

# Positive Relationship Perspective Through Interpersonal Capitalization and Psychological Capital: Future Research Direction

<sup>1)</sup>Anggri Puspita Sari

*Management Study Program Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Bengkulu  
Doctoral Student in Management Science, JenderalSoedirman University*

<sup>2)</sup> Dewi Rahmayanti

*Management Study Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Bengkulu*

<sup>3)</sup>Akram Harmoni Wiardi

*Digital Business Study Program, Faculty of Communication and Business,  
Akprind University, Yogyakarta  
Doctoral Student in Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Gadjah Mada University*

---

## **Abstract.**

*Interpersonal capitalization and psychological capital reveal the phenomenon of competition in the organizational environment and improve individual performance. This phenomenon is interesting to research because the theory is indirectly related to innovative work behavior in a competitive organizational environment. Innovative behaviors are developed by individuals in a fast-changing and competitive organizational environment. Until now, motivational theory has contributed a lot to the issue of causality modeling and is full of emphasis on statistical methods with confirmatory analysis techniques. The integration of concepts in the scope of research related to motivation theory, Innovative work behavior, and psychological capital is still in the process of transition efforts to contribute to the development of organizational behavior theory. This article aims to advance prepositions related to the antecedents of innovative work behavior, contributing to the development of interpersonal capitalization theory and psychological capital theory, while offering suggestions for future research. The results of the development of prepositions based on the literature review are as follows: (1) In high competition situations, the role of leaders can strengthen pride, knowledge-sharing behavior, and innovative work behavior. (2) The impact of individual psychological capital on innovative behavior, (3) the effect of positive psychological traits (creative self-efficacy and optimism) on innovative work behavior.*

**Keywords:** *motivation, knowledge sharing, leadership, self-efficacy, optimism, innovative work behavior.*

---

Date of Submission: 15-09-2025

Date of acceptance: 30-09-2025

---

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Competition in a competitive work environment is genuine within organizational settings; employees vie for promotions, research teams compete for grants, and companies strive for market share. This competitive condition is typically linked with the idea that competition can motivate individuals to excel. Kilduff, Elfenbein, and Staw (2010) highlight the existence of a psychological phenomenon related to competition and suggest that it is fundamentally relational. Their research contributes to the literature on competition among individuals, groups, and firms. In particular, Kilduff et al. (2010) assert that the relationships among competitors, shaped by proximity, attributes, and competitive interactions, can influence the subjective intensity of competition, ultimately impacting competitive behavior. The competitive conditions individuals perceive raise heightened concerns because work events involve organizational transcendence and are intrinsically expressive and motivating for team members.

The dynamics of modern organizations and the competition between individuals and work teams are inevitable phenomena. A competitive work environment is often designed to encourage productivity and performance; however, it can cause psychological stress, interpersonal conflicts, and decreased team effectiveness and cohesion. In high-performance demands, organizations face the challenge of creating systems that are not only competitive but also promote psychological well-being. Sharing positive experiences with colleagues is important as it can strengthen positive emotions, enrich social capital, and enhance a sense of

psychological security within the team. On the other hand, self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience have been shown to play an important role in enhancing work behavior, especially in highly competitive situations. The integration of capitalization and psychological capital development is a potential strategy for managing competition adaptively in organizations (Kahtani & Sulphrey, 2022; Ilies et al., 2024).

The evolution of innovation theory over the past few decades highlights the role of communication visibility theory in environments characterized by intense competition within organizations. As highlighted in Leonardi's (2014) research, the emerging theory suggests that an increase in meta-knowledge can lead to more innovative products and services while reducing knowledge duplication, provided employees learn how to work effectively. By learning directly instead of through experience, workers can more effectively recombine existing ideas into new ones and proactively gather perceived information daily. Individual innovative behavior is a key determinant of long-term organizational success. It is recognized as a vital human resource that contributes to the organization's competitive advantage, as it encompasses the successful implementation of employees' new and valuable creative ideas. (Kor & Mahoney, 2000; Walberga & Starihaa, 1992).

According to Janssen (2000), innovative work behavior refers to individuals' initiative to generate, promote, and implement new ideas that benefit the organization. Innovative behavior encompasses creating and implementing creative ideas within the work environment (Zou & George, 2001). Innovative work behaviors also play a role in designing new services, products, business models, processes, and organizational schemes (Tang, 2006). Knowledge sharing transfers experiences, skills, and information into practice, similar to innovation. The essence of innovation involves value creation, which is possible through the exchange of knowledge. An organization that promotes knowledge sharing enhances its innovation capabilities. (Castaneda and Cuellar, 2020).

The advancement of motivation theory has played a significant role in causality modeling, heavily focusing on statistical methods and confirmatory analysis techniques. Current research still integrates concepts related to motivation theory, leadership, and knowledge sharing to enhance organizational behavior theory. Researchers face challenges in objectively selecting among competing theories that differ in language, assumptions, and frameworks to reveal various cultural values. This issue can lead to conflicting outcomes in confirmatory tests across several theories, which might undermine the values of certain concepts or theories (Minner, 2005). Precise measurements of specific attitudes are essential as predictors to effectively anticipate behavior patterns.

The author contends that identifying the topic's domain and relevant theories allows for the meaningful integration of several concepts. The article's primary aim is to propose factors influencing knowledge sharing and innovative behavior in the workplace under high and low organizational competition conditions. Additionally, it offers an analytical view on concept integration in various studies concerning recent motivation theories linked to innovative work behavior in competitive organizational settings. Lastly, it emphasizes the significance of creative self-efficacy and optimism for fostering innovative work behavior.

### ***Theory of Innovative Work Behavior (IWB)***

According to Yuan & Woodman (2010), innovative behavior is a complex phenomenon involving activities related to generating new ideas and the awareness or implementation of those ideas. It extends beyond just developing new product concepts and technologies; it also encompasses initiating new ideas or changes in administrative procedures that aim to enhance working relationships and applying new ideas or technologies to work processes to improve work effectiveness. Innovative behavior is all individual actions directed toward generating, recognizing, and applying beneficial novelties at every level of the organization (Kleysen & Street, 2001).

Innovative work behavior (IWB) is a multi-step process that an individual finds acceptable, encompassing idea generation, coalition building, and implementation (Scott & Bruce, 1994). This viewpoint offers a current understanding of innovative work behaviors, building on previously established one-dimensional models (Janssen et al., 2004), two-dimensional frameworks by Krause (2004) and Dorenbosch et al. (2005), and the three-dimensional model proposed by Reuvers et al. (2008). Knowledge sharing enables organizations to gather, store, and utilize knowledge effectively, facilitating dynamic learning, strategic planning, decision-making, and problem-solving. Rauch et al. (2006) also demonstrated that knowledge sharing can enhance an organization's ability to innovate new products and services while uniting individuals from various departments to develop skills. Studies on innovative practices within Kaizen-oriented organizations indicate that fostering innovative atmospheres and creativity and implementing quality circles can significantly elevate overall performance in manufacturing and quality management (Imai, 2012).

A knowledge-sharing process often fails if the parties involved are unwilling to share their knowledge due to confidentiality issues, cultural factors, and the fear of losing their competitive advantage. Thus, knowledge sharing will be successful if a company can gain knowledge, absorb it, and subsequently assimilate and apply that knowledge within the organization (Daroch & McNaughton, 2002). Employees should share

information and leverage interpersonal relationships when the competitive conditions in the organization appear low. High competition within an organization can hinder its institutional processes; during intense competition, interpersonal interactions may lead to social weakening. Therefore, managers must establish a reward structure that supports information and resource-sharing activities.

Innovation is risky (Yuan & Woodman, 2010); employees face numerous risks throughout the innovation process. Individuals require two forms of positive psychological capital to navigate uncertainty and overcome failure in the innovation process, specifically creative self-efficacy and optimism. Furthermore, employees possess more information about their tasks (Shalley et al., 2009) and the context they perceive (Janssen, 2000) in their work, enhancing their creativity.

### ***Theory of Interpersonal Capitalization and Knowledge Sharing***

Watkins' (2021) research revealed that the interaction between interpersonal capitalization in the workplace and competition can affect inspiration. Specifically, interpersonal capitalization in the workplace does not directly affect Interpersonal Citizenship Behavior (ICB), which is mediated by employee inspiration in low competition conditions. The results of Watkins' research (2021) indicate that capitalization is more likely to provoke envy and social weakness when competition conditions are high. In contrast, capitalization tends to inspire and subsequently impact ICB when competition is low.

In the study by Watkins, Kleshinski, Longmire, and He (2023), perceptions were differentiated based on the attribution of high and low effort in the relationship between interpersonal capitalization and the perception of pride, as well as under conditions of high and low responsiveness perception in the relationship between pride and knowledge sharing. The results of this research revealed that the positive relationship between workplace interpersonal capitalization and knowledge sharing, driven by pride, was constrained by higher conditions of effort attribution and response to targets. The relationship between capitalization and pride was positive and significant only when effort attribution was high, whereas in the group with low effort attribution, it was insignificant.

Effort attribution moderates the relationship between interpersonal capitalization and pride. When a person has high effort attribution, it can strengthen the disclosure of interpersonal capitalization in the work environment and increase pride. One dimension of emotional self-awareness is the presence of pride, a form of assessment indicating a person's responsibility for socially valuable outputs. The research of Watkins et al. (2023) also revealed that the relationship between pride and knowledge sharing appears significant only when a person demonstrates high responsiveness. Responsiveness moderates the connection between pride and the desire to share knowledge; when a person displays high responsiveness, their pride can enhance their desire to share knowledge.

### ***Innovative Work Behavior, Creative Self-Efficacy, and Optimism***

Psychological capital is an approach to optimizing the psychological potential of individuals, characterized by: (1) self-efficacy, i.e., taking the necessary actions to achieve success in challenging tasks; (2) positive attribution (optimism); (3) resilience in achieving goals, i.e., the ability to redefine paths to reach goals if expectations change; and (4) the capacity to endure and persevere when faced with problems and difficulties (resiliency) to achieve success (Luthans et al., 2007). Osigweh (1989) stated that psychological capital is an approach characterized by dimensions that can optimize individual potential and help improve an organization's performance. Psychological capital positively impacts individual attitudes and work behaviors (Luthans et al., 2008; Riswanto et al., 2018). This is evidenced by the results of longitudinal studies (Avey et al., 2010; Luthans et al., 2006) and field studies conducted by Culbertson, Fullagar & Mills (2010).

Social cognitive theory suggests that individuals are motivated by assessing their ability to perform specific tasks (or behaviors) and their expectation that these tasks will lead to action (Bandura, 1986; 1997). Their self-efficacy can influence the evaluation of an individual's abilities, beliefs, and expectations. Individuals with high self-efficacy tend to feel more confident and view difficulties as challenges. These individuals are also likely to set high goals and exert extra effort to overcome challenges independently. Furthermore, creative self-efficacy expands on self-efficacy and is defined as the belief (or self-confidence) reflecting a person's capability to carry out innovative tasks (Nurfaizal et al., 2018; Tierney & Farmer, 2002; 2011). Creative self-efficacy represents a person's belief in their ability to perform specific tasks within innovation (Luthans et al., 2007; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). Previous research indicates that self-efficacy impacts employee performance, well-being, work attitudes, and creativity-related behaviors, such as problem-solving (Setyawati et al, 2019).

Furthermore, the capacity to meet the criteria for psychological capital lies in optimism. An optimist is a person who always expects positive and pleasant results for the future, while a pessimist, on the contrary, is someone who anticipates negative results and constantly harbors negative thoughts (Scheier & Sculptor, 1985; Luthans, Avolio, et al., 2007). Optimism is linked to positive outcomes, such as good morale, effective problem-solving, academic, political, and employment success, happiness, achievement, good health, and longevity

(Seligman, 2007). Innovation, team orientation, and risk-taking can be related to individual levels of optimism (Medlin, Green, & Gaither, 2010). Optimists tend to generate new ideas because they maintain positive expectations about the success of those ideas. Optimism involves experiencing everyday events in a more positive light and expecting better outcomes than less optimistic ones (Scheier & Carver, 1985).

A person's self-efficacy processes and experiences of oppression increase when they feel the organization values their work and provides work-related assistance (Michael et al, 2011). Individuals with high creative self-efficacy can mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and actions necessary to meet situational demands. They spend more time on cognitive processes related to problem recognition, generating ideas or solutions, and making greater efforts to find sponsors for their concepts and develop prototypes. Consequently, they can successfully perform specific tasks and achieve organizational innovation goals despite obstacles (Baer, Oldham, Jacobsohn, G. Hollingshead, 2008; Beghetto, 2006; Gong, Huang, G. Farh, 2009; Phelan, Young, 2003; Tierney, Farmer, 2002).

## **II. METHODS**

The criteria for a systematic literature review include several rules designed to support the development of theories, strengthen research methods, and contribute to a writing structure that adds depth and precision to the theory. Palmatier, Houston, and Hulland (2018) revealed that the review criteria systematically encompass several rules to support the development of theories and enhance the research methods used. The systematic structure of the review should demonstrate depth and rigor.

Aldag and Stearns (1988) revealed that not all research results provide all the benefits of a literature review; limitations prevent the main contribution from addressing important methodological issues. To make a significant contribution, a literature review should include clarity of the phenomenon, validity of the sampling method, and methodological accuracy. In empirical testing and data collection (qualitative and quantitative), researchers often encounter inconsistencies between observation activities and local wisdom, which can lead to a high measurement error rate (Whetten, 1989).

Whetten (1989) does not concentrate on devising theories, but instead presents straightforward conceptual suggestions regarding the theoretical development process. The article addresses three key questions: (1) What elements contribute to theory development? (2) How valid is the added value of contributions to theory development? (3) What factors should be considered when choosing sources for conceptual papers?

Aldag and Stearns (1988) conducted a meta-analysis that revealed several issues in research methodology, particularly concerning research validity and plagiarism. Selecting the appropriate sampling method, applying rigorous theory, and ensuring measurable validity can significantly impact research findings and serve as a foundation for policy determination and informed decision-making. Regarding causal modeling, it is essential to emphasize the strengthening of theories, even though there is already a strong focus on statistical methods for confirmatory analysis techniques.

### **The Need Theories of Motivation**

Motivation theory is based on various studies that outline scientific theories of psychology, social psychology, and personality theory. Initially, Lewin's theory described human behavior as the result of interactions between individuals and their environment (Minner, 2005). Schwab and Cummings (1970) highlighted the development of research on the connection between job satisfaction and performance, and evidence suggests that this construct has been extensively explored using non-experimental research designs. Empirically, the positive relationship between satisfaction and performance has been thoroughly studied, though there are limitations when establishing the causal relationship between these constructs.

Motivation theory should be further developed because it can reveal the formation of organizational behavior and its relation to organizational leadership. According to Lewin and McClelland, the experimental approach plays a vital role in uncovering causal relationships tied to social psychology theory and personality theory, making it widely adopted in behavioral research within the leadership sphere. For example, it can test constructs related to interpersonal relationships, intellectual, physical, and socioeconomic status.

Previous research examining the relationship between job satisfaction and performance has revealed inconsistent results for decades. Fisher (1980) indicated a misunderstanding in the measurement of the two variables, making it debatable whether a relationship exists between constructs related to attitude and behavior. The constructs of attitudes and behaviors must be clearly distinguished and grounded in philosophy. Attitude is a learned tendency to respond to events or objects in a manner that is consistently liked or disliked. Researchers in the field of organizations have sought to predict behavior at a specific time based on attitudes toward an object. This issue has become particularly relevant in job satisfaction and performance research.

Pinder (1984) revealed that employee job satisfaction results from interaction with colleagues; the experience of meeting and working with them is one of the factors contributing to job satisfaction. An individual is motivated by physiological needs, security, and self-development, as expressed in Maslow's hierarchy of



needs. Motivation is a psychological process that reflects the interaction between attitudes, needs, perceptions, and decisions occurring within a person. Intrinsic motivation represents an individual's efforts to fulfill their needs for growth, such as achievement, competence, and self-actualization.

Intrinsically motivated behavior refers to actions aimed at increasing or decreasing the physiological stimuli a person experiences to align with their desired expectations. On the other hand, extrinsic motivation is influenced by external factors affecting the individual, including relationships with others, both inside and outside the organization, organizational policies, job security, organizational culture, working conditions, rewards, and work regulations. Organizational motivation comprises a set of energy forces originating from within the individual's body, which form the basic motivation for behavior aimed at fulfilling organizational needs, namely power, affiliation, and achievement. An incentive system that establishes a specific pay rate for a defined number of units produced may be enforceable. Specifically, Lawler (2000) indicated that the expectation of effort on performance pertains to the highest level of effort exerted. Expectancy-theory formulations have typically distinguished between extrinsic and intrinsic motivations, but they regard the two as complementary, making the distinction less significant.

### **Leadership Theory as Conventional Theory**

The phenomenon of leadership and the evolution of leadership theory began to attract the attention of researchers in the social sciences in the early 1930s and, by the 1990s (Bass, 1990), started to dominate research in the organizational field, leading to cumulative contributions to the social sciences. Karmel (1978) highlights specific challenges in understanding and defining leadership. His research identifies two particular issues and proposes constructive solutions designed to clarify the definition and construction of leadership. The multi-dimensional scaling (MDS) approach is one of the few analytical techniques not relying on existing leadership instruments. The study adopted a broad interpretation of leadership and thus aimed to identify larger spaces or domains of perception in which a leader's behavior is observed. An MDS study by Salancik et al. presents leadership as a component of social structure, i.e., the evaluation of "the leader's position in the social network of others." The empirically obtained leadership dimensions include the leader's social status, the responsibility to initiate work, and organizational function.

Leadership is a phenomenon that reflects a process by which an individual or group succeeds in framing and defining the reality of others. Some theories related to leadership include Expectancy Theory, Normative Decision Process Theory, Leader-Member Exchange Theory, and Information Processing Theory (Minner, 2005). Leadership theory can still evolve, especially in uncovering the relationship between superiors and subordinates within specific organizational contexts. It is essential to study leadership in the context of the type of organization or organizational component where it occurs, as issues related to leadership often involve individuals and prevailing cultural factors. Cultural differences can blend into group and individual differences, leading to significant variations in universality. House and Aditya (1997) advocate for a broader investigation into cultural differences in leadership perceptions; this is crucial for addressing the issue of universality. We need to understand how similar the categorization process is across different cultures, groups, and individuals.

Meindl et al. (1985) reveal that the social construction of organizational reality has elevated the concept of leadership to a high status and significance level. Such reality emphasizes leadership, giving the concept a brilliance that transcends the limits of general scientific research (the heroic concept). The romanticized conception of leadership is an essential part of the social reality reflected in our informal analysis of the organization. The leader's heroic vision and the leadership concept ultimately ensure that scientific research seeks to dispel the mystery. The primary impact is to objectify, measure, and, in some cases, underestimate the importance of leadership. Consequently, the results of such efforts can be contradictory and at odds with romanticized conceptions. The ongoing fanaticism toward leadership, regardless of the truths generated regarding the qualities and behaviors of our leaders, can also provide insights into followers' motivations.

Yukl (1989) revealed that leadership is defined within the scope of individual characteristics, leader behavior, interaction patterns, relationship roles, subordinate perceptions, and influences on subordinates, task objectives, and organizational culture. LMX is a role-creation process between the leader and each subordinate and an exchange relationship that develops over time. Based on various literature studies, it can be concluded that LMX is an important tool for maintaining good relationships between leaders and subordinates, formed from multidimensional structures. LMX can be interpreted as creating roles between the leader and each subordinate and the exchange relationship that develops over time (Yukl and Mitchel, 2006).

House and Aditya (1997) briefly review the most prominent research paradigms in the leadership literature throughout history and the theories that still exist. In their article, they discuss the primary focus of the leadership paradigm and theory, along with its assumptions, limitations, and some problems that remain unresolved. One leadership trait paradigm that House and Aditya (1997) presented is the dyadic relationship known as Leader Member Exchange (LMX). House and Aditya (1997) acknowledge the challenges LMX faces

in predicting performance, concluding that the theory is best understood as one related to sibling relationships and their subjective consequences, rather than as a traditional leadership theory. The authors note that applying practical leadership theory is crucial at multiple organizational levels.

#### ***Antecedent of Innovative Work Behavior***

Minner (2005) revealed that knowledge development began with the formulation of theories in behavioral research. In particular, Minner showed how to create a solid and systematic theory, specifically by establishing an effective measurement scale to assess a construct. The significance of the reliability and validity of measuring instruments serves as the foundation for operationalizing theory development. Research in organizational behavior has advantages because it tests theories and allows for theoretical validation that can broaden the scope of knowledge.

The interaction between psychodynamic approaches and HRM development offers an opportunity to explore individual, group, and organizational leadership development as conscious and unconscious processes. The psychodynamic perspective describes an approach that differentiates between behaviors and activities aimed at the performance of rational tasks and those directed at emotional needs and the presence of anxiety. Another significant aspect of psychodynamic theory for examining leadership development is the relationship among emotions, organizational dynamics, and leadership development (Trehan, 2007). The connection between the works of Trehan (2007), Aslamazishvili, Ignatova, and Smirnaya (2020), Tikhomirnov and Spangler (2010), and Minner (2005) highlights the importance of group role motivation theory as a contemporary leadership theory; however, the motives involved have not been operationalized, and the theory requires future testing. This theory largely stems from literature on autonomous working groups, sensitivity training, and organizational development. The autonomy effect in innovative work behavior can be interpreted as the extent to which followers have the freedom to perform their tasks without excessive supervision (Basu & Green, 1997). Individuals may be more likely to innovate when they possess sufficient autonomy and control over their work. This fosters an environment that encourages free thinking, information exchange, and the freedom to explore and refine new strategies for addressing problems (Axtell et al., 2000; Jong et al., 2001). Peer perceptions of a supportive climate can promote innovative work behaviors (e.g., Burningham & West, 1995; Bharadwaj & Menon, 2000). Team support should be offered to colleagues to enable them to function independently while pursuing new ideas. Creating innovative services necessitates an environment that encourages and fosters openness, creativity, and taking risks beyond traditional norms (Anderson & West, 1998; Brentani, 2001).

#### ***Preposition Development***

Leong and Rasli (2014) tested how employees utilize innovative work behaviors to achieve optimal performance. In their research, role theory and social cognitive theory were applied from the perspective of innovative work behavior. The findings revealed that tenure significantly supports IWB practices across various divisions, particularly in Product Planning and Development, compared to the Research and Development division. Additionally, achieving greater integration may facilitate innovative strategic outcomes.

The study by Watkins et al. (2023) does not reveal the competitive situation and conditions perceived by the respondents in the organization, so this study proposes a relationship between the perception of pride and knowledge-sharing behavior concerning the competitive conditions of the organization. In contrast to Watkins's (2021) and Watkins et al. (2023) research, this study proposes a relationship between knowledge-sharing variables and innovative behaviors. Three research propositions are put forward, aiming to test the influence of pride and knowledge sharing on innovative work behaviors. The first proposition is that pride and knowledge sharing affect innovative work behavior. Second, competitiveness moderates the relationship between pride, knowledge sharing, and innovative work behaviors. Specifically, the perception of competitiveness is differentiated into high and low conditions to measure the difference between high and low competition conditions. The relationship between the variables of pride, knowledge sharing, and innovative behavior in two conditions can be examined using subgroup analysis. Based on a literature review and highlighting the role of leadership in work behavior within organizations, the third proposition is that leadership roles can strengthen the influence of pride, effort attribution, and knowledge sharing on innovative work behavior in conditions of high competition.

### **III. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

Interpersonal capitalization and psychological capital are connected in that interpersonal capitalization (as a part or form of interpersonal/social capital) provides the social conditions that support the growth and utilization of PsyCap. With good interpersonal relationships and positive responses to an individual's positive experiences, the person's PsyCap can further develop, and its positive effects on well-being, performance,

interpersonal relationships, and other aspects of life can be maximized. Thus, these two concepts do not stand alone but rather reinforce each other within the framework of positive relationships.

This study builds on the research conducted by Watkins et al. (2023), which explores the antecedents of knowledge-sharing behaviors, specifically pride and interpersonal capitalization in the workplace. These behaviors are influenced by factors such as Positive Work Events, Effort Attribution, and Perceived Coworker Responsiveness. The success of individual accomplishments and the expected emotional reactions hinge on colleague interactions and the competitive dynamics present in the work setting (Watkins, 2021). Competition highlights individual achievements' differences, leading to emotional responses that compare outcomes, making assimilative emotional responses less probable. While sharing work accomplishments and expressing pride in coworkers can foster competitiveness, they do not always serve as triggers for it. This study proposes an innovative model of work behavior that individuals perceive can be stimulated by pride and knowledge sharing in a competitive work environment. Further research could empirically test the propositions outlined in this article.

Future research should explore the development and efficacy of interventions designed to cultivate Psychological Capital within diverse organizational contexts, assessing their long-term impact on employee well-being and organizational performance. Further investigation is warranted into the interactive, substitutive, and compensatory mechanisms among PsyCap's components to understand how these psychological resources dynamically influence outcomes (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017). Additionally, future studies could employ person-centered latent profile analyses to uncover how different combinations of PsyCap components might differentially impact employee behaviors and organizational effectiveness (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017). Moreover, researchers should consider the influence of cultural contexts on the manifestation and impact of PsyCap, as well as the potential for cross-cultural comparisons to reveal universal versus culture-specific aspects of this construct. Additionally, there is a pressing need to explore the antecedents and moderators of PsyCap more thoroughly, moving beyond conventional control variables to identify key factors shaping an individual's positive resource inventory (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017). This would involve examining how organizational interventions, leadership styles, and individual differences contribute to the development and sustainment of PsyCap. The impact of orientation training on newcomers' PsyCap, for instance, represents a promising avenue for investigation, suggesting that early organizational interventions can significantly bolster these psychological resources (Song et al., 2023).

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Aldag, R., & Stearns, T. 1988. Issues in research methodology. *Journal of Management*, 14: 253-276.
- [2]. Aslamazishvili, D., Ignatova, V., and Smirnaya, A. 2020. Symbolic Leadership in the Organizational Culture in the Context of Transformation. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, volume 441.
- [3]. Baer, M., Oldham, G. R., Jacobsohn, G. C., & Hollingshead, A. B. (2008). The personality composition of teams and creativity: The moderating role of team creative confidence. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 42(4), 255–282. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2162-6057.2008.tb01299>.
- [4]. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [5]. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- [6]. Castaneda, D. I., & Cuellar, S. (2020). Knowledge sharing and innovation: A systematic review. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 27(3), 159-173.
- [7]. Daroch, J., dan McNaughton, R. (2002). Examining the link between knowledge management practices and types of innovation. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. 3 Iss: 3, pp.210 – 222.
- [8]. Dorenbosch, L., Engen, M. L. V., & Verhagen, M. (2005). on the job innovation: the impact of job design and human resource management through production ownership. *Creativity and innovation management*, 14(2), 129-141.
- [9]. Fisher, C. D. 1980. On the dubious wisdom of expecting job satisfaction to correlate with performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 5: 607-612.
- [10]. Gong, Y., Huang, J. C., & Farh, J. L. (2009). Employee learning orientation, transformational leadership, and employee creativity: The mediating role of employee creative self-efficacy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 765–778. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.43670890>
- [11]. House, R. J., & Aditya, R. 1997. The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis. *Journal of Management*, 23: 409-473.
- [12]. Imai, M. (2012). *Gemba Kaizen: A commonsense approach to a continuous improvement strategy*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- [13]. Janssen, O., Van de Vliert, E., and West, M. (2004). The bright and dark sides of individual and group innovation: A special issue introduction. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 25, 129–145.
- [14]. Kilduff, G. J., Elfenbein, H. A., & Staw, B. M. (2010). The psychology of rivalry: A relationally dependent analysis of competition. *Academy of management journal*, 53(5), 943-969.
- [15]. Krause, D. E. (2004). Influence-based leadership as a determinant of the inclination to innovate and of innovation-related behaviors: An empirical investigation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 79-102.
- [16]. Leong, C. T., & Rasli, A. (2014). The Relationship between innovative work behavior on work role performance: An empirical study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 129, 592-600.
- [17]. Leonardi, P. M. (2014). Social media, knowledge sharing, and innovation: Toward a theory of communication visibility. *Information systems research*, 25(4), 796-816.
- [18]. 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>.
- [19]. Luthans, F., & Youssef-Morgan, C. M. (2017). Psychological Capital: An Evidence-Based Positive Approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4(1), 339. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113324>

- [20]. Meindl, J.R., Ehrlich, S.B. and Dukerich, J.M., 1985. The romance of leadership. *Administrative science quarterly*, pp.78-102.
- [21]. Michael, L. A., Hou, S.-T., & Fan, H.-L. (2011). Creative self-efficacy and innovative behavior in a service setting: Optimism as a moderator. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 45(4), 258–272. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2162-6057.2011.tb01430.x>
- [22]. Minner, J., B. (2005). *Organizational behavior 1. Essential theories of motivation and leadership*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- [23]. Muchinsky, P. M. (2000). Emotions in the workplace: The neglect of organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 801-805.
- [24]. Osigweh, C. A. B. (1989). Concept fallibility in organizational science. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 579–594. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4308386>
- [25]. Pinder, C. C. 1984. *Work Motivation: Theory, Issues, and Applications*. Scott, Foresman and Company, Glenview, Illinois, London.
- [26]. Rauch, A., Frese, M., Wang, Z.M., dan König, C. (2006). A universal contingency approach: innovation, entrepreneurial orientation and performance in Chinese and German entrepreneurs”, *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, Vol. 26, No. 22.
- [27]. Reuvers, M., Van Engen, M. L., Vinkenburg, C. J., & WilsonEvered, E. (2008). Transformational leadership and innovative work behaviour: exploring the relevance of gender differences. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 17(3), 227-244.
- [28]. Riswanto, A., Ridwan, A., & Widodo, W. (2018). Psychological capital and job performance: The mediating role of work engagement. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 292, 361–365. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icas-18.2018.79>
- [29]. Robert W. Palmatier, Mark B. Houston, John Hulland (2018), “Review articles: purpose, process, and structure,” *Journal of Academy Marketing Science*, Volume 46, pp.1-5.
- [30]. Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). Optimism, coping, and health: Assessment and implications of generalized outcome expectancies. *Health Psychology*, 4(3), 219–247. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.4.3.219>
- [31]. Scheier, M. F., & Scultor, C. S. (1985). [Kemungkinan salah ketik: mungkinmaksudnya Scheier & Carver]. *Health Psychology*, 4(3), 219–247.
- [32]. Smircich, L., & Morgan, G. 1982. Leadership: The management of meaning. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 18: 257-273.
- [33]. Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. 1995. What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 371-384.
- [34]. Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of management journal*, 37(3), 580-607.
- [35]. Schwab, D. P., & Cummings, L. L. 1970. Theories of performance and satisfaction: A review. *Industrial Relation*, 9: 408-430.
- [36]. Tang, J. (2006). Competition and innovation behaviour. *Research policy*, 35(1), 68-82.
- [37]. Trehan, K. (2007). Psychodynamic and Critical Perspectives on Leadership Development, *Advances in Developing Human Resources* Vol. 9, No. 1 February 2007 72-82. DOI: 10.1177/1523422306294496.
- [38]. Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M. (2002). Creative self-efficacy: Its potential antecedents and relationship to creative performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(6), 1137–1148. <https://doi.org/10.5465/3069429>
- [39]. Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M. (2011). Creative self-efficacy development and creative performance over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(2), 277–293. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020952>
- [40]. Tikhomirov, A.A. and Spangler, W.D. (2010). Neo-Charismatic Leadership and The fate of Mergers and Acquisitions: An Institutional Model of CEO Leadership, *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, Volume 17 (1), pp. 44-60.
- [41]. Whetten, D.A. (1989), “What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution?,” *Academy of Management Review*, Volume 14, No.4, pp.490-495.
- [42]. Watkins, T. 2021. Workplace interpersonal capitalization: Employee reactions to coworker positive event disclosures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 64 (2): 537–561.
- [43]. Watkins, T., Kleshinski, C. E., Longmire, N. H., and He, W. 2023. Rekindling the fire and stoking the flames: How and when workplace interpersonal capitalization facilitates pride and knowledge sharing at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 66(3): 953-978.
- [44]. 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>
- [45]. Yukl, G., & Michel, J. W. 2006. Proactive influence tactics and leader member exchange. *Power and influence in organizations*, 87-103.