METHOD

Selection of subjects:

A total of 682 middle and senior level managers (males and females) were selected from various national and multinational companies in and around different districts of Punjab (Patiala, Ludhiana, Nabha, Ambala, Sangrur, Rajpura, Malerkotla, Chandigarh, Mohali, Gurgaon) after due consent of the HR managers and participants. All the participants were in the age group of 28-36 years with mean age 34.29 years. 147 were females and 535 mere males. Three scales, namely, Psychological Capital Questionnaire, Social Interaction Anxiety Scale and Organizational Attributional Style Questionnaire were administered to all the participants. Out of 682 participants, 279 participants showed dysfunctional attributional style. Further from these 279 participants, 200 participants who scored low on psychological capital and high on social anxiety were selected. These 200 participants were further divided into 2 groups with 100 each in one group to form experimental and control group.

Research Design:

Pre-Post Experimental-Control group design was used.

Tools used in the study:

Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ, Luthans et al., 2007) was used in this study to measure Psychological Capital of employees. This scale comprises 24 items which includes 6 items for each of the four
components of hope, efficacy, resilience and optimism. The items are on a six-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” such as 1-strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-somewhat disagree, 4-somewhat agree, 5-agree and 6-strongly disagree. The resulting score represents an individual’s level of positive PsyCap (Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007). The higher the score, the higher is the level of psychological capital. Examples of the items include, “I feel confident analyzing a long-term problem to find a solution”; “If I should find myself in a jam at work, I could think of many ways to get out of it”; “When I have a setback at work, I have trouble recovering from it, moving on”; “When things are uncertain for me at work, I usually expect the best”. Reliability coefficients for all the components is greater than 0.70, as the overall PsyCap instrument, which is 0.95. The discriminant validity states that each component of PsyCap adds unique variance and becomes additive to overall PsyCap.

Social Interaction Anxiety Scale (SIAS, Mattick & Clarke, 1998) was used to measure social anxiety in social settings. The SIAS measures feelings of anxiety in social interactions, with the main concerns relating to “being inarticulate, boring, sounding stupid, not knowing what to say or how to respond within social interaction, and of being ignored” (Mattick & Clarke, 1998). The SIAS comprises of 20 items, which are rated on a five-point likert scale, ranging from 0 to 4 where 0 = not all characteristic or true of me, 1 = slightly characteristic or true of me, 2 = moderately characteristic or true of me, 3 = very characteristic or true of me and 5 = extremely characteristic or true of me. Examples of some items are “When mixing socially, I am uncomfortable”; “I find myself worrying that I won’t know what to say in social situations”; “I worry about expressing myself in case I appear awkward”, etc. Internal
consistency is Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of 0.94. The test-retest reliability is greater than 0.90 (Mattick & Clarke, 1998). The higher score means high level of social anxiety.

**Organizational Attributional Style Questionnaire (OASQ, Kent & Martinko, 1995)** was used to measure attributional style of employees. This scale is used to measure the extent to which an individual attributes negative workplace events to external, stable, intentional, controllable, and global causes. Participants are provided with a work scenario and asked to rate the event on each of the five causal dimensions on a 5 point Likert scale. Example of one of the item is “A layoff was announced at your company and you were told that you will one of those laid off:

A. To what extent is your lay-off caused by something about you versus other people or circumstances?
   
   1  2  3  4  5
   
   Completely due to me completely due to others

B. To what extent will the things that caused your lay-off be present in the future in similar situations?
   
   1  2  3  4  5
   
   Never present always present

C. To what extent do you believe that another individual had control over the causes of your lay-off?
   
   1  2  3  4  5
   
   Absolutely no total control control
D. To what extent do you believe that another individual might have intended for you to be laid off?

1 2 3 4 5
Did not intend totally intended

E. To what extent do you believe this lay off will affect other situations?

1 2 3 4 5
Just this situation all situations

Each participant is presented with such 7 negative work scenarios. The internal consistency reliabilities range from .70 to .89 (Kent & Martinko, 1995). The higher score on this scale refers to dysfunctional attributional style.

**Procedure:**

The objective of the present study was to enhance Psychological Capital and reduce Social Anxiety among managers by changing their dysfunctional attributional style with the help of reattribution training (RAT). The study was accomplished in two phases: screening phase and intervention phase. The screening phase included filling up of the questionnaires. Prior consent was taken from the HR managers of the concerned organizations. Appropriate conditions were made to carry out the study, so that employees could fill the questionnaires without any interruption. First of all rapport was built with the participants. With the standardized instructions all the three scales namely, Psychological Capital Questionnaire, Social Interaction Anxiety scale and Organizational Attributional Style questionnaire, were administered to the participants. After the scoring of the scales, the participants scoring
low on Psychological Capital, high on Social Anxiety and having dysfunctional attributional style (N=200) were selected for the next phase of study. The 200 participants were selected for the intervention purpose. Further, these 200 participants were randomly assigned to two groups, i.e., Experimental group (N=100) and Control group (N=100). Experimental group was provided with 4 sessions of reattribution training specifically designed to increase psychological capital and reduce social anxiety by enhancing functional attributional style. The participants in Control group were not given any kind of intervention. However, keeping in mind the ethical consideration, there was general discussion on organizational environment, work-life balance and day to day workplace activities with the participants of the control group. Managers in experimental group were given reattribution training in their particular organizations. All the sessions were conducted in the separate room or the conference room. A standard format (described in next section) of reattribution training was designed and carried out to all the participants in experimental group in their respective organizations. Each session was conducted twice a week with duration of 45-60 minutes. The intervention program was completed in duration of two months. After the intervention, the participants in Experimental and Control group were again administered the three scales, Psychological Capital Questionnaire, Social Interaction Anxiety Scale and Organizational Attributional Style Questionnaire, to obtain the post scores on all the variables. Pre-Post intervention comparison for all the variables was done for both experimental and control group using one-way ANOVA (repeated measures). For dependent variables experimental and control groups were compared by applying series of univariate ANOVAs.
Reattribuion Training

Four session reattribuion training program was designed.

Session-1

First session of reattribuion training was initiated with the rapport building. The researcher presented herself in front of the participants and a general acquaintance with all the participants was sought. The discussion with the participants was initiated in the following manner:

“I would like each of you should introduce yourself. And report about your usual activities, likes, dislikes and leisure pursuits”

After the rapport building and introductory phase, the participants were later asked to discuss in brief about their daily work hassles that they meet in their casual routines such as meeting deadlines, working in teams, group discussion, customer dealings in the context of their work performance.

Session-2

The aim of the second session was to familiarize the participants with concept of attribution. Common questions regarding the way they give explanation for their various organizational success and failure experiences were asked. The importance and consequences of type of attribution made were discussed. Such as “attributions for previous performance act as an important determinant for future expectancies. If conditions continue to be the same, then the outcome a person has experienced earlier is expected to happen again. A success yield to the expectation of future successes and a failure reinforce the belief there will be subsequent failures. Stable causes like high ability will anticipate
higher expectation for success and low ability will anticipate failure. Individuals would experience greater pride following successes when outcomes are attributed to internal or controllable causes. On the other hand, if the causes are perceived probable to change or unstable, there may be ambiguity in future outcomes.” From all the discussion, it came into light that a large number of the participants attributed failure outcomes to internal, stable global and uncontrollable factors like lack of ability. They were helped to alter their explanatory style by substituting lack of ability attributions for failure with lack of effort and poor strategy attributions. The participants were encouraged to restructure their cognitions with an aim to enhance their sense of control.

All the participants were encouraged to generate examples showing dysfunctional attributional style, the investigator then showed it to the participants how these attributions can be made functional by simply substituting other factors. Demonstration of few examples of functional and dysfunctional attributions was given and it was also highlighted how this simple process was significant for an individual’s affect, thoughts and subsequent performance.

e.g., “I failed to meet my deadline of a project because I do not have the ability. I simply cannot do this”---**Dysfunctional attributional style.**

“I failed to meet my deadline of a project because I did not make sufficient efforts or I used poor strategy for team building or planning my time. I should make more efforts next time”---**Functional attributional style.**

The difference between the two types of attributions mentioned above was explained. As part of home assignment, the participants were instructed to rehearse functional attribution at home. They were also instructed to write down three to five examples from real life events
associated to their workplace wherein they demonstrated dysfunctional attributional style.

**Session-3**

Session three was started with a discussion of home assignment. Participants were randomly asked to read out the examples that they have noted down. Then the participants were asked to volunteer for reframing the dysfunctional attributions into functional ones. Each participant was given a chance to read out the cause and reframe the dysfunctional with functional attributions. After each participant was through with his or her turn, they were randomly asked as to how they experienced after making functional attributions. Consistently it was seen that all the participants described a positive affect state and motivation.

The concept of Psychological Capital and Social Anxiety was discussed during the session. The participants highlighted various factors which lead to high Social Anxiety and poor Psychological Capital. Then the participants were helped to give attention to the factor that they themselves can change. This significant factor was their attribution style. As part of their home assignment, the participants were instructed to replicate their previous session task but with one addition. This time, they were required to write down the various events showing dysfunctional attributional style along with their reframing.

**Session-4**

In the last session of RAT, around fifteen minutes were given to the discussion on the home assignment. Some participants were randomly selected for expressing the attributions into dysfunctional and then
functional. This exercise was done in order to provide feedback on the significance of positive attributions. Feedback of the participants for all the sessions was taken. The participants were encouraged to express the changes they felt in their perception and behavior after the intervention. The participants shared how they felt more confident, positive and efficacious after the intervention. To obtain post scores on all the variables, Psychological Capital Questionnaire, Social Interaction Anxiety Scale and Organizational Attributional Style Questionnaire were administered. The participants were thanked for their participation and assured of any future assistance by the investigator.