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Psychological Capital or PsyCap has gained prominence as an important construct in leadership research. Comprising four factors (self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resiliency), PsyCap is considered to be a vital factor for both leadership development and influence. The current study reports the results of a questionnaire survey that was conducted in the construction industry of Singapore. The survey explored the correlations of PsyCap with various forms of leadership and leadership outcomes. The results show that PsyCap significantly correlates with transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness. The discussion in the paper also considers the implications of PsyCap for leadership development and effectiveness.

KEYWORDS: Psychological Capital, Leadership, Effectiveness, Construction Industry, Singapore

INTRODUCTION

Authors have placed much emphasis on human capital (O’Leary et al., 2002) and social capital (Adler and Kwon, 2002) as viable sources of competitive advantage for organizational success. However, rooted in the movement of positive psychology and positive organizational behavior (POB), recent developments in organizational studies have focused on “positively oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed and managed for performance improvement in today’s workplace” (Luthans and Youssef, 2004, p. 152). These psychological capacities are termed as “Psychological Capital” or in short, “PsyCap” (Luthans et al., 2007a). Proponents of PsyCap argue that its development at all levels of the organizations has a high potential to play a key role as a strategy of human resources management (HRM), helping the firms to capitalize on their existing and prospective human resources.

The latest literary developments support the notion that to develop and sustain competitive advantage, the enterprises’ human resource strategies should emphasize the factors that are highly unique and valuable, context-specific, cumulative, renewable, hard to imitate, and non-substitutable (Luthans et al., 2007a; De Saa-Perez and Garcia-Falcon, 2002). Therefore, in addition to providing better monetary compensations, the firms need to invest in human resources in more an innovative manner. They should manage their talent and train them to be better leaders and followers who are inspired to think innovatively, possess positive psychological capacities, and have the highest sense of authenticity to contribute to the achievement of the organizational objectives. For this purpose, firms need to develop PsyCap
among their employees, both followers and leaders. PsyCap is a fresh but theoretically robust and well researched notion. There is substantial support in the literature that PsyCap is potentially an important human resource asset for any business organization.

Given the growing body of knowledge on the subject, it is pertinent to undertake more research on it, as well as performing real-time testing to explore the practical implications of the construct for organizations. The focus of this paper is to examine how PsyCap relates to various forms of leadership (transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez faire leadership) and how it influences various leadership outcomes, such as effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction.

**PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL**

The foundations of PsyCap lie in positive organizational behaviour or POB (Luthans, 2003; Luthans and Youssef, 2004; Youssef and Luthans, 2007). Drawing from POB, Luthans et al. (2007) define PsyCap as the “individual’s positive psychological state of development and is characterized by: (1) having confidence (self-efficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks; (2) making a positive attribution (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future; (3) persevering toward goals and, when necessary, redirecting paths to goals (hope) in order to succeed; and (4) when beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond (resiliency) to attain success” (p. 3). Thus, PsyCap has four main components that are self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resiliency.

Luthans et al. (2007a) argue that for any positive psychological capacity to become a part of the PsyCap, the following criteria must be met:

1. It should be positive and relatively unique to the field of organizational behavior
2. It should fulfill the scientific criteria of being theory- and research-based (that means it should have substantial theoretical and research background)
3. It should be measurable (with the help of some tool such as a questionnaire)
4. It should be state-like (that means the capacity is not hard-wired—or trait-like—or static in nature) and therefore can be developed with certain interventions.
5. It should be related to work performance outcomes (it should have some positive influence on sustainable work performance)

Luthans et al. (2007a) discuss some other candidate social capacities (such as gratitude, forgiveness, emotional intelligence, and spirituality) as well as some higher order strengths (such as authenticity and courage). Luthans et al. (2006a) note that PsyCap is a core construct that predicts performance and satisfaction better than any of the individual strengths that make it up. In their study of Chinese workers, Luthans et al. (2005) ascertain significant correlation of positive psychological capital with their performance that was rated by their supervisors. Luthans et al. (2006b) also claim that a relatively short intervention—or what they call micro-intervention—can lead to increase in PsyCap. Similar results were found when a 2-hour long intervention was conducted on practicing managers. The next section discusses the potential of PsyCap to provide sustainable competitive advantage.
COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL

Earlier research has shown strong support for human capital—that emphasizes developing personal capacities and skills (“what you know”). Researchers have argued that successful organizations attract, engage, develop, and retain the best and brightest employees (O’Leary et al., 2002; Wright et al., 1998). Others argue that social capital—that emphasizes social relations, networks, and connections (“who you know”—is important for organizations as it helps to leverage more information, results in more influence, control power, and organizational solidarity (Adler and Kwon, 2002). It has also been argued that social capital contributes to the creation of human capital and is important for creating sustainable competitive advantage (Luhans and Youssef, 2004). Snell (2002) shares a relatively balanced perspective. He argues that human resource function should treat human capital and social capital equally, saying: “Human capital is, of course, very important for building a foundation for effectiveness, but it may only be the raw material of competitive advantage. The finished product may depend on effective management of social capital” (Snell, 2002, p-64).

PsyCap has several advantages at all levels including employees, leaders and organizations at large. Its proponents argue that it challenges the individuals to explore the question of “who you are” (Luthans and Youssef, 2004) and therefore results in better self-awareness that is fundamental to the development of leadership (George et al., 2007). Luthans et al. (2005) argue that developing PsyCap in employees is not only beneficial for organizations, but also difficult for other enterprises in the business sector to imitate or replicate. PsyCap management possesses the capability of effectively channelling and growing employees’ talents, strengths, and potential and helping the organizations to achieve a long-term competitive edge. A positive psychological state can energize employees’ cognitive processes and their perceptions of what they can achieve (Luthans et al., 2007a). Hopeful employees tend to be independent in their thought processes and possess an internal locus of control that helps them to be motivated by the accomplishment of enriched tasks. Moreover, hopeful leaders and managers are crucial for organizational growth. Such leaders stimulate the followers to determine their own goals and inspire them to reach their maximum potential. Research has also shown a positive relationship between higher level of ‘hope’ among employees and organizational outcomes (Luthans et al., 2007a; Luthans et al., 2005). Empirical evidence has also shown that PsyCap is positively correlated to performance and satisfaction of employees (Luthans et al., 2007b).

Luthans and Youseff (2004) argue that optimism allows individuals to take credit for favorable events in their lives and therefore results in enhanced self-esteem and morale. They also claim that optimism shields them from depression, guilt, self-blame, and despair. Finally, resilience enhances the positive abilities and reduces the fear factors within individuals and/or within their environment. Therefore, resilient individuals are in a better position to bounce back from crises or difficult circumstances. Luthans et al (2007a) also argue that PsyCap emphasizes a new approach to organizational management that inspires a unique and long-term competitive advantage. PsyCap does not contest the widely established need for human capital and social capital. PsyCap is, rather, a new dimension which builds positive psychological capacities and takes the culture of the whole organization to new heights where human potential is valued the most.

Researchers consider PsyCap as a fundamental asset of authentic leadership (Luthans and Avolio, 2003; Walumbwa et al., 2008) which is unique and vital for contemporary businesses (George, et al., 2007) as well as the construction industry (Toor, 2008). Authentic leaders
possess a great deal of self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience (Jensen and Luthans, 2006). With these attributes, authentic leaders are well equipped to face the challenges of business ventures by: understanding their followers and realizing the full potential of their vision (Jensen and Luthans, 2006); establishing organizational trust (Norman, 2006); and appreciating the complexity of the situation (Avey, 2007). They are also able to develop their followers into authentic leaders themselves (Luthans and Avolio, 2003; George and Sims, 2007) through role modelling (Avolio and Gardner, 2005), monitoring, teaching, and coaching (Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999). They are committed to building the highest level of organizational capacity through individual performance (Gardner and Schermerhorn, 2004), intra- and inter-individual impact, group-level impact, and organizational-level impact (Avolio and Luthans, 2006). With a high level of PsyCap as their primary quality, authentic leaders turn their organizations into sustainably high performing and profitable ventures and highly desirable places to work.

Therefore, if developed and well-managed, PsyCap can provide enormous potential benefits for construction organizations. Investment and leveraging of PsyCap can help enterprises to develop a strong workforce with the capacity to build large and complex ventures. With the increasing trend of strategic alliances, having better PsyCap at all levels of the organization can help enterprises to deal with the challenges which organizations normally face when they work in various forms of alliances. PsyCap can also help businesses to realise desirable attitudinal outcomes which include job satisfaction, commitment to the organization, organizational citizenship, and perceived organizational effectiveness (Luthans and Youssef, 2004). Finally, recent publications (see: Luthans et al., 2006b) have also shown that investment in PsyCap development generates high return on investment (ROI). They claim that a mere increase of 2% in PsyCap of organizational leaders can lead to a high return on investment. Luthans et al. (2007) use the approach developed by Skarlicki et al. (1996) to calculate ROI on PsyCap development in a study of 74 managers who went through a micro-intervention for PsyCap development. The results of these initial studies are promising and show high impact of PsyCap development on business performance (see: GLI Briefings Report, 2006). Apparently, PsyCap has a twofold impact; first, in terms of organizational culture and environment, and second, in terms of economic and financial performance.

METHOD

In order to measure PsyCap, a self-report 24-item scale proposed by Luthans et al. (2007) was used. This questionnaire consists of items adapted from Parker, (1998); Snyder et al. (1996); Wagnild and Young (1993); and Scheier and Carver (1985). Luthans et al. (2007) have not only proposed a composite questionnaire to measure PsyCap, they have successfully used and validated this questionnaire in some recent studies (Luthans et al., 2006b; Luthans et al., 2007a). Self-report responses on this scale were sought on a 5-point scale from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 5 (“strongly agree”). To measure various forms of leadership, a self-report 45-item Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5X (Avolio and Bass, 2004) was used. Responses were sought on a 5-point scale from 0 (“not at all”) to 4 (“frequently, if not always”).

Questionnaires were sent to 90 managers across various professional backgrounds of the construction industry. These managers had been nominated by their immediate bosses who were interviewed in an earlier part of the larger study as ‘authentic leaders’ in their organisations – who have a sense of purpose, practice solid values; who lead with heart and
soul, and who demonstrate self-discipline. After these managers were nominated by their bosses, short briefing sessions with held with them to explain the nature of the study and the research objectives, and to seek their consent to participate in the study. After the briefing sessions, questionnaires were distributed among these managers. Follow-up e-mail messages and telephone calls were made in an attempt to enhance the response rate to the questionnaire survey. However, due to the busy schedule of the managers in the prevailing massive boom in construction activity in Singapore, only 32 completed questionnaires were returned, yielding a response rate of 35%.

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Cronbach Alpha values for PsyCap, leadership, and leadership outcomes – effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction – were calculated and appear along the diagonals in Tables 1, 2, and 3. Satisfactory results of internal reliabilities for PsyCap (24-items, $\alpha = 0.88$), PsyCap-Self-Efficacy (4-items, $\alpha = 0.85$), PsyCap Hope (4-items, $\alpha = 0.73$), PsyCap Resiliency (4-items, $\alpha = 0.56$), PsyCap Optimism (4-items, $\alpha = 0.51$), transformational leadership (20-items, $\alpha = 0.91$), transactional leadership (12-items, $\alpha = 0.78$), and leadership outcomes – effectiveness (4-items, $\alpha = 0.61$), extra effort (3-items, $\alpha = 0.74$), satisfaction (2-items, $\alpha = 0.56$) – led to correlation analysis of responses that are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

The results in Table 1 show that PsyCap is significantly and positively correlated to transformational leadership (0.45*) as well as leadership effectiveness (0.49**). Correlations of PsyCap with transactional leadership (0.29) and extra effort (0.24) are positive although not significant. Transformational leadership is positively and significantly correlated with all three leadership outcomes. Whereas transactional leadership significantly correlates with effectiveness and extra effort; it bears positive but insignificant correlations with satisfaction. Laissez-faire leadership is negatively correlated with PsyCap (-0.38), transformational leadership (-0.25), transactional leadership (-0.01), effectiveness (-0.41*), extra effort (-0.14), and satisfaction (-0.22).

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Correlations for Psychological Capital, Leadership, and Leadership Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Psychological Capital</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.88^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Transformational Leader</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
<td>0.91^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Transactional Leader</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.78^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Laissez Faire Leader</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.53^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.49^</td>
<td>0.69^</td>
<td>0.52^</td>
<td>-0.41*</td>
<td>0.61^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Extra Effort</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.68^</td>
<td>0.55^</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.59^</td>
<td>0.74^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.55^</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.68^</td>
<td>0.56^</td>
<td>0.56^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); ^ Cronbach Alpha for internal reliability
Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Correlations for components of Psychological Capital and Leadership Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Psychological Capital (PsyCap)</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.88^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) PsyCap Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.90**</td>
<td>0.85^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) PsyCap Hope</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>0.73^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) PsyCap Resiliency</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.88**</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.56^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) PsyCap Optimism</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.51^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
<td>0.61^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Extra Effort</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.74^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.56^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); ^ Cronbach Alpha for internal reliability

Table 3. Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Correlations for Leadership and Leadership Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Psychological Capital (PsyCap)</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.88^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) PsyCap Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.90**</td>
<td>0.85^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) PsyCap Hope</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>0.73^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) PsyCap Resiliency</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.88**</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.56^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) PsyCap Optimism</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.51^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Transformational Leadership (TL)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
<td>0.91^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Idealized Influence (II)</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
<td>0.79^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Inspirational Motivation (IM)</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
<td>0.87**</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td>0.83^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Intellectual Stimulation (IS)</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.74^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Individualized Consideration (IC)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.64^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); ^ Cronbach Alpha for internal reliability
The results in Table 2 show that three components of PsyCap are significantly and positively correlated to effectiveness (PsyCap-Self-Efficacy = 0.54**; PsyCap-Resiliency = 0.40*; PsyCap-Optimism = 0.40*). PsyCap-Hope is positively correlated with ‘effectiveness’ but this correlation is not significant (0.34). Table 2 also illustrates that PsyCap and its components do not bear any significant correlations with ‘extra effort’ and ‘satisfaction’ of leaders. PsyCap-Hope and PsyCap-Resiliency are, in fact, negatively correlated with satisfaction. This finding is ironical because effectiveness is significantly and positively correlated with both ‘extra effort’ and ‘satisfaction’ as shown in Table 2. Another notable finding in Table 2 is that all components of PsyCap are positively, strongly, and significantly correlated with each other and with overall PsyCap.

Some important findings in Table 3 show that PsyCap is positively and significantly correlated with idealized influence (0.41*), inspirational motivation (0.46**) and intellectual stimulation (0.49**). PsyCap-Self-Efficacy also bears positive and significant correlations with idealized influence (0.56**), inspirational motivation (0.58**) and intellectual stimulation (0.59**). PsyCap-Hope does not bear any significant correlations with components of transformational leadership. However, PsyCap-Resiliency is positively and significantly correlated with intellectual stimulation (0.45*) whereas PsyCap Optimism is positively and significantly correlated with inspirational motivation (0.38*) and intellectual stimulation (0.37*). Table 3 also shows that transformational leadership is positively correlated to all components of PsyCap, although correlations with PsyCap-Hope (0.26) and PsyCap-Resiliency (0.31) are not significant. It is notable that individualized consideration is not significantly correlated with either PsyCap or any of its components.

Tables 1, 2 and 3 also show that PsyCap and transformational leadership are not only positively correlated with each other, but also, they bear positive correlations with leadership outcomes – effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction. Given the strong empirical support for transformational leadership in the literature, and the current evidence that it is positively correlated to PsyCap, it is plausible to claim that transformational leaders possess relatively higher levels of psychological capital which leads to positive outcomes of the functioning of leadership within organizations. It is also evident from the data that ‘authentic leaders’ in the current study possess relatively more attributes and behaviours of transformational leadership rather than transactional or laissez-faire leadership.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION ORGANIZATIONS**

Construction businesses are engaged in an industry that is mostly project based, and in which activities are dynamic, complex, and prone to high risks as its environment is turbulent. As Raiden and Dainty (2006) note, the changing requirements of construction work demands the formation of new teams depending upon the volume and complexity of work. Consequently, many jobs in construction are also project based, resulting in higher performance pressure, lack of organizational citizenship, high turnover, and lack of commitment to the job. High socio-political pressure on construction projects also exacerbates the work pressure. These factors cause discontinuity in organizational learning, growth, and veritable performance.

In the current knowledge age, human resources are indispensable assets which an organization can truly capitalize on, but only if they are properly managed (Luthans and Youssef, 2004). In order to make the most of their human resources, construction organizations need to adopt strategic measures to retain their existing employees and attract new talent. To achieve this, they need to invest in developing the PsyCap of their employees.
through long- and short-term interventions. Given an established theoretical and research base of PsyCap, the present authors argue that it possesses the potential for improving organizational outcomes in construction businesses. It is plausible to posit that construction organizations with better psychological health are likely to provide superior conditions for their employees, both leaders and followers, to grow and contribute to the achievement of the organizations’ objectives. Moreover, it is likely that the employees would feel stronger psychological contracts with their employers which will result in higher motivation, job satisfaction, commitment to the organization, and reduced turnover (Dainty et al., 2000). Such organizations can also be expected to attain self-responsibility and continuous improvement among their employees through organizational learning (Raiden and Dainty, 2006).

High PsyCap construction organizations are also likely to attain greater success in their strategic alliances and other business relationships. Employees with high PsyCap will have better capacity to adjust to new conditions, work in cooperation with their counterparts from other organizations to pursue the project goals. Moreover, as many projects involve players from various cultural backgrounds, employees with high PsyCap will be in a better position to adjust in a cross-cultural environment. High PsyCap construction organizations are also expected to face challenges with confidence in their self-efficacy and optimism to realize better outcomes. These organizations will be capable of making a rebound from failure as they would take such failure as a learning rather than constraining factor. Construction organizations with better PsyCap will also develop authentic leaders and followers who, together, will create a positive organizational culture (Toor and Ofori, 2008). Such an atmosphere is ideal for work, and would improve the employees’ performance.

CONCLUSIONS

Recent developments in the literature on organizations and their behaviour and development support the concept of psychological capital. The current study provides evidence that PsyCap is positively correlated with transformational leadership and leadership outcomes, especially leadership effectiveness. With the increasing complexity of the business world, uncertainty in markets, as well as in employees’ attitudes, it is timely for employers to invest in PsyCap development of their leaders so that the impact can be transferred down throughout the organizations’ membership. Once organizational leaders are able to master and exhibit positive psychological capacities, it will be easier for lower-level organizational members to follow suit. Future research can focus on PsyCap development and return on investment in PsyCap development. Also worth exploring is how PsyCap is related to authentic leadership (that is purported in the literature to be at the root of all forms of positive leadership), ethical leadership, organizational well-being, organizational culture, and organizational citizenship behaviour.
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