PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL, ADAPTABILITY, COPING WITH CHANGE, AND EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT IN A MULTINATIONAL COMPANY

Richard E. Hicks, Bond University
rhicks@bond.edu.au

Eva-Maria Knies, Bond University
emknies@bond.edu.au

ABSTRACT

The Global Financial Crisis (GFC) affected many organizations across the world. There are numerous studies that have examined the financial impacts on organizations and employees but few that have investigated the human capabilities and qualities of employees who survived the crisis. The current study examined the relationships among Psychological Capital (PsyCap: involving self-efficacy, optimism, hope and resilience), individual and organizational adaptability in handling change, and employee engagement after the GFC of 2009, in a multinational organization with headquarters in Europe. The sample totaled 183 employees from across Europe, the US, and Asia. The Psychological Capital Questionnaire, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, the Coping with Organizational Change scale, and a specially developed self-assessment scale assessing perceived personal and company adaptation. PsyCap significantly predicted coping with organizational change, the adaptation demonstrated in handling the GFC, and the engagement levels of the employees in each region. The similarities in the models across each region suggest that organizational managers and HR will find value in understanding and using Psychological Capital in their recruitment, selection and employee enhancement programs.

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

The 2009 Global Financial Crisis (GFC) affected many organizations but little has been written about the qualities of the personnel associated with surviving the crisis, and very little about differences in the qualities of individuals across different regions of the world in one multinational organization. The personal qualities of people make a difference—as was suggested by Luthans, Luthans, and Luthans (2004) in their studies of psychological capital in the US context. This paper examines how Psychological Capital (PsyCap; involving measuring self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience as personal qualities of individuals) relates to individual and organizational adaptability and employee engagement during and shortly after the GFC—in a multinational industrial company operating across Europe, Asia and the United States.

Individual adaptability: Background research and importance in organizations

Individual adaptation and flexibility in handling change has long been seen to underpin organizational adaptability and success. For example, the Australian Government Public Service Commission publication "Strengthening the performance framework" (Blackman, Buick, O'Donnell, O'Flynn, & West, 2013) identifies adaptability development as a key requirement in the human resources management of employees of the organization (e.g., themes 4, 6 and 7 on adaptability, pragmatism and competencies in managing change and performance, p. 4).

Organizations survive and thrive when they can respond effectively to changing circumstances, as faced in many government and private sector companies and organizations around the world. There have been several research papers on adaptability and its correlates over the last two decades, with the references being mostly to resilience and responsiveness of employees, or to creativity and innovation in the face of change and need.

More recently attention on such qualities in individual and organizational adaptability has been addressed through research and reports from numerous authors: for example, by Miller (2015) on individual adaptation involved in professionals in the library and information technology system interactions; by Parent (2006) on individual adaptation in the changing workplace; by O'Connell, McNeely, and Hall (2008) on "Unpacking personal adaptability at work" (indicating adaptability as a key competence for career success able to be developed further under managerial support); and by some 20 or more authors in Chan's (2014) edited book on *Individual adaptability to changes at work: New directions in research* covering a variety of topics from organizational adaptability to assessment and management of adaptability. These references provide information indicating the focus now being given to individual adaptability at work, though earlier research had also given attention to relevant areas such as resilience at work and competency development that enabled adaptable responses to occur in coping with change.

Despite the literature on resilience, adaptability, and the need to develop these qualities through HR processes in organizations, there has been only limited reference to precursor characteristics such as the psychological capital qualities that can predict individual adaptability in organizational change and related employee engagement. This current paper addresses how psychological capital qualities (hope, optimism, self-efficacy, and resilience) are related to self-perceived adaptability, to coping with organizational change, and to employee engagement in a multinational firm that faced considerable changes and survived the GFC.

We next discuss employee engagement and its measurement, coping with organizational change and its measurement, and finally how we assessed individual adaptability—and then we examine psychological capital and its measurement and indicate findings that show how the psychological capital qualities predicted adaptability, coping with change, and employee engagement in the multinational organization that faced and dealt with the 2009 Global Financial Crisis.

Employee engagement: Background research and importance in organizations

There is considerable research and consultancy on engagement around the world. For example, research and consultancies have been reported in the US (e.g., Lockwood, 2007—Report; US Office of Personnel Management 2010—Report); in Australia (the Australian Public Service Commission report of 2011); and in the Scottish Public Service (the Report by DTZ Consulting and Research Group, 2007). Engagement is seen to predict performance. This is evident in the titles of papers and reports such as the following: "Engaging for success: Enhancing performance through employee engagement" (MacLeod & Clarke, 2009); "Driving success through performance excellence and employee engagement" (Kenexa Research Institute Report, 2009); "Employee engagement: The key to improving performance' (Markos & Sridevi, 2010); "Employee engagement: Maximizing human performance" (Haid & Sims of Right Management, 2009); "Old wine in new bottles? Engagement and the bottom line" (Holwerda, 2007—in the 2007 Paris Spring Sponsor Meeting of CAHRS—Centre for Advanced Human Resource Studies—see other papers prepared for the conference also in Dicke, Holwerda, & Kontakos (2007); and many more dealing with associated topics such as well-being and engagement (cf., Robertson, Birch, & Cooper, 2012).

The importance of engagement and performance as integral concerns of organizations including multinational organizations is without question. Many of these articles, white papers, and journal articles also emphasize the role of management in bringing about improved performance through developing internal organizational culture that increases engagement and ability to handle change (adaptability). However, some reports refer to "gaps in the research" including the need to know how to go about recruiting staff who have the potential to show higher levels of engagement and resilience and adaptability, and whether the costs would be exorbitant (cf., DTZ Consulting—Report, 2007).

The current research aimed to show how an assessment of psychological capital made at the recruitment stage or during early stages of employment in organizations could predict engagement and also adaptability and coping with change, during and after the GFC. First, however, assessing engagement is discussed, and then assessing adaptability and coping with change.

Assessing and predicting engagement

Engagement involves positive feelings, motivational drive and commitment, and a sense of fulfillment at work (e.g., Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006; Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzales-Roma, & Bakker, 2001) and is related to many different variables associated with well-being—for example energy, satisfaction, and enthusiasm, and it is also associated with higher levels of work performance (e.g., Bakker & Demerouti, 2014; Demerouti, Bakker, Janssen, & Schaufeli, 2001; Gruman & Saks, 2011; MacLeod & Clarke, 2009; Padmakumar & Prabhakar, 2011; Robertson, Birch, & Cooper, 2012; Salanova, Agut, & Peiró, 2008; Schaufeli, Taris, & Van Rhenen, 2003; Wiley, 2012). One well-known engagement survey is the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale:

Schaufeli and Bakker and colleagues have researched extensively using this scale. This questionnaire was used as part of our study examining engagement, self-perceived performance, and psychological capital (see the Method section for a description of the materials).

Assessing and predicting individual and organizational adaptability and coping with organizational change

Performance is assessable in many different ways—emphasizing overall organizational outcomes (e.g., Buick, et al., 2014) and adaptability is central. As Blackman et al. (2012) indicated in their progress report on developing high performance: "encouraging an emphasis on adaptability, competences, dynamic capabilities and management capacity at the organizational level, as well as capabilities and competencies at the work group and individual level, will provide an enabling environment which will enhance high performance at all levels" (p. 4). Individual adaptability, coping with change, and engagement in the work of the organization are areas directly related to such contribution to performance.

Most reported studies identify employee output (usually linked to attributes related to engagement) as a key criterion in performance; others report absenteeism figures in relation to employee well-being. Still others emphasize the importance of individual adaptability and coping resources. In the current study we used self-estimates of employee engagement (using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale), a coping with organizational change questionnaire (using the Judge, Thoresen, Pucik, & Westbourne 1999 scale), and a specially developed 4-item scale on the employees' adaptation to the economic crisis (GFC) and its effects (see the Method section for more details on the scales).

Psychological capital as predictor of engagement, adaptability and coping

Much of the work on employee engagement, adaptability and handling change has reflected attention to procedures that develop or predict engagement and adaptability. Some of the suggested organizational procedures include attention to the recruitment phase (e.g., DTZ Consulting and Research, 2007, Report); others give attention to both recruitment and development (such as the work of Luthans and colleagues over a decade or more on psychological capital qualities that can be assessed and developed). It is to the nature of "psychological capital" that we now turn as a central part of this paper.

The need to enhance employee effectiveness in order to improve organizational competitiveness has been identified by Luthans, Youssef, and Avolio (2007). In effect they argued for "a new balance" in how human resources are used in organizations via the introduction of a broad conceptualization of psychological capital (PsyCap). PsyCap is seen as state-like rather than trait-like—inferring qualities that can be improved rather than traits or personality factors that are more stable.

PsyCap is assessed by the Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ) and defines an individual's positive state of development related to four major facets: self-efficacy/confidence, optimism, hope, and resilience. The integration of the four facets into PsyCap is new and innovative (over the past decade or so) and follows Luthans' (2002) positive organizational behavior approach, which sprang from positive psychology concepts and emphasized individual strengths (cf., Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Snyder & Lopez, 2007). Strengthening positive psychological capacities was seen as increasing individuals' overall effectiveness in the workplace, and it was argued that the four facets could each be developed further through appropriate training and exposure (Luthans, Youssef, et al., 2007). Scores on the PCQ (assessing PsyCap) combining elements already found to predict performance were expected in turn to predict such success. Research has indeed shown their hypotheses to be supported. For example, PsyCap has been shown to be associated with higher levels of employee well-being (Avey et al., 2010); and presentee-ism and lower absenteeism (Avey et al., 2006).

However, most studies have been western and US-based and the relationships with engagement, performance, adaptability, and coping with change across different multicultural borders have not been examined in detail. The current study addressed this gap while also setting out to identify the relationships of PsyCap to Engagement, Adaptability and Coping with Change—in an organization operating across three major international regions. More detail on the make-up and structure of PsyCap follows.

Self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience: PsyCap's four facets

Self-efficacy is about personal confidence in being able to perform as needed. It has been found to be related directly to workplace productivity (Bandura & Locke, 2003; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998b).

Hope is about agency thinking (the capacity to set clearly defined, realistic and challenging goals) and pathway thinking (the capacity to create alternatives, and adopt already set goals). Goal-directed hope aids productivity (Luthans, Luthans et al., 2004; Snyder & Lopez, 2007), perhaps because setting flexible goals and alternatives keeps the mind and "eyes" targeted on performance outcomes (cf., Kontakos, 2007; Luthans et al., 2005; Luthans, Van Wyk et al., 2004; Youssef & Luthans, 2007).

Optimism is about viewing the world positively and anticipating dealing successfully with different events—also associated in organizational research with positive performance outcomes (Jensen et al., 2007; Medlin & Green, 2009).

Resilience is about "the ability to bounce back quickly" in adverse situations. Resilience has been researched more in clinical and personal contexts (cf., Celinski & Gow 2011; Crowther & Hicks, 2011) but recently several authors (e.g., Luthans, Youssef et al., 2007; Richardson, 2002) have linked resilience directly to performance. Of course HR literature has long recognized the ability to bounce back as an important personal variable.

PsyCap Summary

The four-facet underlying structure of PsyCap can be seen to relate to employee performance. Therefore, the integrated total PsyCap score would be expected also to predict employee performance by whatever measures are used—in our current study these measures are engagement, individual adaptability, and coping with change. In support of these propositions PsyCap has been found, in three American studies, to account for 25% or more of the variance explained in relation to employee performance and employee engagement.

Cross-cultural international research using PsyCap, at the time of our study, was limited—the main study then identified was one using a Chinese sample where PsyCap predicted performance—though one facet was not used in that study (Luthans et al., 2005). Our study set out to identify how psychological capital was related to engagement, performance, and perceived adaptation to changes associated with the GFC in a multinational company with European, Asian and US bases, and to examine whether there were differences in the three cultural groups on the full PsyCap model.

Cultural Differences, Engagement, and Adaptability

The sustained rise of multinational business in emerging economies requires a clear understanding of cultural differences. It sometimes appears to be assumed that transplanting executives and business strategies from one area to another will yield similar results from the same methods. In regard to PsyCap it could be assumed that if it worked in the US studies (as the evidence indicates) then it would also work in other cultures. But PsyCap is itself an emerging concept (a crystallization and integration of known effective facets) and thus its relevance across cultures needs to be demonstrated.

Individualistic cultures (as in America and Europe) usually value individual independence, optimism and self-efficacy (Fischer & Chalmers, 2008; Lee & Seligman, 1997; Scholz et al., 2002) whereas collective cultures (e.g., Asia) usually value connection, order, and hierarchy (cf., Triandis, 1995).

It was hypothesized that the American and European cultures would emphasize self-efficacy and optimism (facets of PsyCap) though some research has indicated no difference: for example, Asian Americans and Chinese scored no differently on optimism when compared to Caucasian Americans and Canadians (Chang, 1996; Ji et al., 2004). There are few studies on hope and resilience in the workplace across cultures. The current study examined in part how the *total PsyCap* scores differed across the three regions. The main emphasis was on the relationships between psychological capital and, in turn, employee engagement and (in a further analysis) adaptability.

In summary (regarding the hypotheses), if psychological capital is a precursor to engagement and adaptability at work then it follows that PsyCap scores would predict employee engagement and

adaptability and do so across each of the three cultural regions of the company. These issues were addressed in the study reported here.

METHOD

Participants

More than 200 employees were initially involved from the multinational organization that produces cables and conductors for different industries and markets, with companies in Europe, America, and Asia. Data screening led to 183 individuals being included in the analyses. Prospective participants needed to be reasonably competent in English. (That is, they needed to be a native English speaker, or to have completed secondary education with a major in English, or to have participated in an English training course/program, or to have worked, studied, or lived in an English speaking country.) This English language approach was seen as preliminary to any subsequent studies that could use local language questionnaires.

Of the 183 participants, 55 were American, 69 European, and 59 Asian employees (30:38:32% respectively); the male:female ratio was 134:49 (73:27% respectively); and the main age ranges were 30-39 years (31%) and 40-49 years (28%). These figures matched closely the demographics in the total organization. Half of the employees sampled were in management positions (50.8%), enabling analyses regarding position held (management vs. non-management).

Materials

The Demographic Questionnaire

This questionnaire gathered information on gender, age, country of origin, country where they were currently working, tenure, position held, and English language background.

The Psychological Capital Questionnaire

The Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ; Luthans, Avolio et al., 2007) measures psychological capital (PsyCap) in adult employees (Luthans, Youssef et al., 2007) using 24 items in total across four facets: six items each come from existing, well-validated scales related to self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience (see Luthans, Youssef et al., 2007 for details). Luthans, Norman et al. (2008) reported a four-factor structure paralleling the four facets. A six-point Likert response scale ranging from one (strongly disagree) to six (strongly agree) is used. Reported alpha coefficients range from .65 to 92 (facets and total PsyCap) while our study across

the three cultural groups yielded a range from .53 to .88 (the total score PsyCap coefficient was .87—PsyCap was of most interest in our study). For research construct purposes, Alpha coefficients from about .40 are often considered satisfactory (Boyle, 1991) and the coefficients for optimism (.63) and resilience (.53) were within this range.

Utrecht Work Engagement Scale

The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) assesses three aspects of work engagement over 17 items: vigour (six items), dedication (five items), and absorption (six items). This three-factor structure has been confirmed in several countries (Seppälä et al., 2009; Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006), though in Japan a one-factor solution was found (Shimazu et al., 2008). A six-point Likert scale ranging from zero (*never)* to six (*always every day)* is used. Alpha coefficients ranging from .88 to .95 have been obtained in a variety of cultural working populations (cf., Shimazu et al., 2008).

Adaptation to the Economic Crisis 2009

Adaptation to the 2009 economic crisis was assessed using a four-item scale developed for the current study in order to assess employees' beliefs on how well they and the organization had handled the economic crisis of 2009. Items included: "How well do you think you personally have dealt with the economic crisis?" and "How positive are you that your company will succeed in the future?" All four items were rated on a 5-point scale, with higher scores indicating higher levels of adaptation to the economic crisis. The four items yielded an alpha coefficient of .63 in the present study.

Coping with Organizational Change

Coping with Organizational Change (CO; Judge, Thoresen, Pucik, & Welbourne, 1999) is a 12-item scale developed for use in working adult populations. Coping with organizational change is defined as an individual's adaptive ability (cognitive and behavioral ability) to deal effectively with the internal and external demands arising from organizational changes. Therefore, the CO attempts to consider both reactance to change (e.g., "When dramatic changes happen in this company, I feel I handle them with ease") and leading change (e.g., "I have been a leader of transformation efforts within this company"). All 12-items are rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree). Overall, all individual item scores are summed together to create a total scale score, with higher scores indicating higher levels of coping with organizational changes.

Studies which have used the CO have demonstrated adequate internal consistency with reliability coefficients ranging from .70 to .77 for self-report (e.g., Bellou, 2008; Kumar & Kamalanabhan,

2005; Judge et al., 1999). The current study gave a Cronbach's alpha of .74. Concurrent validity of the CO is good: relating positively to the Change Specific Self-efficacy Scale ($r = .39$, $p < .01$) and the Commitment to Organizational Change Scale ($r = .62$, $p < .05$). We used the CO in our study as a measure of individual adaptability to change, along with the developed 4-item scale on how well respondents saw themselves and the organization handling the changes occasioned by the Global Financial Crisis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data screening and assumption checking were carried out. Gender, age, or tenure did not influence the dependent variables (engagement and performance) but position held did; resulting in controlling for position held in the subsequent hierarchical regression analyses with PsyCap predicting Self-Perceived Performance and separately Engagement across the three cultural groups. In addition, a one-way between-groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) and a one-way between-group multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) were conducted to evaluate how Culture affected the core-factor PsyCap.

The results showed that PsyCap for the full sample was significantly positively correlated with Engagement ($r = .65$, $p<.001$), Coping with Organizational Change ($r = .57$, $p<.001$) and Adaptation to the Economic Crisis ($r = .52$, $p<.001$).

The hierarchical regressions (across each cultural group) were then conducted in turn in order to examine the extent to which PsyCap predicted (separately) Perceived Adaptation, Coping with Change and Engagement, with appropriate control measures implemented.

Hierarchical multiple regressions

Three hierarchical multiple regressions per cultural sample (American, $n = 53$; European, $n = 67$; Asian, $n = 58$) were conducted with Position as a control variable entered at Step one and PsyCap as the predictor entered at Step two of the regressions. As indicated above, the three criteria were addressed separately—engagement, coping with change, and individual and organizational adaptability. The bases (data means and standard deviations) for the regression equations for each of the three regions are shown in Table 1.

Considering the American sample, Position did not significantly contribute to the regression results. Holding a management position or another position was not found to significantly contribute towards Engagement ($F(1, 51) = 0.01$, $p = .967$) OrgChange ($F(1,51) = 0.64$, $p = .426$), or for IndAdaptation to the Economic Crisis ($F(1, 51) = 2.30$, $p = .135$).

Addition of PsyCap in Step two significantly improved prediction over the use of Position alone explaining 40.3% (37.9% adjusted) of the variance as a whole for Engagement ($F(2, 50) = 16.85$, $p < .001$), 31.8% (29.1% adjusted) for OrgChange ($F(2, 50) = 11.66$, $p < .001$), and 38.9%

(36.4% adjusted) for IndAdaptation to the Economic Crisis ($F(2, 50) = 15.91$, $p < .001$). Once controlled for Position, PsyCap accounted for *an additional* 40.3% of the variance in Engagement, 30.6% in OrgChange, and 34.6% in IndAdaptation.

Table 1: Means (M) & Standard Deviations (SD) for Predictor and Criterion Variables

	American sample		European sample		Asian sample	
Variable	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Engagement	4.52	0.67	4.25	0.70	4.93	0.62
OrgChange	42.49	4.82	41.52	6.05	44.02	5.45
IndAdaptation	16.86	1.89	15.78	2.06	15.95	2.25
PsyCap	5.04	0.39	4.70	0.51	4.94	0.39

Note. OrgChange = coping with organisational change; IndAdaptation = adaptation to the economic crisis 2009; PsyCap = Positive Psychological Capital.

In contrast, the European sample revealed that the control factor Position had a greater impact on the regression results. Holding a management position compared to other positions significantly explained 13.1% (11.8% adjusted) of the variance in Engagement ($F(1, 64) = 9.89$, $p = .003$), 19% (17.8% adjusted) in OrgChange ($F(1, 64) = 12.29$, $p < .001$), and 16.6% (17.8% adjusted) in IndAdaptation to the economic crisis ($F(1, 64) = 15.63$, $p < .001$).

As in the American sample, the addition of PsyCap in Step two for the European sample significantly improved prediction over the use of Position alone, explaining 50.1% (48.5% adjusted) of the variance as a whole for Engagement ($F(2, 64) = 32.08$, $p < .001$), 39.3% (37.4% adjusted) for OrgChange ($F(2, 64) = 20.74$, $p < .001$), and 32.8% (30.7% adjusted) for IndAdaptation to the economic crisis ($F(2, 64) = 15.63$, $p < .001$). Once controlled for Position, PsyCap accounted for an additional 37% of the variance in Engagement, 20.3% in OrgChange, and 20.1 % in IndAdaptation.

In the Asian sample, more like the American sample, the control factor Position had a low impact on the regressions by significantly predicting only 7.6% (6% adjusted) of the variance in Engagement ($F(2, 56) = 4.62$, $p = .036$), whilst not significantly contributing to OrgChange ($F(2, 56) = 3.81$, $p = .056$) or to IndAdaptation to the Economic Crisis ($F(2, 56) = 3.87$, $p = .054$).

However, similar to both the American and the European samples, addition of PsyCap in Step two significantly improved prediction over the use of Position alone explaining 36.4% (34.1% adjusted) of the variance as a whole for Engagement ($F(2, 55) = 15.76$, $p < .001$), 32% (29.6% adjusted) for OrgChange ($F(2, 55) = 12.95$, and 14.1% (10.1% adjusted) for IndAdaption to the Economic Crisis ($F(2, 55) = 4.52$, $p = .015$). After controlling for Position, PsyCap accounted for

an additional 28.8% of the variance in Engagement, 25.7% in OrgChange, and 7.7% in IndAdaptation to the Economic Crisis.

Thus, across the three cultural groups, PsyCap was a substantial predictor of Engagement, Coping with Organizational Change, and Adaptation to the Economic Crisis in 2009. PsyCap accounted for the highest variance amongst the criteria in Engagement across all cultures followed by Adaptation to the Economic Crisis 2009 in the American sample and Coping with Organizational Change in the Asian sample. Overall, PsyCap also appeared to be a stronger predictor of the criterion variables in the two Western cultures compared to the Asian sample.

The impact of Position varied across the three cultures, but the impact of PsyCap was a consistent and substantial predictor of Engagement, Coping with Organizational Change, and Adaptation to the Economic Crisis, consistent with the hypotheses in regard to these criteria. Positive psychological capital (combining self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience) was shown to be applicable across the cultural, national samples used in this multinational industrial corporation.

Hicks and Knies (2013), in an earlier examination of the data on culture, showed that culture impacted PsyCap, with 10% of the variance in PsyCap being explained by culture. There was no difference between the American sample and the Asian sample on PsyCap (item means of 5.04 and 4.93 respectively), though their mean scores were significantly higher than for the European sample (item means of 4.25).

The obtained differences and similarities in PsyCap and in its individual facets (Hicks & Knies, 2013) need further exploration, also given the several limitations of the study as outlined later in this paper. Nevertheless, the overall results suggest the potential value of the Psychological Capital Questionnaire in assessing qualities related to employee engagement and the ability to handle and adapt to organizational change. Practical evidence of the relationships has been indicated in the current study's results.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

The results supported the hypotheses that were based largely on individual facet studies in the literature–with each of the four facets separately having been linked with organizational change, engagement, and performance at work, but not combined as Psychological Capital and examined in one multinational technology centered manufacturer and distributor across three different cultural groups.

The results have demonstrated that psychological capital as assessed by the 24-item questionnaire functions strongly in the three cultures and does so despite some of the limitations discussed below. The results from Luthans and colleagues in their earlier largely US and western studies (there are many: including as reported in Luthans, Youssef-Morgan, & Avolio, 2015; Luthans et al., 2007) are confirmed as having strong international and cross-cultural support from the findings reported in the current study. More international and multinational studies are

needed but the essential concept of psychological capital and its potential for organizational application the message is clear.

In terms of a "new balance" or new directions for management and CEOs of multinational and national organizations this simple measure of psychological capital appears capable of giving a quick guide to qualities that predict engagement, adaptability, coping with change, and performance.

A longitudinal study is needed but those individuals who survived the GFC crisis (as in the current sample) have shown there is a strong relationship between their self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience (PsyCap) and their engagement, their ability to cope with organizational change, and their self-perceived adaptation. It would seem that the Psychological Capital Questionnaire is and will be a useful tool for organizations interested in identifying and improving the qualities of their employees in relation adaptation. This is important as, as indicated in the earlier pages, much recent research has been emphasizing individual adaptation and flexibility as significant qualities contributing to organizational performance (Blackman et al., 2013; Buick et al., 2015; Chan, 2014; Miller, 2015; O'Connell et al., 2008; Parent, 2006).

Not only is there evidence of the relationships between psychological capital and its significance in a time of change as was involved in the Global Financial Crisis and the current study, but also there is other evidence to support assertions of Luthans and his colleagues in their studies (e.g., Luthans et al., 2004; Luthans et al., 2007; Luthans et al., 2015) that psychological capital can be enhanced through special training programs that develop further the competencies associated directly with self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience.

One such recent study supporting the view that the psychological capital attributes of self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience are competency-like attributes that are trainable attributes is that of Russo and Stoykova (2015). Russo and Stoykova reported on the results of training programs in psychological capital in their replication and extension of earlier work, in a Bulgarian study that showed psychological capital could be enhanced through general and specialized delivery in training and development programs.

Our study has limitations and flaws. Specific cultural inventories were not used (as we were limited in the number of scales we could use if we wanted a reasonable rate of completed responses). We pooled employees in the regional groups as "cultural groups" (e.g., combined different countries in Europe or in Asia as 'one culture'). We did not test in the local languages limiting respondents to English speakers (so the respondents we assessed were the more broadly educated employees of the multinational company). And, among other limitations in terms of general applicability of the findings, our participants were survivors from the GFC downturn of 2009. Future research could seek to adjust for these limitations.

Nevertheless, the short 24-item questionnaire seems able to assess personal strengths that provide psychological capital of importance to organizational success. PsyCap qualities (self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience) are valuable aspects of the human resources of organizations. Other attributes such as emotional intelligence (Jordan, 2008), critical thinking and analytical skills, and specific informational and situational process skills are also significant

predictors of individual and organizational performance. However, the addition of psychological capital to the HR decision making repertoire may well turn out to yield a competitive edge to organizations seeking 'a new balance' in the multinational world faced today.

REFERENCES

Australian Public Service Commission (2011). Employee engagement. *Human Capital Matters,* Issue 6.

Avey, J. B., Patera, J. L., & West, B. J. (2006). The implications of positive psychological capital on employee absenteeism. *Journal of Leadership and Organisational Studies, 13*(2), 42-60. doi:10.1177/10717919070130020401

Avey, J. B., Luthans, F., & Smith, R. M. (2010). Impact of positive psychological capital on employee well-being over time. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 15*(1), 17-28. doi:10.1037/a0016998

Bakker, A., & Demerouti, E. (2014). Job demands–resources theory. In P.Y. Chen and C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *Work and wellbeing: Wellbeing: A complete reference guide,* Vol. III, Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, UK, pp. 37–64

Bandura, A., & Locke, E. (2003). Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 87-99. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.1.87

Blackman, D., Buick, F., O'Donnell, M., O'Flynn, J., & West, D. (2013). *Strengthening the performance framework: Towards a high performing Australian Public Service*. Australian Public Service Commission, Canberra, ACT.

Boyle, G. J. (1991). Does item homogeneity indicate internal consistency or item redundancy in psychometric scales? *Personality and Individual Differences, 12*(3), 291-294. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(91)90115-R

Buick, F., Blackman, D., O'Donnell, M., O'Flynn, J., & West, D., (2015) "Can enhanced performance management support public sector change?", *Journal of Organisational Change Management, 28*(2), 271-289.

Celinski, M., & Gow, K. (Eds.). *Continuity versus creative response to challenge: The primacy of resilience and resourcefulness in life and therapy.* New York: Nova

Chan, D. (Ed.). (2014). *Individual adaptability to changes at work: New directions in research.* Taylor & Francis Publishers.

Chang, E. (1996). Cultural differences in optimism, pessimism and coping: Predictors of subsequent adjustment in Asian American and Caucasian American college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*(1), 113-123. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.43.1.113

Crowther, M., & Hicks, R.E. (2011). Stress and stress resilience, emotional intelligence, and perfectionism in an Australian workplace sample. In Kathryn Gow & Marek Celinski (Eds.). *Wayfinding through life's challenges: Coping and survival*. New York: Nova

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Janssen, P. P. M. & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). Burnout and engagement at work as a function of demands and control. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health, 27*, 279-286. Retrieved from http://www.sjweh.fi/show_abstract.php?abstract_id=615

Dicke, C., Holwerda, J., & Kontakos, A. (2007). *Employee Engagement: What do we really know? What do we need to know to take action? A collection of White Papers*. Centre for Advanced Human Resource Studies (CAHRS).

DTZ Consulting and Research Group (2007). "Employee engagement in the Public Sector: A review of the literature" (Report), Scottish Executive Social Research, 64.

Fischer, R., & Chalmers, A. (2008). Is optimism universal? A meta-analytical investigation of optimism levels across 22 nations. *Personality and Individual Differences, 45*, 378-382. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2008.05.008

Gruman, J., & Saks, A. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review, 21*(2)*,* 123-136.

Haid, M., & Sims, J. (2009). *Employee engagement: Maximising human performance (Report).* Philadelphia, PA: Right Management

Hallberg, U., & Schaufeli, W. (2006). Same name but different? Can work engagement be discriminated from job involvement and organisational commitment? *European Psychologist, 11*(2), 119-127. doi: 10.1027/1016-9040.11.2.119

Hicks, R., & Knies, E. (2013). Resilience, optimism, hope, and self-efficacy in handling the Global Financial Crisis: Experiences of employees in a multinational industrial organisation operating in Europe, Asia and the United States. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference of the Centre of Full Employment and Equity and the 18th Annual National Conference on Unemployment,* University of Newcastle: Australia.

Holwerda, J. (2007). Old wine in new bottles? Engagement and the bottom line. In C. Dicke, J. Holwerda, & A.M. Kontakos (Eds). *Employee Engagement: What do we really know? What do we need to know to take action? A collection of White Papers*. Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies (CAHRS).

Jensen, S. M., Luthans, K. W., Lebsack, S. A., & Lebsack, R. R. (2007). Optimism and employee performance in the banking industry. *Journal of Applied Management & Entrepreneurship, 12*(3)*, 57-72.* Retrieved from: http://vlex.com/vid/optimism-employee-performance-banking-64076906

Ji, L.J., Zhang, Z., Usborne, E., & Guan, Y. (2004). Optimism across cultures: In response to the severe acute respiratory syndrome outbreak. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 7,* 25-34. doi:10.1111/j.1467-839X.2004.00132.x

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Pucik, V., & Welbourne, T. M. (1999). Managerial coping with organizational change: A dispositional perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84,* 107-122. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.84.1.107

Kenexa Research Institute (2009). *Driving success through performance excellence and employee engagement. A 2009 Work Trends' Report*. Minneapolis, MN: Kenexa.

Kontakos, A. M. (2007). 'Seeing clearly': Employee engagement and line of sight. In C. Dicke, J. Holwerda, & A.M. Kontakos (Eds). *Employee Engagement: What do we really know? What do we need to know to take action? A collection of White Papers*. Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies (CAHRS).

Kumar, R., & Kamalanabhan, T. J. (2005). The role of personality factors in coping with organizational change. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 13(2),* 175-192. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/eb029003

Lee, Y. T., & Seligman, M. (1997). Are Americans more optimistic than the Chinese? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*(1), 32-40. doi:10.1177/0146167297231004

Lockwood, N. (2007). Leveraging Employee Engagement for Competitive Advantage. *SHRM Research Quarterly,* 2 – 11.

Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organisational behavior. *Journal of Organisational Behavior, 23*, 695–706. doi:10.1002/job.165

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,* 541-572. doi: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 Organisation Review, (1),* 247-269. doi:10.1111/j.1740-8784.2005.00011.x

Luthans, F., Luthans, K., & Luthans, B. (2004). Positive psychological capital: Going beyond human and social capital. *Business Horizons*, *47*(1), 45-50. doi:10.1016/j.bushor .2003.11.007

Luthans, F., Norman, S. M., Avolio, B. J., & Avey, J. B. (2008). The mediating role psychological capital in the supportive organisational climate - employee performance relationship. *Journal of Organisational Behavior, 29,* 219-238. doi:10.1002/job.507

Luthans, F., Van Wyk, R., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2004). Recognition and development of hope for South African organisational leaders. *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal, 25,* 512-527. doi:10.1108/01437730410556752

Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Luthans, F., Youssef-Morgan, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2015). *Psychological capital and beyond.* USA: Oxford University Press.

MacLeod, D., & Clarke, N. (2009). *Engaging for success: Enhancing performance through employee engagement* (Report to UK Government). 152 pp.

Markos, S., & Sridevi, S. (2010). Employee engagement: The key to improving performance. *International Journal of Business and Management, 5,* 12, 89-96

Medlin, B., & Green, K. W. (2009). Enhancing performance through goal setting, engagement, and optimism. *Industrial Management & Data Systems, 109*(7), 943-956. doi:10.1108/02635570910982292

Miller, R. (2015). *Individual adaptation: Interdisciplinary perspectives on personal identity and learning during organisational change*. Contributed paper at ACRL Conference (academic and research librarians) 2015, Portland. In Proceedings: see-http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/conferences/confsandpreconfs/2015/Miller.pdf

O'Connell, D.J., McNeely, E., & Hall, D.T. (2008). Unpacking personal adaptability at work. *Journal of Leadership and Organisational Studies, 14, 3,* 248-259. Doi: 10.1177/1071791907311005

Padmakumar, R., & Prabhakar, G. (2011). The role of employee engagement in work related outcomes. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business, 3*, 47–61

Parent, J. D. (2006). *Individual Adaptation in the Workplace: Causes, Consequences and Outcomes.* Doctoral dissertations Available from Proquest. Paper AA13242353. http://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations/AA13242353

Richardson, G. (2002). The metatheory of resilience and resiliency. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 58*, 307-321. doi:10.1002/jclp.10020

Robertson, I., Birch, A., & Cooper, C. (2012). Job and work attitudes, engagement and employee performance: Where does psychological well-being fit in? *Leadership and Organisational Development Journal, 33,* 3, 224-232

Russo, S. D., & Stoykova, P. (2015). Psychological capital intervention (PCI). A replication and extension. *Human Resources Development Quarterly.* Wiley Online Library. doi:10.1002/hrdq.21212

Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiro J. M. (2005). Linking organisational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: The mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90, 1217-1227.* DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1217

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). *Test manual for the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, Utrecht University, the Netherlands. Retrieved from http://www.schaufeli.com

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66*(4), 701-716. doi:10.1177/0013164405282471

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmative factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3,* 71-92. doi:10.1023/A:1015630930326

Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & Van Rhenen, W. (2003). Workaholism, burnout, and work engagement: Three of a kind or three different kinds of employee well-being? *Applied Psychology, 57*(2), 173–203. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00285.x

Scholz, U., Doña, B.G., Sud, S., Schwarzer, R., et al. (2002). Is general self-efficacy a universal construct? Psychometric findings from 25 countries. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 18*(3), 242–251.

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 5-15. doi:10.1037//0003-066X.55.1.5

Seppälä, P., Mauno, S., Feldt, T., Hakanen, J., Kinnunen, U., Tolvanen, A., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). The construct validity of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Multi-sample and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 10*, 459-481. doi:10.1007/s10902-008-9100-y

Shimazu, S., Schaufeli, W. B., Kosugi, S., Suzuki, A., Nashiwa, H., Kato, A., Sakamoto, M., Irimajiri, H., Amano, S., Hirohata, K., & Goto, R. (2008). Work engagement in Japan: Validation of the Japanese version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. *Applied Psychology, 57(3*), 510–523. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00333.x

Snyder, C. R., & Lopez, S. J. (2007). *Positive psychology: The scientific and practical exploration of human strengths.* California, USA: Sage Publication, Inc.

Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Social cognitive theory and self-efficacy: Going beyond traditional motivational and behavioural approaches. *Organisational Dynamics, 26,* 62-74. doi:10.1016/S0090-2616(98)90006-7

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press

Wiley, J. (2012). *Beyond engagement: The definitive guide to employee surveys and organisational performance (Report).* Minneapolis: MN. Kenexa High Performance Institute.

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

Journal of International Business Disciplines

Volume 10, Number 2 November 2015

Published By:
International Academy of Business Disciplines and Frostburg State University

ISSN 1934-1822 WWW.JIBD.ORG