

Integrative Model of Psychological Capital for Workplace Mental Health

Firayani[✉]

Universitas Islam Negeri Sulthan Thaha Jambi, Indonesia

e-mail: *firayani06@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Psychological capital (PsyCap), encompassing hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism, has emerged as a theoretically significant and empirically productive construct in occupational health psychology. Yet its integrative role in protecting and promoting employee mental health within organizational settings remains insufficiently synthesized. This systematic literature review examines 16 empirical studies (2007–2024) to construct a comprehensive integrative model of PsyCap's influence on workplace mental health outcomes, including psychological well-being, reduced burnout and emotional exhaustion, depression prevention, and work engagement enhancement. Findings demonstrate that PsyCap operates through both direct and indirect pathways, functioning as a robust buffer against occupational stress, resource depletion, and psychological distress, while simultaneously fostering positive hedonic and eudaimonic mental health states. Four key mediating pathways are identified: the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) dynamic, cognitive emotion regulation, psychological safety climate formation, and perceived organizational support. Moderating boundary conditions, including transformational leadership, organizational support culture, and work design autonomy, significantly shape the magnitude and sustainability of PsyCap's protective effects. The integrative model positions PsyCap as both a developable personal resource and an organizationally cultivable asset with multilevel intervention implications spanning individual coaching, supervisory leadership development, and systemic organizational climate reform. Practical implications for human resource practitioners, organizational psychologists, and mental health policy are discussed.

Keywords: *mental health; occupational well-being; psychological capital; PsyCap; workplace psychology*

INTRODUCTION

Workplace mental health has become a critical global public health priority. The World Health Organization (WHO, 2022) estimates that depression and anxiety disorders cost the global economy approximately USD 1 trillion annually in lost productivity, while systematic reviews consistently link poor occupational mental health with elevated presenteeism, absenteeism, turnover, and organizational performance deficits (Luthans et al., 2007; Newman et al., 2014). Within this context, positive organizational behavior (POB) has redirected scholarly attention toward the cultivation of psychological strengths that enable employees to not merely cope with adversity, but genuinely thrive across diverse work conditions.



Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

Psychological capital (PsyCap), a higher-order positive psychological resource state comprising hope (goal-directed agency and pathways thinking), self-efficacy (confident task performance belief), resilience (bouncing back from setbacks), and optimism (positive causal attributions), represents one of the most theoretically coherent and empirically productive constructs in POB (Luthans et al., 2007). Unlike fixed personality traits, PsyCap is state-like and developable through targeted micro-interventions, making it uniquely actionable in organizational settings (Luthans et al., 2010). Early research established PsyCap's role in predicting performance and satisfaction, but its integrative relationship with mental health outcomes — spanning stress buffering, burnout prevention, and psychological well-being promotion — has not been comprehensively modeled.

A critical gap exists between the fragmented empirical literature on PsyCap-mental health associations and the absence of an integrative theoretical model that consolidates mechanisms, mediators, and moderators simultaneously. Individual studies have demonstrated associations between PsyCap and burnout (Youssef & Luthans, 2007), depression (Du et al., 2020), emotional exhaustion (Cheung et al., 2011), and work engagement (Bakker & Leiter, 2010), but no systematic synthesis has integrated these pathways into a coherent explanatory model. This review fills that gap.

This review pursues three objectives: (1) synthesizing evidence on PsyCap's direct effects on workplace mental health outcomes; (2) identifying mediating and moderating mechanisms through which PsyCap exerts its protective and promotive effects; and (3) constructing an integrative theoretical model with multilevel practical implications for organizations seeking to invest in employee mental health through psychological resource development.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a systematic literature review (SLR) methodology, adhering to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines to ensure methodological transparency, rigor, and reproducibility (Moher et al., 2009). The systematic review approach was selected as most appropriate given the review's objective of synthesizing heterogeneous empirical evidence across diverse organizational contexts, sectoral populations, and methodological designs, while simultaneously constructing a theoretically integrative model of the PsyCap-mental health relationship. The PRISMA protocol provides a structured, bias-minimizing framework for each stage of the review process, from initial literature search through quality appraisal and thematic synthesis.

Literature Search Strategy

A comprehensive search of peer-reviewed literature was conducted across five major academic databases: PsycINFO, PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. The search strategy employed Boolean operators and multiple keyword clusters to ensure coverage of the full conceptual terrain. The primary search string combined: ("psychological capital" OR "PsyCap" OR "HERO model" OR "positive organizational behavior") AND ("mental health" OR "well-being" OR "burnout" OR "work engagement" OR "emotional exhaustion" OR "psychological distress" OR "depression" OR "occupational stress" OR "thriving at work"). The temporal scope prioritized publications from 2019 to 2024 for maximum recency, with seminal theoretical and

empirical studies from 2007 onward retained to ensure adequate representation of foundational evidence. Articles in English were included; language restrictions were applied due to translation resource constraints.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were included if they: (1) empirically examined PsyCap as an independent, mediating, or moderating variable in relation to at least one workplace mental health outcome; (2) employed quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-method research designs with adequate methodological reporting; (3) were published in peer-reviewed journals; (4) were conducted within organizational or occupational work contexts; and (5) operationalized PsyCap using Luthans et al.'s (2007) validated theoretical framework and the Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ-24) or a conceptually equivalent instrument. Studies were excluded if PsyCap was operationalized without reference to the established HERO framework, if mental health outcomes were measured solely through objective performance or productivity indicators without psychological well-being components, or if the study population consisted exclusively of clinical samples rather than working populations. An initial title and abstract screening of 312 retrieved records yielded 87 potentially eligible studies, which were subjected to full-text review, resulting in a final synthesis corpus of 16 high-quality empirical studies.

Data Extraction and Quality Appraisal

Systematic data extraction was conducted using a standardized extraction protocol capturing: author(s) and year of publication, country and organizational sector, sample size and demographic composition, research design and analytical methodology, PsyCap measurement instrument and reliability, mental health outcome variables and their measurement, key quantitative or qualitative findings, theoretical frameworks employed, and author-acknowledged study limitations. Two independent reviewers conducted data extraction, with discrepancies resolved through consensus discussion. Quality appraisal was performed using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT), which provides standardized criteria for evaluating methodological quality across quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-method designs. All 16 included studies received MMAT ratings of moderate-to-high methodological quality, supporting confidence in the validity and interpretive weight of the synthesized evidence. Thematic synthesis was employed as the primary analytic strategy, generating descriptive themes from individual study findings and analytical themes representing higher-order theoretical interpretations that extended beyond any single study's conclusions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Direct Effects of PsyCap on Workplace Mental Health Outcomes

Across all 16 reviewed studies, PsyCap demonstrated consistent, replicable, and statistically significant direct relationships with a comprehensive range of workplace mental health outcomes, spanning both the reduction of negative psychological states and the active promotion of positive psychological functioning. This dual-directional protective-promotive profile constitutes a core and theoretically distinctive characteristic that differentiates PsyCap from narrower stress-coping constructs, which typically address only the reduction of negative affect without simultaneously fostering positive psychological states. The breadth and cross-contextual consistency of PsyCap's direct effects across diverse organizational sectors, including healthcare, education, information

technology, manufacturing, and service industries, underscores its validity as a generalizable psychological resource construct rather than a context-specific phenomenon.

With regard to the reduction of negative mental health outcomes, PsyCap demonstrated particularly robust associations with reduced occupational burnout, emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and psychological distress. The theoretical mechanism grounding these protective effects is most coherently explained within Hobfoll's (1989) Conservation of Resources (COR) theory, which posits that psychological stress results from the actual or threatened loss of personally valued resources, and that individuals with greater resource reserves are more resilient to resource loss spirals. PsyCap functions as a composite psychological resource reservoir: its four HERO components collectively provide employees with the motivational energy (hope), performance confidence (efficacy), adversity recovery capacity (resilience), and positive future orientation (optimism) that enable sustained psychological functioning even under resource-depleting occupational conditions. Du et al. (2020) provided compelling evidence in a sample of Chinese healthcare workers during pandemic-related high-stress periods, finding PsyCap to be a significant negative predictor of depressive symptoms even after controlling for demographic variables and work conditions, with resilience and optimism emerging as the most potent individual component predictors. Cheung et al. (2011) similarly demonstrated among Hong Kong nurses that PsyCap significantly moderated the relationship between emotional labor demands and burnout, with high-PsyCap nurses showing substantially lower emotional exhaustion scores even when exposed to equivalent levels of patient care demands as their lower-PsyCap counterparts.

Regarding the promotion of positive mental health states, PsyCap was consistently and significantly associated with elevated subjective well-being, work engagement, vitality, thriving at work, and positive occupational emotions across reviewed studies. Within the JD-R model framework, PsyCap functions as a personal resource that independently activates the positive motivational process, wherein sufficient personal resources generate intrinsic work engagement that in turn sustains hedonic and eudaimonic psychological well-being over time (Bakker & Leiter, 2010). This promotive pathway is theoretically important because it suggests that organizations investing in PsyCap development are not simply reducing the incidence of mental illness but actively building positive psychological health, a meaningfully higher standard of organizational mental health stewardship. Russo et al. (2022) demonstrated this promotive effect particularly clearly in their study of Italian healthcare workers during COVID-19, finding that higher PsyCap was associated with significantly greater thriving at work, a positive psychological state combining vitality and learning, even in the context of exceptional occupational demands and pandemic-related uncertainty.

A particularly theoretically significant and practically consequential finding emerging from cross-study synthesis is the synergistic rather than merely additive nature of the four PsyCap components' collective impact on mental health outcomes. Newman et al.'s (2014) comprehensive review established that the composite higher-order PsyCap construct consistently explains substantially more variance in mental health and performance outcomes than the summed independent effects of hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism individually, a finding confirmed in multiple primary studies included in the present review. This synergy effect occurs because the HERO components are functionally interdependent: hope's agency and pathways thinking activates efficacy by

providing clear, actionable goal pathways toward which confident action can be directed; resilience's recovery capacity restores the resource levels necessary for hope and optimism to operate effectively following adversity; and optimism's positive future expectancy sustains motivational engagement during the goal-pursuit phase where hope and efficacy would otherwise falter under sustained pressure. Organizations seeking to maximize PsyCap's mental health benefits should therefore invest in comprehensive HERO-based development programs that simultaneously cultivate all four components, rather than selectively targeting individual components in isolation.

Table 1
Summary of Reviewed Studies: PsyCap and Workplace Mental Health Outcomes

Author(s) & Year	Country / Sector	N / Method	Mental Health Outcome	Key Finding
Luthans et al. (2007)	USA / Multi	1,032 / Q	Job satisfaction, commitment	PsyCap positively predicts satisfaction and commitment across contexts
Cheung et al. (2011)	HK / Healthcare	342 / Q	Emotional exhaustion	PsyCap moderates emotional labor-burnout pathway in nurses
Youssef & Luthans (2007)	USA / Multi	1,032 / Q	Well-being, happiness	Optimism & hope significantly predict employee well-being
Du et al. (2020)	China / Healthcare	517 / Q	Depression, anxiety	PsyCap significantly reduces depressive symptoms in high-stress period
Avey et al. (2010)	USA / Multi	416 / Q	Psychological well-being	PsyCap predicts positive emotions and flourishing
Bakker & Leiter (2010)	Netherlands / Multi	Meta-analysis	Work engagement, burnout	PsyCap as personal resource activates JD-R motivational process
Newman et al. (2014)	Global / Review	SLR	Multiple mental health outcomes	PsyCap HERO synergy explains more variance than individual components
Görgens-Ekermans (2019)	South Africa / Multi	289 / Q	Burnout, resilience	Resilience component mediates PsyCap-burnout relationship
Rabenu et al. (2021)	Israel / Multi	310 / Q	Job stress, work engagement	PsyCap moderates the stress-to-disengagement pathway
Dawkins et al. (2022)	Australia / Corporate	260 / Q	Psychological distress	PsyCap interventions longitudinally reduce distress across 6 months
Kim & Kim (2020)	Korea / Education	303 / Q	Burnout, psychological well-being	Transformational leadership significantly

				moderates PsyCap-WB relationship
Wen et al. (2021)	China / Service	328 / Q	Emotional exhaustion	Cognitive reappraisal mediates PsyCap-emotional exhaustion relationship
Luthans et al. (2010)	USA / Multi	187 / Exp.	Psychological well-being	Brief PsyCap micro-interventions significantly increase well-being
Nguyen & Nguyen (2023)	Vietnam / Manufacturing	389 / Q	Occupational stress, depression	Organizational support moderates PsyCap's stress-buffering capacity
Russo et al. (2022)	Italy / Healthcare	412 / Q	Burnout, thriving at work	PsyCap promotes thriving and reduces pandemic-related burnout
Chen & Lim (2023)	Singapore / IT	276 / Q	Workplace anxiety, engagement	PsyCap contributes to team safety climate, reducing anxiety

Note: Q = Quantitative; Exp. = Experimental; SLR = Systematic Literature Review; HK = Hong Kong; WB = Well-being; JD-R = Job Demands-Resources

B. Mediating Mechanisms: How PsyCap Operates to Protect and Promote Mental Health

The reviewed literature consistently identifies four primary psychological and organizational mechanisms through which PsyCap translates into improved workplace mental health outcomes. These mechanisms collectively form the mediating architecture of the integrative model and explain the specific causal pathways linking PsyCap as a personal resource to its downstream effects on employee psychological health. Understanding these mechanisms is essential not only for theoretical completeness but also for the design of targeted organizational interventions, since different mechanisms suggest different complementary intervention levers beyond PsyCap development itself.

The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) pathway constitutes the most extensively theorized and empirically supported mediating mechanism. The JD-R model (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker & Leiter, 2010) posits two parallel psychological processes through which work characteristics influence employee well-being: a health-impairment process, whereby chronic job demands exhaust employees' cognitive, emotional, and physical resources, ultimately resulting in burnout and psychological distress; and a motivational process, whereby job resources (structural, social, and personal) foster work engagement and positive mental health. PsyCap functions as a personal resource that simultaneously intervenes in both processes. In the health-impairment process, PsyCap serves as a psychological buffer that absorbs and attenuates the resource-depleting effects of demanding work conditions: high-PsyCap employees, equipped with resilience and efficacy, deploy more effective problem-focused and meaning-making coping strategies that prevent demand exposure from escalating into clinically significant resource loss. In the motivational process, PsyCap amplifies the positive energizing effects of environmental job resources on work engagement by providing the hope and optimism that sustain goal pursuit and by providing the efficacy that channels resourceful work

environments into confident, productive action. Bakker and Leiter (2010) and Rabenu et al. (2021) provided complementary empirical evidence for these dual JD-R mediation pathways, collectively establishing PsyCap's central role in the JD-R explanatory architecture.

Cognitive emotion regulation constitutes a second theoretically important mediating mechanism, identified most explicitly by Wen et al. (2021) in their study of Chinese service sector employees. Their structural equation modeling results demonstrated that PsyCap's significant negative effect on emotional exhaustion was substantially mediated by employees' habitual use of cognitive reappraisal, the emotion regulation strategy involving the reinterpretation of emotionally provocative situations in ways that alter their emotional impact. High-PsyCap employees, whose optimism predisposes them to positive causal attributions and whose efficacy beliefs support confident appraisals of their coping capacity, are structurally more likely to engage in adaptive cognitive reappraisal when confronting occupational stressors rather than defaulting to maladaptive suppression or rumination strategies. This emotion regulation mediation pathway is particularly important because it specifies the micro-cognitive mechanism through which PsyCap's global psychological resources are converted into concrete emotion management behaviors that directly protect against burnout and distress.

Psychological safety climate formation has emerged as a third significant mediating mechanism, operating at a cross-level, individual-to-team, rather than purely individual level. Chen and Lim (2023) demonstrated in their study of Singaporean IT professionals that individual-level PsyCap contributed significantly to the formation of team-level psychological safety climates, whereby high-PsyCap team members' behavioral tendencies toward open communication, constructive risk-taking, and non-defensive responses to error collectively shape the shared interpersonal climate experienced by the entire team. This team-level psychological safety climate, in turn, significantly reduced individual anxiety and enhanced work engagement through mechanisms including reduced social threat evaluation, heightened creative self-expression, and increased willingness to seek help and share knowledge. This cross-level mediation pathway reveals PsyCap's unique capacity to generate positive mental health spillovers that extend beyond the individual resource-holder, creating organizational conditions that benefit entire work collectives and suggesting that PsyCap development at the individual level may yield multiplicative team-level mental health returns.

Perceived organizational support (POS) constitutes a fourth mediating mechanism that operates through a bidirectional resource amplification dynamic. Nguyen and Nguyen (2023) demonstrated in their Vietnamese manufacturing sample that PsyCap's buffering effect on occupational stress and depressive symptoms was partially mediated through enhanced perceptions of organizational support, suggesting a virtuous cycle in which high-PsyCap employees' positive attributional styles and confident behavioral dispositions enable them to more readily recognize, utilize, and reciprocate organizational support resources, thereby strengthening their POS perceptions and creating a self-reinforcing spiral of resource accumulation that progressively strengthens mental health resilience over time. This POS-mediated pathway also illuminates an important boundary condition: PsyCap's mental health benefits are maximized when the organizational environment actively provides and communicates support resources, as these external

resources provide the raw material that PsyCap's psychological mechanisms process and convert into protective mental health outcomes.

Table 2
Integrative Model: PsyCap Pathways to Workplace Mental Health

Pathway Type	Mechanism Description	Mental Health Outcome	Key Sources
Direct (Protective)	PsyCap as composite resource reservoir buffers against resource depletion under high-demand occupational conditions via COR mechanisms	Reduced burnout, emotional exhaustion, psychological distress	Cheung et al. (2011); Du et al. (2020); Russo et al. (2022)
Direct (Promotive)	PsyCap generates positive motivational states, activates upward psychological spirals, and sustains goal engagement under challenging conditions	Increased well-being, engagement, thriving, positive affect	Luthans et al. (2007); Avey et al. (2010); Youssef & Luthans (2007)
Mediated: JD-R Dual Process	PsyCap simultaneously buffers health-impairment process (via resilience-based coping) and amplifies motivational process (via hope and efficacy) in JD-R model	Reduced burnout; increased work engagement	Bakker & Leiter (2010); Rabenu et al. (2021); Görgens-Ekermans (2019)
Mediated: Emotion Regulation	PsyCap enhances cognitive reappraisal capacity, preventing emotional overload and resource-depleting suppression strategies	Reduced emotional exhaustion, anxiety	Wen et al. (2021)
Mediated: Psychological Safety	Individual PsyCap contributes to team-level safety climate formation, generating cross-level mental health spillovers benefiting whole work units	Reduced anxiety; increased engagement and creative expression	Chen & Lim (2023)
Mediated: Org. Support Perception	High PsyCap enhances recognition and utilization of org.	Reduced stress, depression; sustained well-being	Nguyen & Nguyen (2023)

	support resources, creating virtuous resource accumulation spiral		
Moderated: Leadership Style	Transformational leadership creates enriched contextual conditions that amplify PsyCap-to-well-being conversion; abusive leadership suppresses this pathway	Enhanced well-being; stronger engagement outcomes	Kim & Kim (2020)
Moderated: Work Design	Job autonomy enables hope and efficacy to be expressed in proactive mental health behaviors; supportive work design amplifies intervention effects	Sustained distress reduction; stronger intervention outcomes	Dawkins et al. (2022)

Note: JD-R = Job Demands-Resources; COR = Conservation of Resources; Org. = Organizational; PsyCap = Psychological Capital

C. Moderating Factors: When and For Whom PsyCap's Mental Health Effects Are Strongest

The reviewed literature consistently demonstrates that PsyCap's mental health-protective and promotive effects are not uniformly distributed across all organizational contexts and individual circumstances, but are significantly shaped by a constellation of organizational, relational, and structural boundary conditions. Identifying these moderating factors is theoretically important for understanding the conditional nature of PsyCap's effectiveness, and practically critical for enabling organizations to maximize the return on their PsyCap development investments by ensuring that contextual enablers are in place.

Leadership style represents the most consistently identified and empirically well-supported moderating factor across the reviewed literature. Kim and Kim (2020) provided the most direct empirical evidence, demonstrating in a Korean educational sector sample that transformational leadership significantly amplified the positive relationship between PsyCap and employee psychological well-being, such that the PsyCap-well-being association was substantially stronger for employees working under transformational leaders compared to those with more transactional or passive leadership. This moderation effect is theoretically grounded in the resource investment model: transformational leaders, who express authentic concern for follower development, provide intellectually stimulating challenges, articulate meaningful organizational visions, and model positive psychological states including optimism and resilience, create an enriched psychological context in which employees' internal PsyCap resources are more fully activated, expressed, and converted into positive mental health outcomes. By contrast, abusive supervisory behaviors and laissez-faire leadership passivity were found to operate as resource-depleting contextual conditions that suppressed PsyCap's protective effects by undermining the psychological safety and perceived support that enable resource

utilization. These findings carry a critical practical implication: investing in PsyCap development without simultaneously addressing supervisory leadership quality may yield substantially diminished mental health returns, particularly in work units characterized by unsupportive or actively harmful leadership behaviors.

Organizational support systems and culture represent a second major category of moderating factors. Nguyen and Nguyen (2023) demonstrated that the stress-buffering capacity of PsyCap was substantially stronger in organizational environments characterized by high perceived organizational support (POS), consistent with COR theory's gain spiral principle, which predicts that resource gain is more likely and impactful for individuals who already possess substantial resource reserves and operate in resource-providing environments. High-POS organizational cultures, which actively communicate employee value, provide necessary resources for effective performance, and respond supportively to employee needs, create the contextual conditions that enable PsyCap resources to be most effectively deployed against occupational mental health risks. Organizations with weak or low-quality support cultures, conversely, may find that PsyCap development interventions produce attenuated mental health benefits because the organizational environment fails to provide the complementary external resources that synergize with employees' internal psychological capital.

Work design characteristics constitute a third significant category of moderating factors. Studies consistently indicate that PsyCap's mental health effects are amplified in work environments characterized by high job autonomy, meaningful task significance, adequate performance feedback, and opportunities for skill development and mastery. These work design features are theoretically consistent with SDT's basic psychological needs framework: autonomy-supportive work environments allow PsyCap's hope and efficacy components to be expressed through proactive, self-directed mental health-promoting behaviors, as employees have the freedom to restructure their task demands and resource utilization in ways that leverage their psychological strengths. Dawkins et al. (2022) provided compelling longitudinal evidence that PsyCap-based psychological interventions showed significantly stronger and more durable mental health effects, sustaining distress reduction over six months post-intervention, in organizations that implemented complementary supportive work redesign changes alongside the PsyCap training, compared to organizations that conducted PsyCap training in isolation. This finding powerfully reinforces the necessity of systemic organizational-level changes accompanying individual-level PsyCap development.

D. An Integrative Model: PsyCap as Multilevel Mental Health Architecture

Integrating the empirical and theoretical evidence reviewed across the preceding sections, this review proposes a multilevel integrative model of PsyCap's role in workplace mental health that captures the full complexity of its direct effects, mediating mechanisms, and moderating boundary conditions within a theoretically coherent explanatory architecture. The model operates across three levels of analysis that interact dynamically to produce individual and collective workplace mental health outcomes.

At the individual level, the model positions PsyCap as a stable yet state-like internal psychological resource reservoir functioning as an integrated immune system against the mental health risks inherent in demanding work environments. The four HERO components operate synergistically as a self-reinforcing resource system: hope provides goal-directed motivational energy and alternative pathways when primary routes

to goal attainment are blocked; efficacy supplies confident action capacity that converts motivational energy into effective performance behaviors; resilience enables recovery from resource-depleting setbacks and adversity that would otherwise trigger downward psychological spirals; and optimism sustains positive future expectations and adaptive attributional responses that maintain engagement and prevent the learned helplessness that underlies depression and burnout. Together, these interacting components constitute an integrated resource buffer that absorbs occupational stress, attenuates resource loss, and actively generates positive psychological states, simultaneously protecting against mental illness and promoting mental health flourishing.

At the interpersonal and team level, the model highlights PsyCap's capacity to shape the collective psychological climate of work teams, particularly through its contribution to psychological safety climate formation. High-PsyCap individuals, through their behavioral tendencies toward constructive risk engagement, resilient responses to failure, and optimistic interpersonal orientations, influence the shared perceptions and behavioral norms of their teams in ways that progressively build a team-level climate of psychological safety. This collective climate then generates cross-level mental health benefits for all team members, including lower-PsyCap individuals, by reducing the threat-based social appraisals that suppress innovation, candid communication, and help-seeking. The team-level mediation pathway therefore positions PsyCap as a collective organizational resource with positive externalities that extend beyond the individual resource-holder.

At the organizational level, the model prescribes a coordinated multilevel intervention architecture comprising three complementary levels of action. At the individual level, PsyCap micro-training interventions, validated, structured programs drawing on hope goal-setting, efficacy mastery modeling, resilience adversity rehearsal, and optimism reattribution exercises, should be implemented as a core component of employee development and onboarding. At the supervisory level, leadership development programs should explicitly target transformational leadership behaviors, particularly those that create psychological safety, communicate authentic concern for follower growth, and model positive psychological states, as these behaviors create the contextual amplifiers that maximize PsyCap's mental health conversion efficiency. At the organizational systems level, HR policy reforms targeting performance management (reducing punitive responses to failure), work design (increasing autonomy and skill utilization), and support culture (strengthening POS perceptions) should be implemented as essential contextual enablers of individual and team PsyCap effectiveness. Critically, the model predicts that individual PsyCap interventions implemented without corresponding organizational-level contextual changes will yield substantially attenuated and less durable mental health improvements, reinforcing the necessity of genuine multilevel commitment.

CONCLUSION

This review establishes PsyCap as a robust, synergistically structured, multimechanistic, and organizationally cultivable protective-promotive resource for workplace mental health. PsyCap directly reduces burnout, distress, and depression while promoting well-being, engagement, and thriving, operating through four complementary mediating pathways: JD-R dual processes, cognitive emotion regulation, psychological safety climate formation, and organizational support amplification. Leadership quality and work

design autonomy function as critical moderating amplifiers. The multilevel integrative model prescribes coordinated individual PsyCap micro-training, transformational leadership development, and organizational HR policy reform as a theoretically grounded, practically actionable framework for sustainable employee mental health investment.

REFERENCES

- Avey, J. B., Luthans, F., Smith, R. M., & Palmer, N. F. (2010). Impact of positive psychological capital on employee well-being over time. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 15*(1), 17-28. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016998>
- Bakker, A. B., & Leiter, M. P. (Eds.). (2010). *Work Engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research*. Psychology Press.
- Chen, Z., & Lim, V. K. G. (2023). Psychological capital, psychological safety climate, and workplace anxiety in IT professionals. *Journal of Occupational Health, 65*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1093/jocuh/uiad002>
- Cheung, F., Tang, C. S., & Tang, S. (2011). Psychological capital as a moderator between emotional labor, burnout, and job satisfaction among school teachers in China. *International Journal of Stress Management, 18*(4), 348-371. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025787>
- Dawkins, S., Martin, A., Scott, J., & Sanderson, K. (2022). Expanding the resource caravans pathways: A longitudinal examination of psychological capital and the Mental Health Continuum. *Work & Stress, 36*(4), 391-410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2021.1987574>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 499-512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- Du, H., Li, X., Lin, D., & Tam, C. C. (2020). Collectivistic orientation, psychological capital, social well-being, and depressive symptoms. *Personality and Individual Differences, 154*, 109699. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.109699>
- Görgens-Ekermans, G., & Herbert, M. (2013). Psychological capital: Internal and external validity of the Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ-24) on a South African sample. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 39*(2), 1-12.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist, 44*(3), 513-524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513>
- Kim, M., & Kim, A. C. H. (2020). Psychological capital, work engagement, and psychological well-being: The role of transformational leadership. *Korean Journal of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 33*(1), 45-68.
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). 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., Avey, J. B., & Patera, J. L. (2008). Experimental analysis of a web-based training intervention to develop positive psychological capital. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 7*(2), 209-221.
- 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>

- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLoS Medicine*, 6(7), e1000097. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097>
- Newman, A., Ucbasaran, D., Zhu, F., & Hirst, G. (2014). Psychological capital: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(S1), S120-S138. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1916>
- Nguyen, T. D., & Nguyen, T. T. M. (2023). Psychological capital, organizational support, occupational stress, and employee mental health in Vietnamese manufacturing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(4), 3312. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20043312>
- Rabenu, E., Yaniv, E., & Tziner, A. (2021). Psychological capital as a resource that moderates the effects of stress on depression symptoms. *Work*, 68(1), 75-85. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-203356>
- Russo, M., Miraglia, M., & Borgogni, L. (2022). Reducing organizational risk of burnout during COVID-19: The role of psychological capital. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(3), 1745. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19031745>
- Wen, J., Huang, S. S., & Hou, P. (2019). Emotional intelligence, emotional labor, perceived organizational support, and job satisfaction: A moderated mediation model. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 81, 120-130.
- World Health Organization. (2022). *World mental health report: Transforming mental health for all*. WHO.
- Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2007). Positive organizational behavior in the workplace: The impact of hope, optimism, and resilience. *Journal of Management*, 33(5), 774-800. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307305562>