

# The Relationship between Psychological Capital, Job Performance and Job Satisfaction in Higher Education Institutions Offering Sports Education

Yunus Sinan Biricik<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Sport Sciences, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey

\*Correspondence: Faculty of Sport Sciences, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey. Tel: 90-442-231-2430. E-mail: sinan.biricik@atauni.edu.tr

Received: April 25, 2020

Accepted: May 25, 2020

Online Published: June 16, 2020

doi:10.5430/wje.v10n3p57

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v10n3p57>

## Abstract

Psychological capital, which is one of the developing areas of positive organizational behavior, is seen as a psychological resource that can encourage development and performance among employees. In the field of sports education, increasing the psychological capital levels of the employees and increasing the performance and job satisfaction can be effective. The aim of this study is to determine the psychological capital, job performance and job satisfaction levels of academic staff working in higher education institutions offering sports education in terms of various variables and to examine the relationship between them. The study sample consisted of a total of 122 sports science academicians, including 30 female and 92 males, who worked in different regions of Turkey. The Organizational Psychological Capital Scale, Job Performance and Job Satisfaction Scales were used as data collection tools in the study. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, t-test, ANOVA, Tukey HSD and correlation test. According to the findings obtained in the research, a high level of positive correlation was found between the psychological capital dimensions and job performance. Again, a moderately positive correlation was found between the psychological resilience, hope and self-efficacy dimensions of the psychological capital and job satisfaction.

**Keywords:** psychological capital, job performance, job satisfaction, academicians, sports sciences

## 1. Introduction

Nowadays, the number of researches is increasing on determining the psychological capital levels of the employees and how this positive trend approach can be used more efficiently and effectively in line with organizational behavior (Wright, 2003). As of the 1990s, the concept of positive psychology has emerged as a result of various investigations to reveal the abilities of individuals and how these strong features can be improved. Psychological capital, which has emerged from the field of positive organizational behavior and is a very important concept in this field, has been the subject of research more frequently, especially in the last decade. Psychological capital (PsyCap) is used as a kind of personal internal business resource. The definition of psychological capital, in general, is the "positive psychological development state of the individual" (Luthans et al., 2004). PsyCap aims to reveal the strengths of the employees and to increase the strengths of these employees, making them happy, successful and good (Youssef & Luthans, 2014). Traditional economic capital addresses what you have, human capital addresses what you know, and social capital addresses who you know, while PsyCap addresses who you are (Luthans et al., 2004). PsyCap is an investment made to provide recycling of productivity and competitive advantage similar to economic capital (Luthans et al., 2006). In general, employees with high PsyCap have rich psychological resources and positive emotional state, and they become stronger and more optimistic especially against the difficulties at work (Li, 2019). Sweetman and Luthans (2010) suggested that PsyCap can increase the inner motivation of employees, ensuring that they show vitality, dedication and assimilation in the workplace.

PsyCap represents personal resources that produce positive results in the workplace and a higher level structure that expresses self-efficacy, hope, optimism and psychological resilience (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007a). These four positive psychological sources define PsyCap as a multi-dimensional structure (Law et al., 1998). Self-efficacy

refers to the ability of the individual for striving to overcome the difficult tasks he/she faces (Luthans, Youssef & Avolio, 2007a). Hope refers to a cognitive process driven by a sense of success in achieving individual goals (Snyder, 1995). Optimism refers to the positive character of an individual in the face of good and bad events in work and life (Luthans, Youssef and Avolio, 2007a). In addition, optimism refers to a positive expectation that individuals will achieve their goals in the future (Scheier & Carver, 1992; Peterson, 2000). Psychological resilience refers to a positive adaptation in the face of important problems (Bonanno, 2004). Psychological resilience is seen as the person's ability to cope with many negative situations (obstacle, uncertainty) and to be successful (Luthans et al., 2006). These four components of PsyCap can go together and synergistically interact with each other to produce differentiated interactions in various times and contexts (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017).

In the main studies of the literature, it is stated that the psychological capital of the employees is significantly and positively related to their performance (Luthans et al., 2005; Luthans et al., 2007a; Luthans et al., 2010; Walumbwa et al., 2010; Peterson et al., 2011). In addition, most of the studies on PsyCap have focused on overall ratings of job performance (Avey et al., 2011; Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007b). However, the most important advantage of PsyCap is that it has an improvable feature (Luthans et al., 2008), and this is also related to the increase in job performance.

PsyCap plays a positive role in improving the quality of work life and the personal life of employees, increasing their quality (Baron et al., 2016). In most of the studies, it has been shown that PsyCap has a positive and strong correlation with job performance, job satisfaction and quality of life. In their study, Luthans et al. (2010) concluded that the development of PsyCap was significantly and positively associated with an increase in job performance and well-being. In addition, Rabenu et al. (2017) showed that PsyCap is strongly, positively and directly related to job performance and well-being. Due to these results, the return on the investments to the PsyCap factor, which is necessary for improving the motivation of the human element and keeping it high in today's business world, will be very positive and profitable (Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007b).

PsyCap has been found to play a vital role in explaining and interpreting employees' performance at work (Peterson et al., 2011; Luthans et al., 2010; Norman et al., 2010; Luthans et al., 2007a). PsyCap will increase motivation by affecting the performance of the individual in business life. Employees with high self-efficacy, hope, and psychological resilience will be able to easily overcome obstacles by dealing with the difficulties they face and will be able to try many alternatives to achieve their goals. Thus, they will get more satisfaction by performing more (Luthans, 2002). As a result, it can be seen that PsyCap has positive effects on job performance and professional as well as personal well-being levels by changing the individual's cognition and motivation process.

Higher education institutions, which are an important part of the education system, assume important duties in the creation, development, and use of knowledge and education of individuals. Academicians who work in these institutions have obligations such as conducting research, educating and tracking the development of students, and acting within the framework of social responsibilities. Therefore, in order to fulfill these important tasks, they need to have high professional performance and job satisfaction. So, it is important to identify PsyCap resources and capacities that significantly affect academicians' job performance. For this reason, current research aimed to investigate and define the effects of PsyCap levels of academicians on job performance and satisfaction.

## **2. Method**

### *2.1 Design of the Research*

The research was carried out using quantitative research method. In the research, a method for descriptive (survey) and relational screening was used.

### *2.2 Participants of the Study*

The study group, in the 2019-2020 academic year in different regions of Turkey, giving sports training and higher education institutions working in the random method that is 122 academics involved in the study (30 women, 92 men).

### *2.3 Data Collection Tools*

The "Organizational Psychological Capital Scale", "Job Performance Scale", "Job Satisfaction Scale" and "Personal Information Form" were used as data collection tools in the research.

Psychological Capital Scale: The Psychological Capital Scale, which includes the sub-dimensions of optimism, psychological resilience, hope and self-efficacy, was developed by Luthans et al., (2007). The scale includes 24

items in total. The adaptation of the Psychological Capital Scale into Turkish was carried out by Çetin and Basım (2012), and they conducted its validity and reliability tests. In the study, the answers were taken with the 6-point Likert type scale (1 = Never, 6 = Always). High scores obtained from the scale indicate that optimism, psychological resilience, hope and self-efficacy are high for each dimension.

**Job Performance Scale:** The job performance scale, which was first used by Kirkman and Rosen (1999) and later by Sigler and Pearson (2000), was employed in this study to measure the job performance of employees. The scale consists of four questions. Its reliability study was conducted by Çöl (2008) by applying it to academicians in Turkey. In the study, the answers were obtained with a 5-point Likert type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The points that can be obtained from the scale vary between 5 and 20, and the increase in the points indicates that the person's job performance is improved.

**Job Satisfaction Scale:** A five-item and one-dimensional scale adapted to Turkish by Basım and Şeşen (2009) from the Job Characteristics Survey of Hackman and Oldham (1975) was used to measure the overall job satisfaction of employees. The scores that can be obtained from the scale applied as 5-point Likert type (1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree) vary between 5 and 25, and the increase in the scores indicates that the job satisfaction of the person increases.

#### 2.4 Data Analysis

The obtained data were transferred to the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS 20.0) database and evaluated with the necessary statistical analysis. The normality test was used to determine whether the data was normally distributed. Tests of normality assumptions showed that the data showed a normal distribution and therefore parametric tests were performed (Table 1). Therefore, T-test was performed for binary groups, and ANOVA for more than two groups, and Tukey HSD test was performed to determine the source of the difference. In addition, Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to see the relationship of psychological capital with job performance and satisfaction.

### 3. Findings

**Table 1.** Scale Score Distribution

Scales	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Optimism	122	3.33	5.17	4.21	.470	.114	-.500
Psychological Resilience	122	3.50	5.50	4.60	.466	-.251	-.712
Hope	122	3.67	6.00	4.88	.607	-.003	-.938
Self-efficacy	122	3.33	6.00	5.19	.696	-.713	.071
JOB PERFORMANCE	122	3.50	5.00	4.35	.475	.160	-.997
JOB SATISFACTION	122	2.60	5.00	4.24	.652	-.689	-.136

As shown in Table 1, the normality test was used to determine whether the data in Table 2 were normally distributed. It can be seen that the collected data (-1, +1) have a normal distribution and parametric tests should be applied.

**Table 2.** T-Test Results of the Psychological Capital Dimensions, Job Performance and Job Satisfaction in Terms of Gender

Scale	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss.	T	P(sig.)
Optimism	Female	30	4.13	.464	-1.107	.271
	Male	92	4.24	.472		
Psychological Resilience	Female	30	4.58	.521	-.275	.784
	Male	92	4.61	.450		
Hope	Female	30	4.83	.618	-.537	.592
	Male	92	4.90	.606		
Self-efficacy	Female	30	5.24	.780	.431	.668
	Male	92	5.18	.671		
JOB PERFORMANCE	Female	30	4.31	.477	-.527	.599
	Male	92	4.36	.476		
JOB SATISFACTION	Female	30	4.02	.868	-.700	<b>.000</b>
	Male	92	4.28	.569		

As shown in Table 2, t-test results did not show a statistically significant difference between the psychological capital sub-dimensions and job performance scores of male and female academicians. However, a significant difference was found in the job satisfaction scale score [ $t = -.700$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ]. This difference appears to be in favor of male academics. ( $X = 4.28$ ).

**Table 3.** ANOVA Test Results of the Psychological Capital Dimensions, and Job Performance and Satisfaction in Terms of Academic Title

Scale	Academic Title	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss	F	P(sig.)	(Tukey)
Optimism	Research Assist.	46	4.20	.486	.018	.999	
	Instructor	22	4.22	.489			
	Asts. Prof.	32	4.21	.492			
	Assoc. Prof.	18	4.22	.442			
	Prof. Dr.	4	4.25	.288			
Psychological Resilience	Research Assist.	46	4.57	.566	.797	.529	
	Instructor	22	4.63	.397			
	Asts. Prof.	32	4.67	.380			
	Assoc. Prof.	18	4.48	.415			
	Prof. Dr..	4	4.83	.384			
Hope	Research Assist.	46	4.84	.686	2.839	<b>.027</b>	<b>5&gt;1,4</b>
	Instructor	22	4.86	.599			
	Asts. Prof.	32	4.95	.437			
	Assoc. Prof.	18	4.68	.596			
	Prof. Dr..	4	5.75	.096			
Self-efficacy	Research Assist.	46	5.13	.726	.972	.426	
	Instructor	22	5.39	.609			
	Asts. Prof.	32	5.20	.662			
	Assoc. Prof.	18	5.03	.791			
	Prof. Dr.	4	5.50	.577			
JOB PERFORMANCE	Research Assist.	46	4.34	.430	1.099	.360	
	Instructor	22	4.12	.578			
	Asts. Prof.	32	4.31	.491			
	Assoc. Prof.	18	3.91	.437			
	Prof. Dr.	4	4.70	.288			
JOB SATISFACTION	Research Assist.	46	4.32	.642	2.307	.062	
	Instructor	22	4.43	.683			
	Asts. Prof.	32	4.35	.497			
	Assoc. Prof.	18	4.25	.818			
	Prof. Dr.	4	4.75	.346			

As shown in Table 3, according to the academic titles of academicians, there was not a statistically significant difference between optimism ( $p = .999$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), psychological resilience ( $p = .529$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), self-efficacy ( $p = .426$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), job performance ( $p = .360$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ) and job satisfaction ( $p = .062$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ) scores. Hope ( $p = .027$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) levels showed statistically significant difference according to title. In the sub-dimension of hope with significant difference, the level of hope of academics with the title of Professor Dr. was significantly higher than academicians with the title of associate professor and research assistant ( $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 4.** ANOVA Test Results of the Psychological Capital Dimensions, and Job Performance and Satisfaction in Terms of Years of Seniority

Scale	Seniority of academicians	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss	F	P(sig.)	(Tukey)
Optimism	0-5 years	46	4.19	.386	.709	.549	
	6-10 years	38	4.29	.546			
	11-20 years	16	4.20	.528			
	21 years and over	22	4.12	.454			
Psychological Resilience	0-5 years <sup>1</sup>	46	4.51	.537	4.613	<b>.004</b>	<b>2&gt;1,3</b>
	6-10 years <sup>2</sup>	38	4.81	.394			
	11-20 years <sup>3</sup>	16	4.39	.412			
	21 years and over <sup>4</sup>	22	4.60	.327			
Hope	0-5 years <sup>1</sup>	46	4.76	.616	4.832	<b>.003</b>	<b>2,4&gt;3</b>
	6-10 years <sup>2</sup>	38	5.05	.587			
	11-20 years <sup>3</sup>	16	4.52	.554			
	21 years and over <sup>4</sup>	22	5.10	.505			
Self-efficacy	0-5 years <sup>1</sup>	46	5.11	.673	2.869	<b>.039</b>	<b>2&gt;3</b>
	6-10 years <sup>2</sup>	38	5.43	.689			
	11-20 years <sup>3</sup>	16	4.89	.515			
	21 years and over <sup>4</sup>	22	5.16	.780			
JOB PERFORMANCE	0-5 years	46	4.29	.438	2.158	.097	
	6-10 years	38	4.50	.539			
	11-20 years	16	4.18	.359			
	21 years and over	22	4.36	.467			
JOB SATISFACTION	0-5 years	46	4.27	.724	1.830	.146	
	6-10 years	38	4.33	.534			
	11-20 years	16	3.90	.516			
	21 years and over	22	4.27	.726			

As shown in Table 4, there was no statistically significant difference in optimism ( $p = .549$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), job performance ( $p = .097$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ) and job satisfaction ( $p = .146$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ) scores according to the seniority of academicians. Psychological resilience ( $p = .004$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ), hope ( $p = .003$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) and self-efficacy ( $p = .039$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) levels differed statistically significantly according to years of seniority. Table 4 shows which groups caused this difference.

It is seen in Table 5 that there was a positive and significant relationship between the psychological capital dimensions, job performance and job satisfaction levels of the research group. It was found that there was no significant correlation between the optimism subscale score of the psychological capital scale and the job satisfaction scale score ( $r = -.056$ ), and a high level of positive correlation was found between the psychological capital dimensions and job performance. Again, a moderately positive correlation was found between the psychological resilience, hope and self-efficacy dimensions of the psychological capital and job satisfaction.

**Table 5.** Correlation Analysis between the Psychological Capital Dimensions and Job Performance and Satisfaction

Scale		1	2	3	4	5	6
Optimism <sup>1</sup>	r	1					
	p						
	n	122					
Psychological Resilience <sup>2</sup>	r	.391**	1				
	p	.000					
	n	122	122				
Hope <sup>3</sup>	r	.482**	.676**	1			
	p	.000	.000				
	n	122	122	122			
Self-efficacy <sup>4</sup>	r	.472**	.729**	.630**	1		
	p	.000	.000	.000			
	n	122	122	122	122		
JOB PERFORMANCE <sup>5</sup>	r	.370**	.621**	.595**	.685**	1	
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000		
	n	122	122	122	122	122	
JOB SATISFACTION <sup>6</sup>	r	.048	.432**	.391**	.197*	.327**	1
	p	.598	.000	.000	.030	.000	
	n	122	122	122	122	122	122

#### 4. Discussion

In the analyses conducted to examine the effects of PsyCap levels of academicians working in higher education institutions offering sports education on job performance and satisfaction, positive and meaningful relationships were found between the variables. Looking at the answers given to the questions in the scales, it was observed that academicians' PsyCap dimensions, job performance and job satisfaction averages were high. It was concluded that male academics felt more job satisfaction than female academicians in terms of gender, that professors were more hopeful than associate professors and research assistants, and that PsyCap levels of academicians with 6-10 years of seniority were higher than other groups.

According to the results of the correlation analysis, a high level of positive correlation was determined between the PsyCap dimensions and job performance. Luthans et al. (2007b), who played an important role in the development of the PsyCap concept, wanted to reveal the relationship between PsyCap and job performance and concluded that there was a highly positive correlation between PsyCap and job performance. There are also similar studies showing that PsyCap improves job performance (Luthans et al., 2008). Considering the research on the sub-dimensions of PsyCap and the job performance of employees, Seligman (1990) concluded that the optimism dimension increased job performance. Luthans et al., (2005) found a strong relationship between psychological resilience and job performance. Again, there are also studies that determined the existence of a positive and significant relationship between the sub-dimensions of self-efficacy and hope, and employee performance (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998; Avey et al., 2011).

In our study, a moderately positive correlation was found between the psychological resilience, hope and self-efficacy dimensions except for the optimism sub-dimension of the PsyCap scale. Most studies have demonstrated similar results, stating that PsyCap, which is formed by a combination of optimism, hope, self-efficacy and resilience factors, is a high-level positive psychological factor that can be associated with job satisfaction (Luthans, et al., 2007b; Luthans & Youssef, 2004; Luthans, et al., 2004; Luthans & Youssef, et al., 2007a). Youssef and Luthans (2007) determined that job satisfaction had a positive and significant relationship with optimism. This finding contradicts our results. On the other hand, there are studies that support the results of our study. In their study, Larson and Luthans (2006) showed that there were positive and significant relationships between the hope and resilience sub-dimensions of psychological capital and job satisfaction. Again, Larson et al. (2013) found in their study on employees that PsyCap caused a positive progress in job commitment and satisfaction. According to this result, as the positive capital level of academics increases, both job performance and job satisfaction levels increase. Therefore, the factors that increase this level should be strengthened by measuring the psychological capital levels of the academicians working in the sports education institutions of universities.

## 5. Conclusion

In conclusion, this study presents that positive structures such as optimism, hope, self-efficacy and psychological resilience can have a common core with positive characteristics in terms of job performance and satisfaction. The findings obtained from this study seem to have many positive effects on the development and management of the motivational tendencies of individuals working in the field of sports science today. It is possible that people serving in the sports industry, which is located in a socially and economically broad industry, will be more eager, devoted and committed to their jobs by being happier, more optimistic and resilient. Therefore, the investments or practices of managers working in this industry for the development of these four dimensions will affect the psychological capital levels positively and increase the job performance and satisfaction levels.

## References

- Avey, J. B., Reichard, R. J., Luthans, F., & Mhatre, K. H. (2011). Meta-analysis of the impact of positive psychological capital on employee attitudes, behaviors, and performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 22(2), 127-152. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.20070>
- Bandura, A., Freeman, W. H., & Lightsey, R. (1999). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 13(2), 158-166. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0889-8391.13.2.158>
- Baron, R. A., Franklin, R. J., & Hmieleski, K. M. (2016). Why entrepreneurs often experience low, not high, levels of stress: The joint effects of selection and psychological capital. *Journal of Management*, 42(3), 742-768. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313495411>
- Basım, H. N., & Şeşen, H. (2009). Örgütsel adalet algısı-örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ilişkisinde iş tatmininin aracılık rolü. *Osman Gazi Üniversitesi*, 17, 806-812.
- Bonanno, G. A. (2004). Loss, trauma, and human resilience: Have we underestimated the human capacity to thrive after extremely aversive events? *American Psychologist*, 59(1), 20. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.1.20>
- Çetin, F., & Basım, H. N. (2012). Örgütsel psikolojik sermaye: Bir ölçek uyarlama çalışması. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 45(1), 121-137.
- Çöl, G. (2008). Algılanan güçlendirmenin işgören performansı üzerine etkileri. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 9(1), 35-46. <https://doi.org/10.31671/dogus.2019.220>
- Hackman, R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(2), 159-170. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0076546>
- Kirkman, B. L., & Rosen, B. (1999). Beyond self-management: antecedents and consequences of team empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 58-74. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256874>
- Larson, M. D., Norman, S. M., Hughes, L. W., & Avey, J. B. (2013). Psychological capital: A new lens for understanding employee fit and attitudes. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(1), 28-43.
- Larson, M., & Luthans, F. (2006). Potential added value of psychological capital in predicting work attitudes. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 13(2), 75-92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10717919070130020601>
- Li, Y. (2019). Leadership styles and knowledge workers' work engagement: Psychological capital as a mediator. *Current Psychology*, 38(5), 1152-1161. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-9968-6>
- Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(6), 695-706. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.165>
- Luthans, F., & Youssef, C. M. (2004). Human, social, and now positive psychological capital management: Investing in people for competitive advantage. *Published in Organizational Dynamics*, 33(2), 143-160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.01.003>
- Luthans, F., & Youssef-Morgan, C. M. (2017). Psychological capital: An evidence-based positive approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behaviour*, 4, 339-366. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113324>
- Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., & Patera, J. I. (2008). Experimental analysis of a webbased training intervention to develop positive psychological capital. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7(2), 209-221. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2008.32712618>
- Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., & Peterson, S. J. (2010). The development and resulting performance impact of

- positive psychological capital. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 21(1), 41-67. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.20034>
- Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., Norman, S. M., & Combs, G. M. (2006). Psychological capital development: toward a micro-intervention. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 387-393. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.373>
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007b). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(3), 541-572. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00083.x>
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Li, W. (2005). The psychological capital of chinese workers: exploring the relationship with performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 1, 249-271. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2005.00011.x>
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007a). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195187526.001.0001>
- Luthans, F., Luthans, K. W., & Luthans, B. C. (2004). Positive psychological capital: beyond human and social capital. *Business Horizons*, 47(1), 45-50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2003.11.007>
- Norman, S. M., Avolio, B. J., & Luthans, F. (2010). The impact of positivity and transparency on trust in leaders and their perceived effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(3), 350-364. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.002>
- Peterson, C. (2000). The future of optimism. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 44. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.44>
- Peterson, S. J., Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Zhang, Z. (2011). Psychological capital and employee performance: A latent growth modeling approach. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(2), 427-450. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01215.x>
- Rabenu, E., Yaniv, E., & Elizur, D. (2017). The relationship between psychological capital, coping with stress, well-being, and performance. *Current Psychology*, 36(4), 875-887. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-016-9477-4>
- Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1992). Effects of optimism on psychological and physical well-being: Theoretical overview and empirical update. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 16(2), 201-228. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01173489>
- Sigler, T. H., & Pearson, C. M. (2000). Creating an empowering culture: Examining the relationship between organizational culture and perceptions of empowerment. *Journal of Quality Management*, 5(1), 27-52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1084-8568\(00\)00011-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1084-8568(00)00011-0)
- Snyder, C. R. (1995). Conceptualizing, measuring, and nurturing hope. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 73(3), 355-360. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1995.tb01764.x>
- Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 240. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.240>
- Sweetman, D., & Luthans, F. (2010). The power of positive psychology: Psychological capital and work engagement. *Work Engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research*, 54-68.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Peterson, S. J., Avolio, B. J., & Hartnell, C. A. (2010). An investigation of the relationships among leader and follower psychological capital, service climate, and job performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 63, 937-963. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01193.x>
- Wright, T. A. (2003). Positive organizational behavior: an idea whose time has truly come. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 4(24), 437-442. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.197>
- Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2007). Positive organizational behavior in the workplace: the impact of hope, optimism, and resilience. *Journal of Management*, 33(5), 773-800. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307305562>
- Youssef-Morgan, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2014). Psychological capital and well-being. *Stress and Health*, 31(3), 180-188. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2623>