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Abstract—This research examines the effects of positive psychological capital (or PsyCap) on employee’s outcomes (satisfaction, commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, innovation behavior and individual creativity). This study conducted a meta-analysis of articles published in the Republic of Korea. As a result, positive psychological capital has a positive effect on the behavior of employees. Heterogeneity was identified among the studies included in the analysis and the context factors were analyzed; the study proposes contextual factors such as team tenure. The moderating effect of team tenure was not statistically significant. The implications were discussed based on the analysis results.
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I. INTRODUCTION

RECENTLY, the organization has a great interest in the positive psychological capital of its members. Research on positive psychological capital (or PsyCap) composed of hope, efficacy, resilience and optimism is actively being conducted [1], [2]. The purpose of this study is to investigate the flow of research on positive psychological capital in the Republic of Korea and to clarify the relationship with performance variables. The present meta-analysis included 43 independent samples (representing a total of N = 12,058 employees). As a result, positive psychological capital has a positive effect on the attitude, behavior and creativity of the employees.

Positive psychological capital determines whether or not to undertake tasks, motivates them to perform them, and constantly strives to achieve them [3]. Since positive psychological capital has a generally positive effect on outcome variables, organizational managers should plan ways to activate and augment the positive psychological capital of their members [4]. In this way, it is necessary to analyze the whole research flow when the importance of positive psychological capital is increasing. The purpose of this paper is to identify the research flow of positive psychological capital and to draw the direction of future research.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS

A. Positive Psychological Capital and Employee Outcomes

Positive psychological capital has been conceptually identified by Luthans and colleagues [1], [3]. The PsyCap concept contains four sub-concepts; these dimensions are hope, optimism, efficacy, and resilience [3].

Positive psychological capital has a positive effect on the satisfaction and commitment of the members [5]. In addition, positive psychological capital has positive effects on employee performance, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment [6], [7].

According to previous studies, PsyCap is positively related to employee attitudes and behaviors. A core explanatory mechanism for the effect of positive psychological capital on employee attitudes is that those higher in PsyCap expect optimism, efficacy, hope, and resilience [4]. In addition, positive psychological capital has negative effects on the stress and anxiety of members [8]. Therefore, we predicted as follows:

Hypothesis 1. Positive psychological capital will be positively related to employee outcomes (satisfaction, commitment, OCB, innovation behavior, and individual creativity).

B. Potential Moderating Effect

The diversity of the members in the organization is increasing; a variety of team and work groups are employed in organizations. Therefore, the influence on the behaviors and attitudes of the members according to the organizational characteristics may be different. In this paper, it is important to clarify the context factor. In studies dealing with positive psychological capital, tenure positively correlates with the attitudes of employee [9]. Hence, we propose:

Hypothesis 2. Tenure moderates the relationship between positive psychological capital and employee outcomes. That is, the longer tenure will have a more negative moderating effect.

C. Research Model

As previously discussed, a research model was set up. H1 is the relationship between PsyCap (positive psychological capital) and Employees outcome, H2 is investigating the moderating effect of tenure. The research model is shown in Fig. 1.
A literature search was conducted to identify published studies of positive psychological capital in the Republic of Korea from 2011 to 2016. Various databases were used to collect related studies. A computer search was done of RISS (Research Information Sharing Service), KISS (Korean studies Information Service System), Google scholar and NDSL (National Digital Science Library). The specific words used to search these databases included positive psychological capital/satisfaction, positive psychological capital/commitment, positive psychological capital/outcomes, positive psychological capital/creativity, positive psychological capital/innovation. Through the data collection process, 63 studies were found. Only those studies that show consistency between independent (positive psychological capital) and dependent (employees outcome: satisfaction, commitment, OCB, innovation behavior and individual creativity) variables are used in the analysis. The final number of studies used in the meta-analysis was 31, yielding a total of 43 correlations (representing a total of N = 12,058 employees).

B. Coding of Studies

Prior to analysis, the collected studies are coded. In the coding work, major information such as research title, year of publication, researcher, major variables, correlation coefficient, and sample number are summarized. The summary is shown in Fig. 2. In the collected studies, the study name, number of samples, correlation coefficient and dependent variables were summarized. A total of 43 studies were collected.

IV. RESULTS

A. Main Effects: Positive Psychological Capital and Employees Outcomes

Using the meta-analytic technique, we tested the main effects of positive psychological capital (PsyCap) on employee’s outcomes as well as the moderating effects of tenure. Table I presents the main effect results. We first examined the correlations between PsyCap and Employees Outcome, significant result (Fisher’ Z = 0.66, k=43, 95% CI = 0.61 to 0.71). The forest plot for the main effect is shown in Fig. 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE I</th>
<th>MAIN EFFECTS: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POSITIVE PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL AND EMPLOYEE OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effect Sizes(k)</td>
<td>Total Teams(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Psychological Capital</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

k = number of effect sizes; N = total sample sizes; Q is the effect-size heterogeneity statistic indicating the possibility of moderators (***(p<.001)
We then conducted separate analyses for employee’s outcomes (satisfaction, commitment, OCB, innovation behaviors and individual creativity) and found a similar pattern. The relationship between PsyCap and Satisfaction, Commitment, OCB, Innovation Behavior and Individual Creativity were positive and significant. Specifically, the relationship between PsyCap and satisfaction was positive and significant (Fisher’ Z = 0.73, k=8, 95% CI = 0.62 to 0.85). The relationship between PsyCap and commitment was positive and significant (Fisher’ Z = 0.61, k=16, 95% CI = 0.52 to 0.70). The relationship between PsyCap and OCB was positive and significant (Fisher’ Z = 0.73, k=6, 95% CI = 0.65 to 0.80). The relationship between PsyCap and Innovation Behavior was positive and significant (Fisher’ Z = 0.61, k=4, 95% CI = 0.42 to 0.80). The relationship between PsyCap and Creativity was positive and significant (Fisher’ Z = 0.70, k=6, 95% CI = 0.64 to 0.76). In summary, PsyCap has a positive effect on all dependent variables, thus H1 is all supported (Figs. 4-8).

### Table II

**Main Effects: The Relationship between Positive Psychological Capital and Employee Attitudes, Behaviors, and Creativity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect sizes (K)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Fisher’Z</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.62, 0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4,467</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.52, 0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.65, 0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Behavior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.42, 0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Creativity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,583</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.64, 0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

k = number of effect sizes; N = total sample sizes; Q is the effect-size heterogeneity statistic indicating the possibility of moderators (***p<.001, **p<.01)
Through heterogeneity analysis it is possible to predict the difference between the effect-size. From the analysis, the heterogeneity $Q = 213.46$, is analyzed with $df = 29$, $p < 0.001$, $Q$-$df > 0$ could confirm the heterogeneity. Therefore, we analyze the moderator variable.

### C. Moderator Analysis: Tenure

We tested the heterogeneity of the effect sizes by calculating the Q-statistic [10]. A significant Q indicates the likelihood of moderator. In Fig. 1, Q values are statistically significant ($Q = 317.65$, $P<.001$), so we can deduce that there is a moderator variable. For the continuous moderator (tenure), weighted least squares (WLS) regression was used, by Hedges and Olkin (1985) [10]. Hypotheses 2 proposed that tenure moderated the relationship between PsyCap and Outcomes. Hypothesis 2 proposed that positive effects of PsyCap would be weakened in long tenure teams. The result, because it is not supporting all the slope coefficients and regression fit moderating effect of tenure, was rejected. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

### D. Publication Bias

Publication bias was statistically verified. Through this, it is checked whether there is a problem in the samples utilized in this study [11]. The results show that statistical publication bias is not serious (Fig. 10 and Table IV).
This study analyzed the flow of positive psychological capital research published in the Republic of Korea. As a result, positive psychological capital has a positive effect on the attitude, behavior and creativity of the members. The moderating effect of tenure was also analyzed, but it was rejected because of not obtaining statistically significant results. Since this study confirmed the importance of positive psychological capital, the organization needs management to increase positive psychological capital. Positive psychological capital is potentially a positive influence on performance. Therefore, a positive organizational culture should be formed so that positive psychological capital can accumulate.

There are some limitations to this study. First, there are limitations that do not reflect various studies. Second, all of the studies used in the analysis are Korean studies. Third, it did not reflect various moderators. Future research therefore uses data from various countries to increase the number of samples. In addition, various moderators should be identified to elucidate various implications.
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