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Abstract
Job performance of the employees is one of the central constructs which plays a crucial role in achieving organizational performance. The concept of Psychological Capital (PsyCap) has given much attention in the recent past as a new approach to enhance the job performance of the employees. However, the extent of the impact between PsyCap and job performance has not been investigated in Sri Lankan context. On the other hand the work values and attitudes of Sri Lankan employees are different from other countries. They may affect on the relationship between PsyCap and job performance. Therefore, the purpose of this conceptual paper is to propose a conceptual model for empirically examination of the impact of PsyCap on job performance. Moreover, the effect of work values and attitudes on this relationship is examined by reviewing the relevant literature. The proposed conceptual framework will be a valuable contribution to the future research.
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1. Introduction
In today’s hypercompetitive business environment, job performance of the employees is one of the central constructs which plays a crucial role in achieving organizational performance. It is the most significant dependent variable in the organizational context and the most important concept in industrial – organizational psychology. Job performance is the observable behaviors that employees do in their jobs that are relevant to the goals of the organization (Campbell, McHenry & Wise, 1990). Since the job performance of the employees is a crucial construct in an organization, understanding of the factors influencing on job performance is essential for the managers. This understanding may help to the managers to understand, explain, predict, measure and change the employees’ job performance (Campbell et al., 1993). In reviewing the theoretical and empirical evidence, researchers have identified different factors that can be affected for job performance. Among them, newly developed concept of psychological capital has given much attention in the recent past in USA and China as a new approach to enhance the job performance of the employees.

However, this newly emerged psychological capital has been virtually ignored by both researchers and practitioners. Therefore, Luthans and other researchers pointed out the need of further investigation of psychological capital to generalize its effects on different work related variables in different context. Most of the research in PsyCap has been conducted by Luthans and his colleagues in the United State and China. There have been relatively few empirical studies on PsyCap in Asia. The empirical evidence on PsyCap of employees in USA and China show that there is a positive relationship between PsyCap and job performance but in the review of existing research literature in Sri Lanka, up to date, any research has not been conducted in any context on the consequences of psychological capital even though the concept is developed in 2002.

On the other hand it is not enough to just examine PsyCap in determining job performance. It can be predicted that the strength of the relationship between PsyCap and job performance can be changed owing to different organizational and cultural factors. The researcher believes that work values and attitudes are important concepts that may affect on the relationship between PsyCap and job performance of the employees because the work values and attitudes of the employees are different from country to country. Although the employees are more self-confidence, hopeful, optimistic and resilience, their job performance may not be increased if their expected work values and attitudes cannot be fulfilled from the organization. Therefore, it is important to find out the effect of work values and attitudes on the relationship between PsyCap and job performance. Luthans (2002) therefore argues that future research needs to be devoted to the identification of mediating and moderating variables in the PsyCap-outcome relationships. However, thus far, there is no research has been reported in the research literature in any country to find out the impact of work values and attitudes on PsyCap and job performance relationship.

1.1 Objectives of the Study
The purpose of this paper is to develop a conceptual framework so as to understand the impact of PsyCap on job performance in Sri Lankan context bringing out the work values and work attitudes to the model.
2. Literature Review

2.1 Positive Organizational Behavior

Fred Luthans introduced the term Positive Organizational Behavior (POB) on bringing positive psychological applications to the workplace in 2002. Luthans (2002a) defined POB as “the study and application of positively oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed, and effectively managed for performance improvement in today’s workplace”. According to Luthans POB must be met five criteria to differentiate from other positive approaches. They must be grounded in theory and research, valid measurement, unique concepts, state-like construct and managed for performance improvement. Based on these criteria, Luthans (2002a) initially identified five constructs to be included in POB: self-efficacy, hope, optimism, subjective well-being (happiness), and emotional intelligence. Later, Luthans (2002b) introduced resilience as another construct that could be classified as POB. Lots of researchers have investigated a number of positive constructs in the literature (Cameron et al., 2003; Nelson & Cooper, 2007). However, only four construct such as efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience have been identified as the highly correlated criteria with POB definition (Luthans, 2002a; Luthans, Youssef, et al., 2007).

2.2 Psychological Capital

Luthans and colleagues developed the concept of Psychological Capital (PsyCap) (Luthans et al., 2007) and defined it as “an individual’s positive psychological state of development characterized by self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience”. PsyCap was positively and uniquely related to the field of positive organizational behavior because it is based on theory and research, measurable, state-like or open to development, and related to positive work outcomes (Luthans, 2002a, b). PsyCap as well as each of its constituent resources have been considered as state-like in the positive psychological literature (Bandura, 1997; Masten & Reed, 2002; Luthans, 2002a, b) and as a second order core construct (Luthans et al., 2007). The theoretical and empirical evidence have clearly demonstrated that each of the positive psychological constructs of self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience has discriminant validity (Luthans and Jensen, 2002; Snyder, 2000). These evidence demonstrated that the conceptual independence of each construct of PsyCap. In the same time, these four constructs in combination have been supported PsyCap as a core construct and there is a cohesion among each dimension (Luthans, et al. 2008). PsyCap as well as its dimensions of self-efficacy (Bandura, 2000), hope (Snyder, 2000), optimism (Luthans, Youssef, et al., 2007) and resilience (Bonanno, 2005; Luthans, 2000b; Masten & Reed, 2002; Youssef & Luthans, 2005) are situational based, open to development and change. Therefore PsyCap and each of its psychological capacity can be developed and trained. Luthans and colleagues considered the open to develop nature of four constructs of self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience as one of the most important criterion in developing the core construct of PsyCap.

2.2.1 Self-Efficacy

The first and most theoretically developed and researched dimension of Psyap is self-efficacy. It has been received more research support. This dimension has been best matched with all the POB criteria (Luthans, 2002a). Stajkovic and Luthans (1998) defined the concept of self-efficacy relevant to work place as person’s confidence of his or her abilities to make ready for the motivation, cognitive resources and a way of acting necessary to effectivly perform a specific task within a certain context. The concept of Self-efficacy is based on Bandura’s (1997) social cognitive theory, which is an approach to understand human cognition, action motivation, and emotion that assumes we are active shapers, rather than simply passive reactors to our environments (Bandura, 1997). Bandura (1982) defined self-efficacy as a person’s perception or belief of “how well one can execute courses of action required to deal with prospective situations.” In 1986 he defined self-efficacy as “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances”.

2.2.2 Hope

According to Snyder and colleagues (1991) hope is a “positive motivational state that is based on an interactively derived sense of successfu[1]l.” It is also included agency and pathway components. Agency is goal directed energy and pathway means planning to achieve goals. Snyder (2000a, b) defined hope as “both the willpower (agency) and the way power (pathways) that you have for your goals”. It is the will for desired goal (Snyder, 2000; Snyder et al., 1996). The pathways component of this definition involves the alternative ways and contingency plans to reach those goals as they forecast obstacles to achieve the expected goals (Snyder, 1995, 2000). According to Snyder, (2000a) agency and pathways thinking were interrelated and operate in a combined, iterative manner to generate hope.

2.2.3 Optimism

In general, optimist is a person or positive thinker who expects good things to happen while a pessimist expects worse (Carver et al., 2005). Anyway, in positive psychology based on empirical theory and research it has a specific meaning. Tiger (1979) defined optimism as a mood or attitude associated with an expectation about the social or material future, one which the evaluator regards as socially desirable, to his or her advantage, or for his or her pleasure. Seligman’s explanatory style model and Carver and Scheirer’s self-regulatory model are two
theoretical models that have been used to define optimism (Peterson, 2000). Scheier and Carver (1985) described dispositional optimism as an activity related to goal attainment and self-regulation. According to the definition, when people feel that there is a discrepancy between expected goal and actual situation, they start the assessment process. If the people feel that this discrepancy can be reduced, they will exert more effort to achieve the desired outcomes. In turn, if they feel they cannot reduce the discrepancy, they give up their effort. According to this argument, it can be concluded that optimistic person manage the problems they encountered by working hard and continue to striving. On the other hand pessimists give up the situation (Scheier & Carver, 1987; Scheier et al., 1989). Seligman (1998) with his complementary optimistic framework based on attribution defines optimism as an explanatory style in which individuals attribute positive events to internal, stable, global causes, and attribute negative events to external, unstable, specific causes.

2.2.4 Resilience

In general, it can be defined as an adaptive system which enables an individual to rebound or bounce back quickly from a setback or failure. In positive psychology, resilience is a positive adaptation process that can rebound in the context of significant adversity or risk (Masten & Reed, 2002). As adapted to the work place, Luthans (2002b) defined resilience as “the positive psychological capacity to rebound, to ‘bounce back’ from adversity, uncertainty, conflict, failure, or even positive change, progress, and increased responsibility.” Based on this definition, it can be concluded that resilience is a positive strength that can be used to face adverse events as well as extreme positive events.

2.3 Job Performance

According to Murphy (1989) performance definitions should focus on behaviors rather than outcomes, because if the managers focus only the employees’ outcomes, employees will find the easiest way to achieve the outcomes without considering other important behaviors. Campbell, McCloy, Oppler, and Sager (1993) explained that performance consists of the behaviors that employees actually engage in which can be observed. According to Moorhead and Griffin (1999), job performance is all of the total set of work related behaviors that the organization expects from the individuals to display. Motowidlo, Borman and Schmit (1997) defined job performance as behaviors or activities that are oriented towards the organization’s goals and objectives. Similarly, Campbell, McHenry, & Wise (1990) defined job performance as the observable behaviors that people do in their jobs that are relevant to the goals of the organization. Motowidlo, Borman, and Schmit (1997) pointed out performance as behaviors with an evaluative aspect. It should be the behaviors relevant to the goals of the organization (Campbell et al., 1993). Borman and Motowidlo (1993) have identified two classifications that can be explored the job performance. There are two dimensions of job performance.

2.3.1 Task Performance

According to Borman and Motowidlo (1993) the task performance is the behavior that is directly linked with completion of the job. Behavior in the domain of task performance is usually recognized as a formal requirement of an individuals’ job. Job description often explicitly stipulates that the job holders must perform these activities. Borman, Ackerman and Kubisiak’s (1994) identified three dimensions of task performance as follows.

1. Task proficiency
   - This dimension includes demonstrating well expertise in work task, displaying work accuracy, paying more attention to details, minimizing mistakes and providing high quality service.

2. Efficiency
   - Operating in a cost effective manner so as to use resources effectively, manage time well, accomplish the targets under any context, provide more service to customers regularly are the sub dimensions of efficiency.

3. Problem solving
   - Taking good decisions when facing problems, correctly analyzing situations or problems, determine the proper solutions using available information are the indicators of this dimension.

2.3.2 Contextual Performance

Borman and Motowidlo (1993) defined contextual performance as an individual’s performance, which maintain and enhances an organization’s social network and the psychological climate that supports technical tasks. Contextual performance is comprised of interpersonal behaviors or actions that benefit the organization. Furthermore, they explained that contextual performance includes activities that may not represent formal work tasks although they still make an important contribution to the effectiveness of an organization. Motowidlo and Schmit (1999) identified five dimensions of contextual performance.

1. Volunteering to accomplish task activities
2. Persevering with extra effort
3. Helping and collaborating with others
4. Following organizational rules and procedures
5. Approving, assisting, and defending organizational objectives
2.4 Work Attitudes

Work attitudes are an individual’s general attitude towards his or her job and the organization. The majority of the researchers have found job satisfaction and organizational commitment as two important work attitudes in the organization.

2.4.1 Job Satisfaction

Robbins (2000) defined job satisfaction as a subjective measure of worker attitudes, that is, an individual’s general attitudes to his or her job. An employee with high job satisfaction holds positive attitudes towards their job and an employee with high job dissatisfaction holds negative attitudes towards his or her job. Ivanchevich and Mattson (2005) explained job satisfaction as an attitude that individuals have towards their jobs which stems from their perception of their jobs and the degree to which there is a good fit between the individual and the organization. Robbins & Judge (2007) defined job satisfaction as a positive feeling about one’s job resulting from an evaluation of its characteristics. They further explain that employees that have high levels of JS hold positive feeling about their job, while dissatisfied employees hold negative feeling about their job. George and Jones (1996) defined it as “the collection of feeling and beliefs that people have about their current jobs. Spector (1997) defined job satisfaction as how employees feel about their overall job and various dimensions of their jobs. Work itself, pay, promotion, supervision, coworker, working condition are the mostly accepted dimensions of job satisfaction.

2.4.2 Organizational Commitment

According to Peter et al., (1984) organizational commitment refers to the psychological attachment or affective commitment formed by an employee in relation to his/her identification and involvement with the respective organization. Moreover, they define it as “an attachment to the organization, characterized by intention to remain in it, identification with the values and goals of the organization, and a willingness to exert extra effort on its behalf.” It is considered to be the linkage between the individual employee and the organization because of individuals consider the extent to which their own goals and values related to that of the organization as part of organizational commitment.

2.5 Work Values

According to Dawis, (2001), “Work values refer to what a person wants out of work in general and also which components of a job are important to their work satisfaction.” Work values are the qualities that employees expect from their jobs (Ben-Shem & Avi-Itzhak, 1991). Zytowski (1970) defined work values as “a set of concepts which mediates the person’s affective orientation and classes of external objects offering similar satisfaction. The majority of researchers (Borg, 1990; Mottaz, 1985; Pryor, 1987; Rosenberg, 1957) have identified intrinsic and extrinsic values as the more important work values.

2.5.1 Intrinsic Values

George and Jones (1997) stated that intrinsic work values referred to the end-states which happened through work or engaging in work activities, and depended on the content of the work, for example the sense of accomplishment.

2.5.2 Extrinsic Values

George and Jones (1997) extrinsic work values referred to the results from the consequence of work regardless of the content of work, for example family security.

2.6 Empirical Evidence between the Variables

2.6.1 PsyCap and Job Performance

Lots of researches have examined the contribution of each construct of PsyCap on employee performance. Based on the employees’ perceived self-confidence, they engage with the specific task and complete that task successfully. Bandura (1997) named self-confidence employees as good performers. According to his explanation, if the employees have high self-efficacy, they believe they can succeed. As a result they put more effort on the given task. When employees try harder to succeed, they generally perform better. It means that self-efficacy correlates with job performance. According to Multiple meta-analyses self-efficacy has positively and strongly correlated with job performance (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998a; Bandura, 2000; Bandura & Locke, 2003; Sadri & Robertson, 1993).

Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Li, (2005) found that a relationship between Chinese factory workers’ hope and supervisory rated performance. Similarly, hope has been found as a positive predictor of job performance in different researches in different context (Luthans et al., 2005; Luthans, et al., 2007; Peterson & Byron, 2007; Peterson & Luthans, 2003; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). Adams et al., (2002) found that hopeful employees are more effective than the low hopeful employees. Peterson and Byron (2008) stated that highly hopeful employees possess goal oriented effort. Those employees have special ability to find the continuous alternative ways to accomplish their goals. This ability led to continuous effort and ultimately helped to improve the job performance. They found that different types of employees with more hope had high job performance. They measured this relationship after one year controlling their self-efficacy and cognitive ability. According to Bandura (1997) self-efficacious and hopeful employees perform better because these employees accept
challenges and put more efforts to achieve goals owing to their high efficacy. And also they identify sub goals and strategies to achieve those goals.

According to Corr & Gray (1996) optimism has positively correlated with job performance because when the employees believe that they can succeed, they are less likely to give up the task and put forth more effort to accomplish the goal. Seligman (1998) found that positive relationship between optimism and job performance among the insurance sales agents. Luthans et al., (2005) found similar result in Chinese factory workers. Youseff and Luthans (2007) reported positive relationship between optimism and employees performance.

Resilience is “the ability to make a successful comeback after being assailed by problems or unexpected barriers to success” (Luthans et al., 2007b). According to the definition, resilience employees can quickly come back when the setbacks do occur. Thus, they can regroup the strategies and do exert effort for the success (Bonanno, 2004, 2005). Similarly, Maddi (2005) with his work on hardiness noted that the employees who have high resilience bounce back from the major setback quickly and engage with normal work. According to him resilience provides the stimulant to employees to eliminate the loss of functioning and bounce back from setbacks. Moreover, he stated that the important of this psychological capacity (resilience) in enhancing the performance of the employees in the turbulent environment (Maddi, 2005). According to Seligman (1998) optimism is positively and significantly correlated with job performance of insurance sales agents. Similar result was found by Youseff and Luthans (2007). Luthan et al., (2005) found a significant relationship between resilience and rated performance of the Chinese workers.

Based on the above mentioned empirical evidence, it can be concluded that the composite effect of PsyCap as a multi-dimensional construct may be significantly and positively correlated on job performance. Avey & Nimnicht (2009) found that PsyCap (self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience) is positively correlated with managers’ evaluations of employee performance in the two field studies. Some researchers have found similar results (Avey & Nimnicht, 2009; Luthans et al., 2007; Walumbwa et al., 2009). Stajkovic (2006) point out the importance of combined effect of four facets of PsyCap to improve performance. Fredrickson (2001) suggested that “higher levels of positivity will contribute to maintaining higher levels of individual motivation and performance.”

2.6.2 PsyCap and Work Attitudes

For the purpose of this study work attitudes define as an individual’s general attitude towards his or her job and the organization. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment were considered as two dimensions of work attitudes.

According to the empirical evidence, PsyCap has positively correlated with job satisfaction and the correlation between PsyCap and job satisfaction is stronger than correlation between the individual construct of PsyCap and job satisfaction. Appollis (2010) stressed that the relationship between PsyCap and job satisfaction is strong and linear among the employees who worked in the tourism sector. Further, this finding indicates highly self-confidence, hopeful, optimistic and resilient employees have high level of job satisfaction.

According to a research done by Larson & Luthans (2006) in production workers who worked in small Midwestern factory, they found that hopeful production workers were more satisfied with their jobs. A similar result was found by Youseff & Luthans in 2007. They found that employees’ level of hope was correlated with job satisfaction. Peterson & Luthans (2003) have confirmed this relationship and stressed that hopeful managers who worked in the fast food stores have showed more satisfaction. In general, the employees’ higher level of hope will lead to the improvement of their job satisfaction because the hope level of employees enable them to self-motive and plan their activities so as to gain best of their situation (Yousseff & Luthans, 2007). Anyway, researchers have pointed out the higher level of job satisfaction can be found when the hope is accompanied by the level of self-efficacy and optimism of the employees and the ability that they can respond favorably to setbacks. Youseff and Luthans (2007) and Cetin (2011) found that hopeful, optimistic and resilience employees are more satisfied with their jobs.

Larson & Luthans (2006) with their exploratory study in small factory found that positive relationship between the level of PsyCap of production worker and their job satisfaction. Luthans et al., (2007) did a research taking two samples of management students, technicians and engineers. It is revealed positive relationship between PsyCap and job satisfaction. The relationship between PsyCap and JS was stronger than the relationship between each construct of PsyCap and job satisfaction. Luthans et al., (2008) found similar result and stressed that there was a positive relationship between general psychological capital and job satisfaction.

To date there are very few studies that have explored the relationship between PsyCap and organizational commitment. Among them, Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Li, (2004) found that PsyCap is positively related to organizational commitment. Similar to this finding, Youseff & Luthans (2007) found that the four construct of PsyCap (self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resiliency) have correlated with organizational commitment. Again, Luthans with Bruce, Avolio & Avey, (2008) confirmed the ability of PsyCap to influence the organizational commitment. Shahnavaz & Jafri (2009) have done a research using public and private organizations in India and found that slight positive relationship between PsyCap and organizational commitment among the managers.
Sinha, Talwar, and Rajpal (2002) stated that there was a positive relationship between self-efficacy and organizational commitment in a sample of 167 managers. Larson & Luthans (2006) with their exploratory study in small factory found that positive relationship between the level of PsyCap of production worker and their organizational commitment. A similar result was found by Youssef & Luthans, (2007). Cetin (2011) found a positive relationship between three construct of PsyCap (hope, optimism and resilience) and organizational commitment.

2.6.3 Work Attitudes and Job Performance

Wei and Chu (2008) found that a work attitude has a positive relationship with job performance with their survey conducted on employees in the financial service industry. The relationship between job satisfaction and job performance has received much attention from the Human Relations movement in 1930s. Overall Job satisfaction and job performance (Birnbaum and Somers, 1993; Dart, 1988; Igbaria, 1991; Meyer et al., 1989; Shore and Martin, 1989) as well as multi faced job satisfaction and job performance have received significant attention in the past research. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) believed that productivity will be increased with the improvement of the moral of the employees. However, Lawler & Porter (1967) explored that the high performed employees were more satisfied employees because they received greater rewards. In the 1985s, this relationship was reversed and found that more satisfied employees are better performers. According to ‘happy–productive worker hypothesis’ (Kluger & Tikochinsky, 2001; Ledford, 1999; Staw & Barsade, 1993), people believed that happy employees are more satisfy with their jobs and it will help to perform better on their jobs. According to Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, (1985) research has reported a positive correlation between individuals’ job satisfaction and their performance. However they concluded that satisfaction and performance are slightly related. In this connection, they used facet level of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction of the employees may be a better predictor of job performance (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 1998). Once again, Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, (2001) found much stronger positive correlation between job satisfaction and individual performance in the more recent meta-analysis. They used global level of job satisfaction. Moshavi & Terborg (2002) revealed a positive relationship between job satisfaction and job performance among the sample of contingent and regular customer service representatives. Caldwell and O’Reilly (1990) and Spector (1997) suggest a potential relationship between satisfaction and performance.

Several researchers have focused their studies on the relationship between organizational commitment and job performance (Mowday et al., 1974; Bangh & Roberts, 1994; Ward & Davis, 1995). According to empirical evidence it has been given mixed results. The results have been mixed (Becker, Billings, Eveleth, & Gilbert, 1996). Organizational commitment has positively correlated with job performance of the industrial sales people (Bashaw and Grant, 1994; Benkhoff, 1997; Khan, 2010; Meyer et al., 1989 & 2002; Suliman and Lles, 2000). Vinchur et al., (1998) explored similar result and said that organizational commitment is one of the variables that influence on job performance. In addition, Legge (1995), Guest (1997) and Morrow (1993) pointed out high committed employee as high performing employees. Jaramillo et al., (2005) found a positive correlation between organizational commitment and job performance with the result of meta-analysis which was conducted using 51 empirical studies. Chen, Silverthorne and Hung (2006) found a positive correlation between organizational commitment and job performance among accounting professionals. Mathieu & Zajac (1990) found weak positive relationship between organizational commitment and job performance but they pointed out a tendency of high committed employees to perform well. Other researchers have identified insignificance or negative relationship between two variables (Leong et al., 1994; Wright, 1997). This different result can be predicted owing to different conceptualization of commitment. Rashid, Sambasvani and Joari (2003) examined 202 managers in Malaysian companies and they found that corporate culture and organizational commitment are correlated on the performance.

Lots of researches have typically focused on affective commitment and job performance relationship. Affective commitment was the most significant predictor of individual performance (Brett et al., 1995; Angle and Lawson, 1994). According to Meyer and Allen (1996) and Hackett et al., (1994) there was a positive relationship between affective commitment and job performance. Similar result was found by some other researchers (Luchak & Gellanty, 2007; Caruana et al., 1997; Meyer et al., 1989; Meyer et al. 2002; Qaisar et al., 2012). Affectively committed employees performed better than those who are not (Meyer et al., 1989; Mowday et al., 1974; Steers, 1977) because the employees committed to the goals of the organizations are likely to work hard (Chelte and Tausky, 1986; Leong et al., 1994; Zahra, 1984) and they are more consistence with organizational expectations (Leong et al., 1994; Sujan, 1986; Weitz et al., 1986) than those who are not. Affective commitment has been positively correlated with supervisor ratings of job performance among laboratory technicians (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991). Similar result was found among the first-level managers in food service (Meyer et al., 1989), and employees from various levels and positions (Mayer & Schoorman, 1992; Moorman, Niehoff, & Organ, 1993).

In addition to the above mentioned empirical findings, in general, it can be predicted a positive correlation
between organizational commitment and job performance because committed employees are happy to be the members of the organization. They have positive attitude about the organization. Thus, they intend to give the best so as to achieve the goals of the organization. As a result job performance can be increased.

2.6.4 Work Values and Job Performance

Employees’ work values are the basis of their work outcomes. Job performance as one of work outcomes, it is affected by work values of the employees. Work values may be related to job performance in different ways. First, job performance of the employees may be increased according to the extent of the work values shared by the employees. Thus, shared values between managers and employees, among the employees will enhance the job performance. In turn, the congruence between work values and other work behaviors will help to increase the job performance of managers and non-managerial employees.

Lyons et al., (2006) stated that work values affect behavior at work, including job performance. Adkins and Naumann (2001) argued that work values can raise employees’ morale, and can predict their work behavior and performance. Liu et al., (2006) examined members of pyramid selling networks, and found better alignment of work values across the hierarchical levels results in better operating performance. According to Cuong and Swierczek (2008) work value is “one of the key factors influencing employee performance.”

Wang and Kao (2009) found that a significant and positive relationship between work values of entry-level police officers and their job performance. Schein, (1985) pointed out work values as a critical elements of organizational culture which may ultimately serve to enhance individual performance. In addition some other researchers have found that positive association between work values and job performance (Adkins, Ravlin, & Meglino, 1992; Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994; Chatman, 1991; Judge & Bretz, 1992; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989)

2.6.5 Work Values and Work Attitudes

According to Chatman (1989) employees were satisfied with their job if the organizations set their work values so as to match with the work values of the employees. Those employees are more committed their organizations. Meglino, Ravlin, and Adkins (1989) reported that when the employees’ values were congruent with the values of the supervisors, it increased the job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Chen and Lu (2000) indicated that the better the work values of employees are aligned, the stronger their organizational commitment and work involvement will be. Wang et al., (2008) found that positive, direct significant relationship between work values and organizational commitment.

Chuang and Li (2002) found that a positive correlation between work values and work attitudes. Furthermore, they stated that if the management places more emphasis on work values it helps for better work attitudes. Some other researchers have found that positive association between work values and work attitudes (Adkins, Ravlin, & Meglino, 1992; Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994; Chatman, 1991; Judge & Bretz, 1992; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989).

4. Development of the Conceptual Framework

The proposed following conceptual framework was developed based on the identified variables and their relationships through the literature review relating to the research problem of the study.

![Proposed Conceptual Framework](image)

5. Methodology

This study reviews the existing literature that is relevant to the variables and the empirical evidence on each variable so as to develop the conceptual framework. Basically 300 articles were reviewed to identify the
concepts, their dimensions and relationships.

6. Conclusion
This conceptual paper proposed the aforementioned conceptual model for the Sri Lankan Context. Luthans and some other researchers have found positive direct relationship between PsyCap and job performance. However in Sri Lankan context thus far it has not been tested. On the other hand if there is a relationship between PsyCap and job performance, since the work values and attitudes of the Sri Lankan people are different from other countries, they may affect on the relationship between PsyCap and job performance. Anyway, the mediating and moderating effect of work values & attitudes on the relationship between PsyCap and job performance has not been examined in previous studies. According to the empirical evidence, there were relationships between PsyCap and work attitudes, work attitudes and job performance, work values and job performance, work values and work attitudes. Therefore, work values can be used as a moderating variable and work attitudes can be used as a mediating variable. Although the proposed conceptual model is yet to be tested empirically, the description of the relationships among the variables, the mediating and moderating effect on the relationship between PsyCap and job performance will enhance the body of knowledge on organizational behavior literature. Since this new model has not been explored previously, it will set a new direction for future PsyCap, job performance research.
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