in positive thoughts was observed. Heimberg and colleagues (1985) reported that with cognitive restructuring socially anxious individuals changed their attribution of negative outcomes by making fewer internal and stable attributions and by placing less blame on themselves for negative outcomes. Taylor and colleagues (1997) noticed that cognitive restructuring among socially anxious individuals led to a decrease in the internal attributions for negative social events. Thus, attributions are malleable via various ways such as group exposure, social skills training and individual exposure treatments (Wlazlo, Schroeder-Hartwig, Hand, Kaiser, & Münchau, 1990). Dysfunctional attributional style (attributing failure to internal, stable, global causes and failure to external, unstable, specific causes) maintains Social Anxiety. Reattribution training is an efficacious method of altering interpretation of social events. Therefore, to reduce social anxiety reattributional training i.e., altering dysfunctional attributional with functional attributional style can be an effective method. Jennings (1980) reported that attributional styles were responsive to experimental manipulation. He conducted an experiment and instructed participants to make radio broadcasts convincing people to donate blood to the Red Cross. In the internal, uncontrollable condition, the investigator articulated that “persuading people...is a task in which abilities determine a volunteer’s success or failure”, whereas, in the internal and controllable condition, the investigator articulated that strategies influence success or failure. And in the control condition, the investigator stated that “no one in the Red Cross really knows why some volunteers are more successful than others.” The existing attributional style of the participants in the control condition was measured. The results revealed that the participants who were promoted to make use of
controllable attributions, together with those in the control condition who genuinely had a controllable attribution style, displayed improved success expectancies, variation of strategies employed, positive affect and performance effectiveness. Various other studies (Anderson & Arnoult, 1985; Bruch & Pearl, 1995; Stopa & Clark 2000; Bruch & Belkin, 2001) have supported correlation between social anxiety and decreased controllable attributions for both negative and positive social event.

Cobb (2007) used reattribution training to modify attributions for successful and failing situations of socially anxious individuals. The attributions for success due to effort and failure due to lack of effort were encouraged as well as the attributions for failure due to internal causes such as poor ability and for success due to external causes such as luck were discouraged. He found that by making socially anxious individuals to attribute both social successes and failures to effort increased their sense of control for all situations and therefore decreased anxiety during a succeeding social performance.

Overall, it can be concluded that due to maladaptive beliefs, employees become high on social anxiety and see themselves in an unwanted inferior position at workplace and remain worried about what others would think about them. They are likely to take on non-assertive and submissive defensive actions and anticipate failures all the time. Thus, by changing the type of causal attribution made with the help of reattribution training, there can be made a shift in the behavior of an individual.

**Social Anxiety and other variables related to it**

Various researches (Beidel & Turner, 1998; Heimberg, Liebowitz, Hope & Schneier, 1995) have widely recognized the influence of social anxiety on social functioning of an individual. High socially anxious
individuals come across distress in countless social situations and they time and again show signs of performance deficits and ineffective communication patterns in interpersonal interactions (Schlenker & Leary, 1985; Voncken, & Bögels, 2008). Whereas, very little is known about the impact of social anxiety on workplace outcomes (Rapee, 1996; Haslam et al., 2005; Andrea, Bultmann, van Amelsvoort & Kant, 2009).

A higher level of social anxiety is linked with workplace bullying (Coyne, Seigne & Randall, 2000). Bullying victims have been depicted as cognitively inflexible, and with an unrealistic view of their particular social skills and resources (Brodsky, 1976). Many bullying victims have reported that they are unable to defend themselves because of variety of factors such as low self esteem, lack of coping resources, lack of conflict management skills and high social anxiety (Einarsen et al., 1994; Niedl, 1995). Social anxiety has been recognized to contribute to exacerbate the problem. Similarly, Einarsen, Raknes, Matthiesen & Hellesøy (1996) found that social anxiety moderated the link between bullying and different measures of psychological and somatic health. Concerning this finding, previous studies have exposed that bullying victims have poor self-image, as well as a tendency for high anxiety in social situations (Einarsen et al., 1994). Recently, Moreno-Jiménez, Rodríguez-Muñoz, Moreno & Garrosa (2007) conducted two studies to examine the moderating role of personality (assertiveness and social anxiety) in workplace bullying. Findings indicated that social anxiety and assertiveness moderated the association between bullying and its effects on health. Bullying was found to be associated positively with social anxiety and negatively with assertiveness.

Social anxiety has been studied to put impact on occupational adjustment. The previous studies were done with survey data. According to Turner, Beidel, Dancu & Keys (1986), more than 90% of a group of
socially anxious individuals described that their anxiety significantly interfered with occupational functioning and the difficulties meet in the workplace were detrimental to their career advancement. Additionally, Schneier, Johnson, Hornig, Liebowitz & Weissman (1992) pointed out that more than 82% of their sample with social anxiety recognized difficulties in occupational functioning, including financial strain. Later on, empirical study was carried out by Bruch, Fallon & Heimberg (2003) to examine socially anxious and non-anxious individuals on a variety of factors that indicated occupational adjustment. They hypothesized that social anxiety would be related with struggle in three areas of employee career behavior: career choice, career entry, and adaptation to work. Results indicated that socially anxious individuals were underemployed than non-anxious individuals as well as they had a belief that their work supervisor would rate them as less dependable. They also noticed that compared to low anxiety individuals, those with high social anxiety were more likely to be uneasy when beginning a new job, avoided interpersonally relevant jobs and be overqualified for their current job with regards to level of educational attainment.

Wittchen and his colleagues (1999) showed that social anxiety worsened work productivity. They reported that socially anxious employees stay more absent from their work as compared to non-anxious individuals. Thus, the work productivity decreases. Similarly, a study was conducted by Linden and Muschalla (2007) which revealed that there are various situations in the workplace which give birth to anxiety. In their study, they found that socially anxious employees avoided to make contact with co-workers, clients or superiors whenever possible which depleted their work productivity. Some participants reported social anxiety linked to organization only. They reported fear from social get-together such as meetings, formal performance situations, in addition to
speaking in front of other people. Thus, Linden & Muschalla, (2007) suggested two types of social anxiety, namely indiscriminate social anxiety and discriminate social anxiety. The former form of anxiety occurs everywhere and with everyone where as the latter form is limited to selected situations or individuals. Acarturk and his colleagues, (2009) stated that socially anxious individuals meet with major societal costs. Their study also stated that not only individuals high on social anxiety but also individuals with average levels of social anxiety show reduced work productivity. Hinrichsen and Clark (2003) conducted research and indicated that individuals high on social anxiety were more likely than their counterparts to catastrophize small situations; anticipate safety behaviors and escape social situations. These behaviors socially anxious individuals contribute to a decrease in productivity. Past research has also highlighted the fact that individuals with high levels of social anxiety remained less absent, attended work, but were unable to work in a productive manner (Dewa & Lin, 2000) as well as unable to work with their co-workers (Sanderson and Andrews, 2006). Indirect costs are related to both absenteeism and presenteeism (Prasad et al., 2004). The former represents being unable to attend work where as the latter represents loss of productivity by attending work while not well (Sanderson & Andrews, 2006).

It has been seen that socially anxious individuals are not able to meet job demands properly. A study by Sanne, Mykletun, Dahl, Moen & Tell (2005), demonstrated that there exists a positive relation between job demands and social anxiety as well as negative relation between social anxiety and support in organizations. Another study performed by Plaisier et al., (2007) pointed out that better working conditions (lower psychological demands) were linked with a decrease in social anxiety. Stressful working conditions and high job strain are related to poor
mental health and further amplify social anxiety (Stansfield, Blackmore, Zagorski, Munce, Stewart & Weller, 2008).

Antony and his colleagues (Antony, Roth, Swinson, Huta, & Devins, 1998) found that people with high social anxiety showed substantial impairments across various domains such as daily functioning activities, including spousal and family relationships, self-expression and **impaired work functioning**. Haslam, Atkinson, Brown, & Haslam, (2005) carried out a focus group study among working individuals high on social anxiety. According to the participants, there were various factors in the workplace which contributed to the development of social anxiety such as poor communication, high workloads, insensitive management, poor industrial relations and stigma. Due to high levels of social anxiety, participants reported loss of social interaction, sickness absence, unemployment, accidents and impaired work performance. This in turn contributed to various organizational effects such as poor staff morale, reduced productivity and increased staff turnover. The authors concluded their study by proposing interventions to help employees with social anxiety which would ultimately decrease the negative effects for the individual and increase organizational morale and performance (Haslam et al., 2005). In a study examining interpersonal functioning in close relationships, Davila and Beck (2002) observed that social anxiety was related with less emotional expression, increased conflict avoidance, higher fear of rejection, and less assertive behavior. On the similar lines, Quilty, Van Ameringen, Mancini, Oakman & Farvolden, (2003) found that high social anxiety was significantly related to problems with education, social functioning, occupation, family and romantic relationships.
Social anxiety affects all facets of an individual’s life (social, personal and work relationships). Due to which socially anxious are more likely to be underemployed. Study by Lepine & Pelissolo, (2000) reported that people high on social anxiety were more apt to be of lower socio-economic status as compared to their counterparts. The participants high on social anxiety reported that the fear situations in which they had to be centre of attraction (e.g. speaking/writing in front of others, team work, participating in social situations, etc). This further led them to be underemployed and financially dependent. It has also been observed that employees high on social anxiety encounter increased financial dependency (Leon et al, 1995; Schneier et al, 1992); high levels of unemployment (Wittchen & Beloch, 1996). In their study, Patel, Knapp, Henderson, & Baldwin, (2002) compared socially anxious individuals and non-anxious controls on economic and employment status. These authors observed that persons with higher levels of social anxiety had lower rates of employment, were more likely to have a low household income, and were more expected to have left a job in the past year due to mental or emotional problems.

Individuals high on social anxiety experiences negative emotions more than positive emotions. Kashdan and his colleagues (Kashdan, 2002; Kashdan, & Steger, 2006; Kashdan, 2007) did a number of studies to find out link between positive emotions and social anxiety. They inferred that socially anxious individuals experienced high levels of negative affect and low levels of positive affect on both occasions i.e. when they had to participate or think about participation in a social situation. A strong negative correlation has been found between social anxiety and positive experiences. It was also noticed that individuals with increased levels of social anxiety focused more on negative outcomes which further interfered with their ability to respond to various
situations. Various other researchers (Brown, Chorpita, & Barlow, 1998; Kashdan, 2004; Kashdan & Roberts, 2004; Watson, Clark, & Carey, 1988a; Turk, Heimberg, Luterek, Mennin, & Fresco, 2005) have also found the similar results stating that social anxiety diminishes positive emotions. Hughes, Heimberg, Coles, Gibb, Liebowitz & Schneier, (2006) found a stable inverse relationship between social anxiety and positive affect (r = -.36; p<.05) and Weeks, Jakatdar, & Heimberg (2010) found in their study that socially anxious individuals have decreased positive affect and other positive psychological experiences and have less frequent and less intense emotional response to positive social events. According to previous researches, people high on negative affect are found to be more hostile, distrustful, demanding and sensitive to minor failures (Watson & Clark, 1984). Moreover, they focus highly on negative side of others (Watson & Slack, 1993). Therefore, they perceive their job negatively, despite of actual environmental conditions (Watson, Pennebaker, & Folger, 1986).

**Well-being** in the workplace has also been related to social anxiety by few. Angermeyer, Bruffaerts, Bryson, de Graaf, Gasquet, Brugha, Girolamo, Demyttenaere, Haro, Katz, Kessler, Kovess, Lepine, Omel, Plordori, Russo and Vilagut (2001), reported that individuals with social anxiety had decreased functional ability as compared to people with less social anxiety which influenced personal well-being, social relationships as well as work productivity. Warr (2002) investigated work-related well-being with three dimensions, namely pleasure-displeasure, anxiety-comfort, and enthusiasm-depression. He stated that individuals experiencing social anxiety reported limited commitment, energy and aspirations.
Various researches (Stein & Kean, 2000; Hambrick, Turk, Heimberg, Schneier, & Liebowitz, 2003; Wittchen, Fuetsch, Sonntag, Müller, & Liebowitz, 2000) have revealed that quality of life is related with levels of social anxiety. Wittchen, Fuetsch, Sonntag, Muller & Liebowitz (2000) examined the relationship between quality of life and social anxiety amid two groups. First group had socially anxious individuals and the other one was a control group. Results of the study revealed that participants of the first group reported lower levels of quality of life. Socially anxious group reported greater substance use and were severely impaired in terms of social functioning, occupational functioning and general physical and mental health. Lepine & Pelissolo (2000) found that individuals with social anxiety were more likely to be unemployed, live in isolation, etc. due to which there was a great impact on an individual’s quality of life. They found quality of life of the subjects with high social anxiety was very poor. In a study examining quality of life in socially anxious, Zhang, Ross and Davidson (2004) found a decrease in the quality of life in both individuals with high levels of social anxiety as well as individuals with average levels of social anxiety. Heiser et al., (2009) compared shy individuals with socially anxious individuals. The individuals with social anxiety reported a significantly greater amount of negative thoughts and decreased quality of life. The shy group stated less functional impairment and a higher quality of life than the social anxiety group. On the similar lines, Pallanti et al., (2008) compared socially anxious with non-anxious individuals. On comparing both groups, they found a significant negative correlation between quality of life and severity of social anxiety.

The aforesaid studies indicate that the work scenario is full of characteristics which initiate anxiety which further hampers employees at individual level as well as at organizational level. Thus, for a better
adjustment in an organization, the level of social anxiety needs to be addressed.

**Attributions and other variables related to it**

With the passage of time, various links have been discovered which proves that attributional style is related to outcomes in many life domains. In the literature, pessimists have been reported to have poorer health (Peterson, Seligman & Valliant, 1988), poorer sports performance (Seligman, Nolen-Hoeksema, Thornton, & Thornton, 1990), poorer academic performance (Peterson & Barrett, 1987) and more relocation-related stress (Martin, Leach, Norman, & Silvester, 2000). Attribution research is emerging in the workplace, yet relatively less attention has been paid to various work related outcomes due to attributional styles (Ashforth & Fugate, 2000; Furnham, Brewin & O’Kelly, 1994; Furnham, Sadka & Brewin, 1992). Various researchers (Furham et al., 1992; Furnham et al., 1994; Proudfoot et al, 2001) have designed tools specifically to measure attributional styles at workplace with other significant work related factors. These measures are commonly known as Occupational Attributional Style Questionnaires. Attributional style has been studied in relation to various workplace related variables.

Using the Occupational Attributional Style Questionnaire (OASQ) to investigate attributional style specific to the workplace, Furnham and colleagues (Furnham, Brewin, & O’Kelly, 1994; Furnham, Sadka, & Brewin, 1992; Furnham, Stewart, & Medhurst, 1996) found that positive workplace attributional styles (internality and perception of personal control over positive outcomes) were related to greater **commitment, job involvement, job satisfaction, and job motivation** for workers in a variety of occupations. Koys (1988, 1991) empirical results largely confirmed that internal causal explanations of success are positively
related to commitment while external causal explanations are unrelated to commitment. Individuals with an optimistic explanatory style tend to continue in the face of negative events and explain the causes of these events as external and unstable (Abramson et al., 1978).

Proudfoot, Corr, Guest, & Gray (2001) developed a domain-specific attributional style Questionnaire namely the financial services attributional style questionnaire. They conducted two studies and reported that positive attributional style was more strongly related to job motivation and learned resourcefulness, where as negative attributional style was related to intention to quit and psychological strain, than was the negative attributional style. In other terms, it can be stated that they found that as the employees showed positive attributional style, their motivation and learned resourcefulness increased at the same time their psychological strain and intention to leave the organization decreased. Xenikou (2005) took employees from various organizations such as banks, hospitals, insurance companies, and administered the Occupational Attributional Style Questionnaire developed by Furnham et al., (1992) to examine the relation between attributional style and job motivation. It was found that not only the attributional style was predictor of job motivation but also tenure of an employee at a given organization had an impact on the relationship between attributional style and job motivation. Sujan (1986) identified factors that influenced salesperson's motivations to work smarter and harder. He took 191 sales managers and 1283 sales people randomly from 123 different industries. He observed that sales people who had tendency to attribute failures to poor strategies were more motivated to work smarter, while sales people who attributed failures to insufficient effort were motivated to work harder and changed their course of action for future to achieve targets.
In an earlier attempt, Spector (1988) developed a work locus of control (WLOC) scale and described that average correlation between work locus of control and **job satisfaction** existed across several studies. Using job-rated outcomes as events, Silvester, Patterson, & Ferguson (2003) stated that functional attributional style was a better predictor of performance ratings and job satisfaction than was dysfunctional attributional style. Welbourne and his colleagues (2007) conducted study on sample from health sector. They assessed attributional style, workplace coping strategies and job satisfaction among a sample of 190 nurses. It has been noticed that as an occupational group, nurses have to experience high levels of chronic workplace stressors. Results revealed that individuals with positive attributional styles explained stressful events in optimistic ways, and were more likely to utilize problem solving and cognitive restructuring coping styles and less likely to make use of avoidant coping styles to deal with stressful situations at workplace. This pattern of coping strategies, ultimately led to greater levels of job satisfaction. Also, the relationship between attributional style and job satisfaction was found to be mediated by the use of coping strategies. Though both cognitive restructuring/problem solving strategies and avoidant coping styles mediated the relationship between attributional style and intrinsic job satisfaction (independence, sense of achievement, responsibility), only problem solving/cognitive restructuring was found to be a significant mediator in relating attributional style and extrinsic job satisfaction (salary, working conditions).

In the health sector, Haybatollahi (2009) examined the role of organizational causal attribution to identify the relation of work stressors (work role overload, excessive role responsibility, and unpleasant physical environment) and personal resources (social support and cognitive coping) to various organizational-attitudinal outcomes such as
work engagement, turnover intention, and organizational identification. The data was collected from hospital nurses (n = 934). The general findings of the study supported the moderation effect and the mediation effect of causal attribution in the work stress process. According to the results, optimistic attributional style came out to be a positive and significant predictor of work engagement and organizational identification but it did not significantly predict turnover intention. On the other hand, pessimistic attributional style was found to be a positive and significant predictor for turnover intention; negative and significant predictor for work engagement but it did not predict organizational identification.

Previous studies have shown links between an employees’ attributional style for positive and negative events and their work performance/productivity. Various researchers have assessed employees’ Occupational Attributional Style in sales department. Earlier, Seligman and Schulman (1986) conducted a study of attributions made by newly recruited U.S. insurance sales agents. Results reported that low score on composite negative attributional style significantly correlated with sales performance. Particularly, the sales agents who had the tendency to explain negative events with internal, stable, and global causes showed lower productivity as compared to those agents who attributed negative events to external, unstable and specific causes. Seligman and Schulman’s study highlighted that agents with an optimistic explanatory style sold between 37% and 88% more insurance as compared to those with a pessimistic explanatory style. As well, optimistic explanatory style made them to avoid turnover at twice the rate of agents with a pessimistic explanatory style. This study provides evidence of a link between attributional style and performance, as measured by productivity. Similarly, Corr & Gray (1995a) found that
functional attributional style was positively correlated with sales effort ($\beta = .19$) and with actual achieved sales ($\beta = .20$). Agents with functional attributional style worked harder for higher levels of productivity than those with dysfunctional attributional style. One year later, Corr and Gray (1996) took 130 senior male sales agents with longer tenure from a leading insurance company in UK to examine the relationship of attributional style and performance. Results revealed that positive attributional style of agents that is attributing positive events to internal, stable and global causes rather than external, unstable and specific causes was positively correlated with sales, showing that salespeople scoring higher in positive attributional style were more successful than their lower scoring counterparts; positive attributional style for achievement-related situations came out to be the best predictor of performance ranking. Recently, Tsuzuki and his colleagues (2012) took a sample of Japanese life insurance sales agents (n=360) to explore the impact of an agent’s length of sales experience as a moderator of the relation between attributional style for positive and negative events and sales performance. Findings revealed attributional style for positive events was positively related to sales performance ($r = .16$, $p < .01$). On the other hand, attributional style for negative events was negatively related to sales performance ($r = -.11$, $p < .05$). Thus, insurance sales agents who attributed positive events to internal, global and stable factors and attributed negative events to external, specific, unstable factors were more successful than those who attributed positive events to external, specific, and unstable factors and negative events to internal, global and stable factors. The results also showed that relationship between sales performance and two types of attributional style were different for two categories of sales experience. In case of ‘novices’ (n=183, tenure < 3years) sales performance was significantly associated to negative attributional style where as in case of ‘veterans’ (n=177,
tenure > 3 years) sales performance was associated to positive attributional style.

Ashforth and Fugate (2006) developed work attributional style questionnaire to measure employees’ attributional tendency in work settings. They conducted two studies. Study 1 was carried out on 383 business students. Findings of this study showed that the tendency to attribute positive events to internal, stable, global and controllable causes was associated with positive work adjustment. Study 2 was carried out on 148 employees from the pharmaceutical industry. Findings of the second study were similar. They concluded that adjustment in the workplace was associated with the individual differences in the attributional styles.

Followers’ attributional styles play an important role in forming the perceptions regarding leaders. Recently, various researches (Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002; Gardner & Avolio, 1998) have noted that followers’ subjective attributions regarding leaders’ degree of self-interest are essential to understanding followers’ reactions to self-sacrificing versus self-serving leadership. A qualitative study was done on a small advertising firm over the period of 3 years. A phenomenon was identified namely, hypocrisy attribution, as a consistent explanation for all negative leader actions.

Various researchers have identified that attributional styles can influence counterproductive work behaviors. In the reformulation of the learned helplessness model, Abramson et al. (1978) expounded two different explanatory styles, pessimistic and optimistic. Apart from these two types, Martinko and Zellars (1998) proposed another type of attributional pattern known as the hostile attributional style in which individuals attribute negative events at work to external, stable,
controllable, and intentional factors. These individuals blame another person or the organization for the negative outcome. Martinko, Gundlach, & Douglas (2002) in their Causal Reasoning Model of Counterproductive Behavior proposed that an individual’s attributions about workplace events act as mediators between dispositional variables and CWB. This proposition was tested by Douglas and Martinko (2001) in a sample of employees chosen from a transportation company and a public school system. They examined the relationship between numerous individual differences variables, including attributional style, and the incidence of workplace aggression. The results depicted that hostile attributional style significantly added to the prediction of self reported incidences of aggression at work ($\beta = .152, \ p < .05$). On the similar lines, Baker (2005) wanted to test causal model of counterproductive behavior (Martinko et al., 2002) which proposed that individuals’ attributions about workplace events act as mediators between personality and CWB/OCB. She hypothesized that hostile attributional style and pessimistic attributional style would be positively related to and predict CWB. Additionally, attributional style would act as a mediator between personality and CWB. She administered the questionnaires on 139 employees. It was also hypothesized that Optimistic attributional style would be positively related to OCB and would act as a mediator between personality and OCB. The findings showed that hostile attributional style and pessimistic attributional style were positively related to Counterproductive work behaviors. There was evidence of the link between attributional style and CWB, but not of its role as a mediator. Similarly, optimistic attributional style was positively related to Organizational citizenship behavior but it did not act as a mediator between the personality variables and OCB. Later on, Goh (2006) conducted a study on dyads of employees and coworkers ($n=147$) with a purpose to observe the effects of attributional style (i.e., hostile
attrition style) on the procedures that relate job stressors (e.g., incivility and organizational constraints) with Counterproductive work behaviors. Results revealed that when stressors were high, individuals with high levels of hostile attributional style (HAS) engaged in more CWB, as compared to individuals low on HAS.

Some attempts have been made to see the relation between stress and attribution in organizational context. The role of hostile attribution style was examined by Harvey and Martinko (2005) in the experience of stress and turnover intentions. They projected that an individual’s hostile attributions concerning a negative outcome head to increased levels of stress, and that stress in turn mediates the link between attributions and increased turnover intentions. Findings revealed that hostile attribution style was positively related to encountered stress (psychological strain) and to turnover intentions. Moreover, findings established stress as a moderator between hostile attributions and turnover intentions. Srivastava & Krishna (2010) analyzed the mediating effect of causal attribution for work performance or achievements on the experience of role stress, and moderating effect on the role stress-health strain relationship. The study revealed that employees who attribute for their performance and achievement at work highly to internal factors (e.g. ability, effort, and luck or chance) felt markedly less role stress as compared to those employees who attributed little to these factors. In contrast, employees who attribute highly to external factors (e.g. immediate boss, nature of work, working conditions, etc) showed relatively more amount of job stress. Findings also suggested that high attributing highly to internal factors moderated the positive relationship between job stress and health strain, whereas attributing to external factors strengthened the relationship of the two.
Attributions play an important role in emotions. More particularly, emotions are considered responses to the causal evaluations individuals make in reaction to outcomes (Weiner, Graham, & Chandler, 1982). For negative outcomes, when individuals make internal attribution they are more likely to experience shame. On the other hand, anger or frustration is experienced when negative outcome is externally attributed (Weiner, 1985). Dasborough and Ashkanasy’s (2002) model of emotions and attributions of intentionality states that when subordinates make negative attributions of intentionality (self-serving, manipulative intentions) for their leader’s behaviors, then they are more likely to experience negative affect toward the leader, and this further decreases leader member relationship quality. Expanding on Weiner’s (1985) framework, Harvey and Dasborough (2006) introduced a theoretical model of attributions and emotions, and their behavioral and psychological consequences in the workplace. They claimed that emotional intelligence tends to play a moderating role in the attribution-emotion-behavior process. They proposed that due to the kind of attributions employees’ made and their emotional responses, individuals with high levels of emotional intelligence displayed more engagement, less stress, lower learned helplessness and fewer deviant/aggressive behaviors than those with low levels of emotional intelligence. Zellar’s, Perrewé, Ferris, and Hochwarter (2004) explored a sample of female lawyers to see the effect of attributions in relation to the cause of work-family conflict (experienced stress) on emotions and coping behaviors. They found that when attributions to others (external, controllable) were thought of as the cause of felt stress (i.e., work-family conflict), then they were related to various negative emotions, such as anger ($r = .22$), shame ($r = .26$), frustration ($r = .31$), and guilt ($r = .21$), and with both emotion-focused ($r = .22$) and problem-focused ($r = .23$) coping behaviors. Additionally, while regarding attributions to organizational policies
(external, controllable) as the cause of experienced stress (i.e., work-family conflict), they were found to be related to shame \((r = .31)\), anger \((r = .44)\), guilt \((r = .21)\), and emotion-focused coping behaviors \((r = .19)\).

Various studies have stated the relationship of hostile attributional style with **workplace aggression**. In an earlier attempt, Douglas and Martinko (2001) studied the position of attribution style in workplace aggression, and discovered that employees who attributed negative outcomes to external, stable, controllable and intentional causes displayed high workplace than their counterparts. A strong relationship \((r = .60)\) between attribution style and incidence of workplace aggression was found. Similarly, researchers (Homant & Kennedy, 2003; Aquino, Douglas, & Martinko, 2004) found that employees’ hostile attribution style predicted workplace aggression in both ambiguous and definite (i.e., unambiguous) situations. Hepworth and Towler (2004) replicated Douglas and Martinko’s (2001) study on employees from a variety of occupations and found that aggressive workplace behaviors \((r = .24)\) occurred due to hostile attribution style.

Green and Mitchell (1979) were the first to recognize the connection between attributions and **leader member exchange**. Later, it was emphasized by Dienesch and Liden (1986) that attributions and categorizations act as critical inputs to the maturity of the relationship between leaders and followers. Moreover, Bitter and Gardner (1995) stressed that attribution of intentionality and emotion in leader-member relationships can greatly influence the kinds of attributions that followers have for their leader’s behavior. This in turn can profoundly influence various workplace outcomes such as employee motivation, role clarity, overall satisfaction, commitment, role conflict, work effectiveness, member competence, job performance, and turnover intentions (Gerstner
Attribution theory has been related to the study of ethical decision-making (Gundlach, Douglas, & Martinko, 2003). Research indicated that ethical decisions are affected by individual's beliefs in relation to the causes of significant outcomes. Research suggested that
two biases (self-serving and actor-observer bias) were related with ethical decision processes. More biased individuals exhibited behaviors that were unethical. With both biases (Self-serving bias & Actor-observer bias), followers reported to attribute negative outcomes to situational factors beyond their control, whereas their leaders reported to blame the internal traits of their followers (e.g., lack of ability or effort), resulting in potential conflict (Douglas & Martinko, 2001).

Few studies have been conducted on the Chinese samples also. It has been stated that stable and global attributions for negative outcomes predicted depression, anxiety, obsession and compulsion (Li, Qiu, & Wang, 2001). Among Taiwanese insurance salespeople dysfunctional attributional style was found to be associated with low sales performance, low self-efficacy, and high turnover intention in underselling and rejection situations (Chung, 2002). Findings showed that the stability and globality dimensions (but not the internality dimension) predicted disengagement responses (such as quitting and being neglectful at work) and lack of engagement responses (such as voicing suggestions and being loyal to the organization). Insurance salespersons that attributed bad events with external and global causes were more likely to withdraw from their organization where as those who attributed bad events to internal and unstable causes were more likely to give inputs and stay loyal with the organization.

Harvey & Martinko (2009) conducted study on full time employees (n=415) with minimum tenure of 5 years to empirically examine the role of attributions in psychological entitlement and its outcomes. Psychological entitlement refers to the occurrences where individuals constantly consider that they deserve preferential rewards and treatment, often with little concern of actual qualities or performance
levels (Naumann, Minsky, & Sturman, 2002; Snow, Kern, & Curlette, 2001). Findings suggested that a strong sense of psychological entitlement was linked with self-serving attributional bias and reduced need for cognition. This attributional distortion in turn led to variance in employees’ conflict with supervisors and levels of job satisfaction. Results also indicated that self-serving attribution styles mediated the relationship between psychological entitlement and job satisfaction (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Kenny et al., 1998).

From the above stated studies it can be concluded that attributions play a significant role in various outcomes within an organization. But it is a less researched variable in organizations. Employees can work smarter by adopting functional attributional style. It can help to uncover the various relations between employees and their organizational environment.

It has been attempted in the present research to investigate how Psychological Capital and Social Anxiety influence the performance of managers. Taking into consideration, the role played by attributions in psychological capital and social anxiety, the following objectives were formulated:

**Objectives**

In light of review of literature the following objectives were formulated to study:

- the effect of attributional style on psychological capital (Hope, Efficacy, Resilience and Optimism) of managers.

- the effect of attributional style on social anxiety of managers.
• the relationship between psychological capital and social anxiety of managers.

• the effect of Reattribution Training (RAT) on occupational attributional style of managers.

• the effect of RAT on psychological capital of managers.

• the effect of RAT on social anxiety of managers.

**Hypotheses**

Following hypotheses were framed for further testing:

1. Managers with functional attributional style would show higher level of psychological capital as compared to their counterparts.

2. Managers with functional attributional style would show lower level of social anxiety as compared to their counterparts.

3. Social anxiety among managers would be negatively related to their psychological capital (Hope, Efficacy, Resilience and Optimism).

4. RAT would enhance functional attributional style among managers.

5. RAT would enhance psychological capital (Hope, Efficacy, Resilience and Optimism) among managers.

6. RAT would reduce social anxiety among managers.