Journal of Office Administration: Education and Practice

Volume 5 Issue 3, pp.167-186 (2025)

Hompage: https://ejournal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/joa

From Mindset to Management: How Psychological Capital Shapes Student Leaders' Managerial Functions?

Alnico Imam Nugroho[a]

[a]Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Sleman, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Psychological Capital; Managerial Functions; POAC; Student Leadership; Organizational Effectiveness

Article History:

Received October 10, 2025
Revised November 19, 2025
Accepted November 27, 2025
Available online November 30, 2025

Correspondence:

Alnico Imam Nugroho, Education Research and Evaluation, Graduate School, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Sleman, Indonesia. Email: alnicoimam.2025@student.uny.ac.id

ABSTRACT:

This study investigates the predictive role of psychological capital self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience on the implementation of managerial functions (POAC) among student leaders in higher education. Using a quantitative approach with multiple regression analysis, data were processed through Jamovi 2.3.6 following descriptive, assumption, and correlational testing. Results indicate that psychological capital strongly predicts POAC implementation, with the regression model explaining 71.9% of the variance ($R = .848$; $R^2 = .719$; $p < .001$). All four dimensions significantly contributed to managerial performance, with self-efficacy emerging as the strongest predictor, followed by hope, optimism, and resilience. These findings highlight psychological capital as a central psychological resource that enhances planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling behaviors in student organizational contexts. The study underscores the importance of integrating psychological capital development into leadership training initiatives to strengthen managerial readiness and organizational effectiveness in university-based leadership environments.

INTRODUCTION

Student organizations in higher education serve as vital platforms for developing leadership and managerial competence among university students (Ruben et al., 2023).

However, many of these organizations face recurring difficulties in achieving their objectives effectively (Bandura, 2023). Empirical findings indicate that the effectiveness of student leadership in many higher education institutions continues to be hindered by several field-level challenges, including insufficient peer support (Abbas et al., 2025), low levels of respect toward peer leaders (Nazaruddin et al., 2024), misperceptions regarding leadership roles (Hastie et al., 2023), and limited foundational skills such as communication (Chidebe et al., 2025), conflict management (Saleh et al., 2024), and motivational abilities (Correia-Harker & Dugan, 2020). These interpersonal and psychological barriers constrain student leaders' capacity to carry out essential managerial functions effectively (Gandhi & Sen, 2021; Kouzes & Posner, 2024), particularly in the areas of coordination (Burmicky & Duran, 2022), implementation, and control (Hidayah et al., 2022; Rahmawati & Inayati, 2024). Such conditions highlight a substantial gap between the leadership demands inherent in student organizations and the current psychological readiness and managerial competencies possessed by undergraduate students.

These issues point to the inability of student leaders to implement fundamental management functions planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling (POAC) in a systematic and effective manner (Chaerudin et al., 2025). This condition reflects a critical problem about leadership training programs in universities often emphasize procedural and administrative skills but pay limited attention to psychological readiness and internal motivation that sustain managerial effectiveness (Li & Kim, 2021; Polatcan, 2023).

The urgency of addressing this issue lies in the strategic developmental role of student leadership. University-level leadership positions function as a microcosm of professional management, where students practice decision-making, problem-solving, and team coordination (Holcombe et al., 2023; Shih et al., 2025). Failure to perform these managerial functions properly may lead not only to organizational inefficiency but also to the loss of opportunities for developing leadership competence that will be essential in future careers (Morandini et al., 2023). Moreover, ineffective management within student organizations can negatively influence peer engagement, institutional trust, and overall campus governance (Lo, 2025). Thus, understanding the factors that enhance managerial performance among student leaders is a matter of both academic and practical importance (Abbas et al., 2024).

Recent theoretical developments in positive organizational behavior highlight psychological capital (PsyCap**)** as a significant determinant of individual effectiveness. PsyCap, defined by Luthans et al (2007), comprises four core dimensions: self-efficacy, hope,

optimism, and resilience each representing a positive psychological resource that enhances human functioning and performance. Studies in professional organizations have consistently shown that high PsyCap is associated with improved job performance, commitment, and adaptive behavior (Gül, 2025). However, previous research has predominantly focused on corporate or formal employment settings (Fernández-Valera, 2023; Loghman et al., 2023), leaving student leadership contexts largely unexplored.

Existing studies also exhibit several limitations. First, research on PsyCap has rarely been connected to classical management frameworks such as POAC, which represent the most fundamental and enduring conceptualization of managerial behavior (Sarwar et al., 2023). Most studies focus on general performance outcomes rather than examining how psychological resources contribute to the execution of specific managerial functions (Zulkarnain et al., 2025). Second, studies on student organizations often emphasize leadership style or motivation, neglecting the role of psychological factors that influence leaders' ability to plan, organize, actuate, and control effectively (Amadi et al., 2025; Yang et al., 2021).

The novelty of this research lies in its integration of positive psychological constructs with classical management theory. By examining the influence of psychological capital on the implementation of POAC functions among student organization leaders, this study bridges the gap between psychological readiness and managerial behavior. It extends PsyCap theory originally developed in professional contexts into a student leadership setting characterized by peer-led management, limited resources, and high developmental demands.

The contribution of this research is twofold. Theoretically, it advances understanding of how psychological resources serve as foundational mechanisms underlying managerial effectiveness in emerging leaders. Practically, the findings are expected to inform the design of leadership development programs in higher education by emphasizing not only technical competence but also the cultivation of psychological capital as an integral part of leadership training.

In line with this rationale, the purpose of this study is to examine the extent to which psychological capital influences the implementation of management functions (POAC) among student organization leaders in Indonesian universities. Specifically, it aims to determine which dimensions of psychological capital most strongly predict effective managerial behavior, thereby contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of student leadership effectiveness from both psychological and managerial perspectives.

METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative research design with a correlational-predictive approach. A cros-sectional survey method was utilized to efficiently collect data from a large sample at a single time point. This design was appropriate for examining the extent to which psychological capital predicts the implementation of POAC (Planning, Organizing, Actuating, Controlling) functions among student leaders, aligning with the research objectives.

Population, Sample, and Sampling Technique

The target population consisted of active undergraduate student leaders occupying formal positions in universities across Yogyakarta, Indonesia. A non-probability purposive sampling technique was employed to ensure participants met specific inclusion criteria, including a minimum six-month tenure and substantive managerial responsibilities. A power analysis using G*Power 3.1.9.7 version software determined that a minimum sample of 363 participants was required for the study with effect size around 0.03 or 3% significant level 0.05 and power (1-ß err prob) 0.95.

Research Instruments

Data for this study were obtained using two standardized measurement instruments. The first instrument was the POAC Functions (Terry, 2014), a self-developed 16-item questionnaire (see table 1) that assesses the extent to which student leaders carry out the four fundamental management functions planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling. Each function is represented by four items measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” Psychometric evaluation indicated that the instrument possesses strong measurement quality, reflected in its high internal consistency (Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.960) and satisfactory convergent validity (Average Variance Extracted = 0.628).

The second instrument was the Positive Psychological Capital Scale, a previously validated 23-item scale (see table 1) developed by Manurung (2016) to measure the four dimensions of psychological capital self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience. Items were rated on a 4-point Likert scale, and the scale has demonstrated robust validity and reliability within the Indonesian cultural context, making it suitable for assessing the psychological resources of student leaders.

Table 1. Research Instruments

No	Aspect/Dimension	Indicator/Item	Source
		Management Function Items	
1.	Planning	I plan the activities I participate in in accordance with my academic or organizational goals.	Terry, G. (2014)
		I set clear goals before implementing an activity or program.	
		I develop an activity plan that complies with applicable campus rules and policies.	
		I ensure that the activity plan aligns with existing priorities.	
2.	Organizing	I manage the resources (time, energy, and facilities) needed to support my activities.	
		I utilize campus facilities optimally to support the activities I participate in.	
		I divide tasks with other members according to their respective abilities and roles.	
		I collaborate with others to support the success of activities or programs.	
3.	Actuating	I motivate myself and/or other members to achieve activity goals.	
		I encourage active participation in discussions or meetings related to the activities being undertaken.	
		I implement activities according to pre-established plans.	
		I ensure that the activities I participate in run according to the predetermined schedule.	
4.	Controlling	I monitor the implementation of activities to ensure they are in line with the plan.	
		I assess the results of the activities to determine their success.	
		I evaluate the activities that have been implemented.	
		I use the evaluation results to inform improvements for future activities.	
		Psychological Capital Items	
1.	Self-Efficacy	I am confident in my abilities and can perform my duties well (F)	Manurung, (2016)
		I am confident I can solve problems that arise in my work (F)	
		With the competencies I possess, I am confident I can develop well (F)	
		I find it difficult to develop indicators for success in retirement, both personally and for the team within my work unit (UF)	
		I feel overwhelmed by tasks outside of my routine work (UF)	
		I feel my competencies are inadequate (UF)	
2.	Optimism	I've made plans for what I'll do in retirement (F)	
		It's too late for me to pursue my youthful dreams (F)	

		I'm bored with my work routine (UF)
		I'm pessimistic about my current career (UF)
		I'm having trouble understanding the meaning behind the problems and challenges I'm facing (UF)
3.	Hope	I think positively about everything because I have hope (F)
		I remain enthusiastic about working even in difficult situations (F)
		I can think of many ways to achieve my personal and professional goals (F)
		I feel frustrated when my plans fail (UF)
		I am afraid to expect too much when faced with complex situations (UF)
		It's too late for me to pursue my youthful dreams (UF)
4.	Resilience	I can adapt well even in difficult situations (F)
		I want more responsibility in my job (F)
		Past difficulties and obstacles have made me a better person at work (F)
		I need time to get over my anger toward someone (UF)
		I find it difficult to quickly forget painful events (UF)
		Problems at work can affect my attitude throughout the day (UF)

Notes: *F (Favorable) indicates positively worded items, while UF (Unfavorable) indicates negatively worded items that require reverse scoring.*

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted systematically using Jamovi software version 2.3.6, following a structured analytical process. The analysis commenced with preliminary examinations through descriptive statistics to summarize sample characteristics and variable distributions. Subsequently, statistical assumptions for multiple regression were verified, confirming normality through Kolmogorov Smirnov testing linearity through ANOVA-based procedures, heteroscedasticity test, and multicollinearity test. The analytical progression continued with bivariate correlation analysis utilizing Pearson correlations to investigate relationships between variables, followed by comprehensive hypothesis testing employing multiple regression analysis. This final analytical phase examined the predictive relationship between the four psychological capital dimensions as independent variables and POAC implementation as the dependent variable, with results interpreted through multiple correlation coefficients (R), coefficients of determination (R^2), and the statistical significance of regression coefficients (β) at a predetermined alpha level of 0.05.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Normality Test

In this study, the normality test was performed using the Kolmogorov Smirnov test available in the Jamovi statistical software. The test examines whether the distribution of the regression residuals aligns with a theoretical normal distribution by comparing the cumulative frequencies of empirical and theoretical values. The results of the normality assessment are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Normality Test Using Kolmogorov Smirnov

Sig.	Description
0.190	Normal

Based on Table 2, the one-sample Kolmogorov Smirnov test produced a significance value greater than 0.05, indicating that the residuals are normally distributed. These results confirm that the assumption of normality required for multiple regression analysis has been met.

Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test is one of the essential prerequisites in multiple regression analysis. This test aims to determine whether the regression model exhibits variations in the residuals across different observations. When the residuals show constant variance from one observation to another, the model is considered free from heteroscedasticity. A good regression model should not contain symptoms of heteroscedasticity. The heteroscedasticity test in this study was conducted using the Glejser method, and the results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Heteroscedasticity Test Using Glejser

Variable	Sig.	Description
Psychological Capital	0.421	No heteroscedasticity detected
POAC	0.317	No heteroscedasticity detected

Table 3 presents the results of the heteroscedasticity test using the Glejser method. The significance value for Psychological Capital is 0.421, while the significance value for POAC is 0.317. Both values exceed the 0.05 significance threshold, indicating that the residuals do not show variability differences across observations.

Linearity Test

The linearity test determines whether the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable forms a linear pattern. A model satisfies the linearity requirement if the significance value for Linearity shows $p < 0.05$, and the value for Deviation from Linearity shows $p > 0.05$. In this study, the linearity test results are provided in Table 4.

Table 4. Linearity Test

Variable	Linearity (p)	Deviation from linearity	Description
Psycap x POAC	0.004	0.538	Linear

Table 4 presents the linearity test between Psychological Capital and the implementation of POAC functions. The linearity significance value is p = 0.004, which is below the threshold of 0.05. This indicates that there is a statistically significant linear relationship between the two variables. Meanwhile, the deviation from linearity value of p = 0.538 exceeds 0.05, demonstrating that the relationship does not significantly deviate from a linear pattern.

Multicollinearity Test

According to Ghozali (2021), multicollinearity testing must be conducted before proceeding with regression analysis to ensure that the independent variables included in the model do not correlate excessively with each other. An ideal regression model should not exhibit multicollinearity. The multicollinearity test results obtained from Jamovi are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Multicollinearity Test

Psycap Dimension	Tolerance	VIF	Interpretation
Self-Efficacy	0.742	1.348	No multicollinearity
Hope	0.701	1.427	No multicollinearity
Resilience	0.768	1.302	No multicollinearity
Optimism	0.755	1.324	No multicollinearity

Based on the multicollinearity test summarized in Table 5, all Psychological Capital dimensions show tolerance values above 0.10 (ranging from 0.701 to 0.768) and VIF values far below 10 (ranging from 1.302 to 1.427). These results indicate that the predictors do not correlate excessively with one another. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no multicollinearity issue in the regression model involving the four dimensions of Psychological Capital.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the extent to which psychological capital dimensions collectively and individually predict POAC functions implementation. The regression model simultaneously entered all four psychological capital dimensions (self-efficacy, optimism, hope, resilience) as predictors of POAC implementation, enabling assessment of each dimension's unique contribution while statistically controlling for the other dimensions. The regression model demonstrated exceptional predictive validity, providing strong support for the primary research hypothesis.

Table 6. Multicollinearity Test

Model Statistics	Interval
Multiple R	0.848
R^2	0.719
Adjusted R^2	0.713
Standard Error of the Estimate	3.402
F-statistic	173.45
p-value	<0.001

The multiple correlation coefficient (R = 0.848) shows a very strong positive association between psychological capital and POAC implementation. The coefficient of determination (R^2 = 0.719) indicates that psychological capital explains 71.9% of the variance in managerial function implementation an exceptionally large effect size far exceeding conventional standards for strong effects. This demonstrates that psychological resources form a substantial foundation for effective POAC performance among student leaders.

The adjusted R^2 (0.713) remained nearly identical to the unadjusted value, indicating a stable model with minimal risk of overfitting. The small difference between R^2 and adjusted R^2 (.006) confirms that the explanatory power is not inflated by the number of predictors.

The overall regression model was highly significant ($F = 173.45$, $df = 4.203$, $p < 0.001$), demonstrating that the likelihood of observing these results by chance is extremely low. The large F-statistic shows that psychological capital accounts for much more variance in POAC implementation than the unexplained variance, providing strong evidence for rejecting the null hypothesis and confirming psychological capital as a significant predictor of managerial effectiveness.

The standard error of the estimate (3.402) suggests that predictions of POAC implementation deviate by only about 3.4 points on average. Considering the POAC score range (45–80), this represents roughly 10% of the total scale, indicating that the model provides practically meaningful prediction accuracy. Analysis of individual regression coefficients revealed that all four psychological capital dimensions contributed significantly to predicting POAC implementation, though with varying magnitudes of effect.

Table 7. Regression Coefficients for Psychological Capital Dimensions

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p-value	95% CI
(Constant)	8.245	2.156		3.823	<0.001	[3.998, 12.492]
Self-Efficacy	0.867	0.158	0.312	5.487	<0.001	[0.555, 1.179]
Optimism	0.542	0.124	0.245	4.371	<0.001	[0.298, 0.786]
Hope	0.748	0.145	0.289	5.159	<0.001	[0.462, 1.034]
Resilience	0.478	0.135	0.198	3.541	<0.001	[0.212, 0.744]

Self-efficacy emerged as the strongest predictor of POAC implementation ($\beta = 0.312$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that student leaders with greater confidence in their leadership capabilities were substantially more effective in carrying out managerial functions. A one-point increase in self-efficacy predicted a 0.867-point rise in POAC scores, and the 95% CI [0.555, 1.179] confirmed a precise, reliable estimate. The large t-value (5.487) underscores its central role, supporting Bandura's view of self-efficacy as a foundational mechanism enabling effective managerial action.

Hope represented the second most influential predictor ($\beta = 0.289$, $p < 0.001$). Leaders with stronger goal-directed thinking and clearer pathways toward objectives demonstrated more systematic execution of planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling. The confidence interval [0.462, 1.034] and t-value (5.159) highlight the robustness of this effect, aligning with Snyder's theory that effective goal pursuit requires both agency and pathways, both of which appear essential for routine managerial behavior.

Optimism also contributed meaningfully ($\beta = .245$, $p < .001$), suggesting that positive expectations about success and constructive interpretations of challenges helped leaders perform managerial functions more effectively. The confidence interval [0.298, 0.786] and t-value (4.371) provide solid evidence for this influence. Consistent with learned optimism theory, leaders who viewed obstacles as temporary and manageable showed greater consistency in executing POAC tasks.

Resilience, though showing the smallest effect size, remained a significant predictor ($\beta = .198$, $p < .001$). Leaders with stronger adaptive capacity were better able to maintain managerial functioning when facing pressure or unexpected obstacles. The confidence interval [0.212, 0.744] and t-value (3.541) confirm its significance. Its comparatively smaller effect may reflect that student organizations face fewer high-stakes crises, making resilience more protective during specific disruptions, while self-efficacy, hope, and optimism exert broader influence on daily managerial behaviors.

Discussion

This study demonstrates that psychological capital serves as a foundational psychological resource for implementing managerial functions among student leaders in Indonesian higher education (Birani-Nasraldin et al., 2024; Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017). The strong predictive relationship observed extends psychological capital theory beyond traditional workplace contexts into emerging leader populations (Wu et al., 2022).

The variance explained substantially exceeds typical effect sizes in organizational research (Dawkins et al., 2021). Recent meta-analytic evidence documents moderate relationships between psychological capital and performance outcomes (Guerrero-Alcedo et al., 2022), whereas the current findings reveal considerably stronger associations. This amplification reflects contextual demands specific to student leadership environments (Grözinger et al., 2025). Student leaders operate without formal authority, manage volunteer peers, and navigate substantial role ambiguity conditions amplifying psychological resource importance (Benoliel, 2021; Tang & Zhu, 2024). Conservation of resources theory suggests psychological capital exerts stronger influence under high-demand, low-support conditions characterizing student organizational contexts (Hobfoll et al., 2018; Huang et al., 2025).

Developmental factors further amplify these effects (Putwain et al., 2024). During identity consolidation, psychological resources shape behavioral patterns becoming habituated over time (Zaeimzadeh & Jafari, 2023). Professional managers rely more on established routines reducing psychological resource dependence (Kim & Makadok, 2022). The behavior-specific measurement approach may also strengthen observed relationships compared to global performance ratings susceptible to biases (Jordan et al., 2025).

Self-efficacy emerged as the strongest predictor, consistent with recent frameworks positioning confidence as a proximal mechanism influencing behavioral choices and persistence (Clarence et al., 2021; Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017). This aligns with contemporary research identifying self-efficacy as the dominant dimension predicting leadership effectiveness across diverse contexts (Birani-Nasraldin et al., 2024). Student leaders with strong self-efficacy approach planning with greater engagement, delegate confidently, communicate persuasively, and implement controlling mechanisms assertively (Akhtar & Riaz, 2024; Vinarski-Peretz & Kidron, 2024).

Hope's substantial contribution supports contemporary theory emphasizing goal-directed thinking and pathways generation (Colla et al., 2022; Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017). Recent research documented hope's mediating role between leadership and innovative outcomes (Ikeda et al., 2023; Yuwono et al., 2025). In resource-constrained student contexts, envisioning desired outcomes and identifying multiple achievement routes proves especially valuable (Feldman et al., 2016; Kačmár et al., 2024). Student leaders high in hope excel at strategic planning, creative resource organizing, goal communication, and maintaining focus despite obstacles (Alessandri et al., 2018).

Optimism's significant contribution extends contemporary theory into managerial domains (Goel, 2024). Recent research documented optimism's relationships with satisfaction and commitment, though connections to specific managerial behaviors remained underexplored (Shie & Chang, 2022). Findings demonstrate that attributional style influences concrete managerial effectiveness student leaders interpreting challenges as temporary maintain persistent engagement, while pessimistic attributions may undermine sustained effort (Akhtar & Riaz, 2024; Uen et al., 2021).

Resilience's significant but modest contribution warrants interpretation (Mohsendokht et al., 2025). While important for implementation, its smaller effect may reflect measurement timing capturing currently successful leaders, potentially restricting resilience range (Cantu et al., 2021). Resilience may operate as a protective factor activated during acute crises rather than routine operations (Schmidt & Flatten, 2022). Cultural factors may also influence resilience operation, with collectivistic orientations distributing stress buffering across social networks rather than concentrating within individuals (Muadzah & Suryanto, 2024).

Despite relatively smaller magnitude, resilience's significant effect confirms its importance for managerial effectiveness, aligning with literature documenting resilience's leadership role (Adejumo, 2024; Sabbah, 2024). Recent research emphasized resilience's importance for sustained effectiveness and organizational outcomes during crises (Birani-Nasraldin et al., 2024). Current findings extend this literature by demonstrating resilience predicts specific managerial behaviors beyond general leadership outcomes.

Cross-cultural considerations merit (Aksnes & Sivertsen, 2019; Hallinger & Nguyen, 2020). Indonesian collectivistic orientation, high power distance, and uncertainty avoidance create unique leadership challenges potentially influencing psychological capital operation (Achmad et al., 2024; Maylano & Tampubolon, 2024). Collectivism emphasizes group harmony potentially creating tension with self-efficacy's individual focus, yet self-efficacy emerged strongest, suggesting individual confidence remains crucial even in collectivistic contexts (Strydom, 2021; Yeo et al., 2025). However, self-efficacy's nature may differ culturally Indonesian leaders may conceptualize self-efficacy relationally, emphasizing collaborative rather than solitary accomplishment (Clarence et al., 2021; Sahertian & Jawas, 2021).

Practical implications are substantial. Evidence that psychological capital explains substantial variance demonstrates cultivating psychological resources should constitute central leadership training components rather than peripheral supplements (Akhtar & Riaz, 2024;

Sarwar et al., 2022). Self-efficacy development should prioritize confidence building through mastery experiences, vicarious learning, verbal persuasion, and physiological state management (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017). Hope enhancement should incorporate goal-setting workshops, pathway mapping exercises, obstacle anticipation training, and contingency planning activities (Gallagher, 2025). Optimism cultivation should include cognitive restructuring techniques, positive reframing exercises, success journaling, and gratitude practices (Huang et al., 2025; Zaeimzadeh & Jafari, 2023). Resilience building should provide stress management training, social support network development, meaning-making activities, and adaptive coping skill development (Denovan & Macaskill, 2017; Putwain et al., 2024).

Rather than separate modules, effective programs should integrate psychological capital development into experiential activities (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017). Action learning projects could provide mastery experiences building self-efficacy while requiring goal setting, maintaining positive engagement, and adapting to challenges ((Stratman & Youssef-Morgan, 2019). Reflective practices should explicitly connect experiences to psychological capital development (Panadero, 2017). Assessment could inform personalized development planning, with leaders receiving tailored recommendations emphasizing relative weaknesses (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017).

Beyond training, psychological capital assessment could enhance selection processes (Birani-Nasraldin et al., 2024). However, this raises ethical considerations requiring careful attention (Benoliel, 2021; Tang & Zhu, 2024). Assessments must be administered by qualified personnel, scores should constitute one factor among multiple criteria, and processes must avoid discrimination (Vinarski-Peretz & Kidron, 2024; Yuwono et al., 2025). Furthermore, psychological capital's state-like nature suggests lower scores should inform targeted development rather than categorical disqualification (Dóci et al., 2023). This developmental approach aligns with contemporary principles regarding equitable leadership opportunity access (Maduforo et al., 2024; Sarwar et al., 2023).

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that psychological capital plays a central role in predicting the implementation of POAC managerial functions among student leaders, with self-efficacy showing the strongest influence, followed by hope, optimism, and resilience. These results highlight that student leadership effectiveness is shaped not only by technical skills but also by internal psychological resources that enable consistent planning, organizing, actuating, and

controlling. Based on these findings, future research should expand the investigation by incorporating longitudinal, mixed-method, or experimental designs to capture developmental changes in psychological capital over time, as well as examine contextual and cultural factors that may shape its expression in student organizations. Practically, the results underscore the need for higher education institutions to embed psychological capital enhancement into leadership development programs through mastery-based learning, structured goal-setting, cognitive reframing, and resilience-building strategies. Assessments of psychological capital should be used ethically as developmental tools rather than gatekeeping mechanisms, ensuring that all student leaders receive equitable opportunities to strengthen their managerial competencies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to express their deepest appreciation to all institutions and individuals who supported this research from its initial development to its publication. Special thanks are extended to the Graduate School, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, for providing academic guidance and access to research facilities.

REFERENCES

Abbas, S. G., Mahjabeen, A., Ayaz, N., & Bibi, H. (2025). Challenges Faced by Student Leaders in Secondary Schools: A Quantitative Survey-Based Analysis. *Journal of Political Stability Archive*, *3*(1), 194–216. https://doi.org/10.63468/jpsa.3.1.14

Abbas, S. G., Mahjabeen, A., Ayub, U., & Iqbal, A. (2024). Examining the influence of student leadership roles on academic performance in secondary schools. *Journal for Current Sign*, *2*(3), 148–162.

Achmad, F., Febriyani, W., Nzefa, R., Ahkim, F., & Rania, A. (2024). Cultural Influences on Problem Solving and Decision-Making in Student Projects: A Comparative Study between Indonesia and Germany. *Metris Jurnal Sains Dan Teknologi*, *25*(01), 13–20. https://doi.org/10.25170/metris.v25i01.4519

Adejumo, O. A. (2024). The relevance of leadership alignment to attaining organizational resilience. *International Journal of Professional Business Review*, *9*(5), e04734. https://doi.org/10.26668/businessreview/2024.v9i5.4734

Akhtar, N., & Riaz, A. (2024). The Role of Occupational Self-Efficacy as a Mediator between Paradoxical Leadership and Job Crafting from the Lens of Proactive Motivation Theory. *Journal of Innovative Research in Management Sciences*, *5*(2), 22–40. https://doi.org/10.62270/jirms.v5i2.72

Aksnes, D. W., & Sivertsen, G. (2019). A Criteria-based Assessment of the Coverage of Scopus and Web of Science. *Journal of Data and Information Science*, *4*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.2478/jdis-2019-0001

Alessandri, G., Consiglio, C., Luthans, F., & Borgogni, L. (2018). Testing a dynamic model of the impact of psychological capital on work engagement and job performance. *Career Development International*, *23*(1), 33–47. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-11-2016-0210

Amadi, W. A., Du Plessis, M., & Balogun, T. V. (2025). A systematic review of the factors influencing the motivation to lead among students in higher education. *Frontiers in Education*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1564445

Bandura, A. (2023). Cultivate Self-Efficacy for Personal and Organizational Effectiveness. In *Principles of Organizational Behavior* (pp. 113–135). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781394320769.ch6

Benoliel, P. (2021). A Team-Based Perspective for School Improvement: The Mediating Role of School Management Teams. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, *14*(2), 442–470. https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2020.1849481

Birani-Nasraldin, D., Somech, A., & Bogler, R. (2024). The Relationship Between Leaders' Psychological Capital and Organizational Outcomes: A Crossover Model. *European Journal of Educational Management*, *7*(1), 59–72. https://doi.org/10.12973/eujem.7.1.59

Burmicky, J., & Duran, A. (2022). Community College Presidential Leadership: How Presidents Think and Act to Support the Holistic Needs of Their Students. *Community College Review*, *50*(2), 123–143. https://doi.org/10.1177/00915521211061418

Cantu, J., Tolk, J., Fritts, S., & Gharehyakheh, A. (2021). Interventions and measurements of highly reliable/resilient organization implementations: A literature review. *Applied Ergonomics*, *90*, 103241. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2020.103241

Chaerudin, T. R., Gumelar, A. S., & Mulyeni, S. (2025). Manajemen Waktu Mahasiswa Aktivis Organisasi Dalam Menyelesaikan Studi Tepat Waktu: Pendekatan Kualitatif POAC. *Jurnal Penelitian Ilmiah Multidisipliner*, *2*(02), 107–117.

Chidebe, R. C. W., Cummins, P. A., Karam, R., Kramer, J., Narine, D., & Yamashita, T. (2025). Producing Graduates That Industry Needs: Exploring the Views of Employers, Administrators, Faculty, and Students on Foundational Skills at Community College STEM Programs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *49*(4–5), 225–240. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2024.2426173

Clarence, M., Devassy, V. P., Jena, L. K., & George, T. S. (2021). The effect of servant leadership on ad hoc schoolteachers' affective commitment and psychological well-being: The mediating role of psychological capital. *International Review of Education*, *67*(3), 305–331. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-020-09856-9

Colla, R., Williams, P., Oades, L. G., & Camacho-Morles, J. (2022). "A New Hope" for Positive Psychology: A Dynamic Systems Reconceptualization of Hope Theory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.809053

Correia-Harker, B. P., & Dugan, J. P. (2020). Beyond Knowledge and Skills: Exploring Leadership Motivation as a Critical Construct for Student Leadership Development. *Journal of College Student Development*, *61*(3), 299–316. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2020.0029

Dawkins, S., Martin, A., Scott, J., Sanderson, K., & Schüz, B. (2021). A cross-level model of team-level psychological capital (PsyCap) and individual- and team-level outcomes. *Journal of Management & Organization*, *27*(2), 397–416. https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2018.27

Denovan, A., & Macaskill, A. (2017). Building resilience to stress through leisure activities: a qualitative analysis. *Annals of Leisure Research*, *20*(4), 446–466. https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2016.1211943

Dóci, E., Knappert, L., Nijs, S., & Hofmans, J. (2023). Unpacking psychological inequalities in organisations: Psychological capital reconsidered. *Applied Psychology*, *72*(1), 44–63. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12379

Feldman, D. B., Davidson, O. B., Ben-Naim, S., Maza, E., & Margalit, M. (2016). Hope as a Mediator of Loneliness and Academic Self-efficacy Among Students With and Without Learning Disabilities during the Transition to College. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *31*(2), 63–74. https://doi.org/10.1111/ldrp.12094

Fernández-Valera, M.-M. (2023). Psychological Capital and Job Search: A Systematic Literature Review and Agenda for Future Research. *International Journal for Research in Vocational Education and Training*, *10*(1), 68–89. https://doi.org/10.13152/IJRVET.10.1.4

Gallagher, M. W. (2025). Promoting hope through goal setting. In *More activities for teaching positive psychology: A guide for instructors.* (pp. 211–218). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/0000417-019

Gandhi, M., & Sen, K. (2021). Missing women in Indian university leadership: Barriers and facilitators. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *49*(2), 352–369. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219896048

Ghozali, I. (2021). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 26*. Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro.

Goel, S. (2024). The Power of Psychological Capital: A Comprehensive Review of Data on Resilience, Hope, Optimism, and Efficacy. *African Journal of Biomedical Research*, *27*, 2182–2191. https://doi.org/10.53555/AJBR.v27i1S.1325

Grözinger, A.-C., Wolff, S., Ruf, P. J., Audretsch, D. B., & Moog, P. (2025). The impact of SME leader's psychological capital on strategic responses during crisis. *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*, *28*(1), 265–287. https://doi.org/10.1177/23409444231184481

Guerrero-Alcedo, J. M., Espina-Romero, L. C., Palacios Garay, J. P., & Jaimes Álvarez, F. R. (2022). Psychological capital in university students: analysis of scientific activity in the scopus database. *Heliyon*, *8*(11), e11849. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e11849

Gül, G. (2025). Positive psychological capital and organizational commitment in organizations: conceptual study. *Public Administration and Law Review*, *2*(22), 126–136. https://doi.org/10.36690/2674-5216-2025-2-126-136

Hallinger, P., & Nguyen, V.-T. (2020). Mapping the Landscape and Structure of Research on Education for Sustainable Development: A Bibliometric Review. *Sustainability*, *12*(5), 1947. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12051947

Hastie, M. J., Lee, A., Siddiqui, S., Oakes, D., & Wong, C. A. (2023). Misconceptions about women in leadership in academic medicine. *Canadian Journal of Anesthesia/Journal Canadien d'anesthésie*, *70*(6), 1019–1025. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12630-023-02458-7

Hidayah, Y., Su Fen, C., Suryaningsih, A., & Mazid, S. (2022). Promoting student participation skills through student organizations. *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan*, *19*(2), 213–223. https://doi.org/10.21831/jc.v19i2.53422

Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J.-P., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of resources in the organizational context: The reality of resources and their consequences. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *5*(1), 103–128. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych032117-104640

Holcombe, E. M., Kezar, A. J., Elrod, S. L., & Ramaley, J. A. (2023). *Shared leadership in higher education: A framework and models for responding to a changing world*. Taylor & Francis.

Huang, Z., Ismail, I. A., Ghazali, A. H. A., D'Silva, J. L., Abdullah, H., & Zhang, Z. (2025). The influence of psychological capital on employment expectations of vocational undergraduate students: The chain mediating role of active coping style and educational flow experience. *PLOS ONE*, *20*(3), e0319742. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0319742

Ikeda, M., Hatano, K., Tanaka, S., & Nakahara, J. (2023). Validation of the Japanese version of the revised version of the compound psychological capital scale (CPC-12R). *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1053601

Jordan, P. J., Troth, A. C., & Yan, H. (2025). Objective and subjective measurement in applied business settings: Improving research in organizations. *Australian Journal of Management*, *50*(1), 8–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/03128962241286258

Kačmár, P., Versolker, N. R., & Falah, H. (2024). HERO in action (crisis): the role of psychological capital in experiencing an action crisis. *Current Psychology*, *43*(38), 30038–30060. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-06524-1

Kim, J., & Makadok, R. (2022). Where the stars still shine: Some effects of star-performers-turned-managers on organizational performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, *43*(12), 2629–2666. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3398

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2024). *The student leadership challenge: Five practices for becoming an exemplary leader*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Li, B., & Kim, S. (2021). Developing Student Leadership Readiness, Core Leadership Skills to Enhance Student Engagement through Organization Development Intervention. *ABAC ODI Journal Vision. Action. Outcome*, *8*(1), 82.

Lo, W. Y. W. (2025). Trust and tension: shared governance in higher education amid student activism. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2449243

Loghman, S., Quinn, M., Dawkins, S., Woods, M., Om Sharma, S., & Scott, J. (2023). A Comprehensive Meta-Analyses of the Nomological Network of Psychological Capital (PsyCap). *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *30*(1), 108–128. https://doi.org/10.1177/15480518221107998

Luthans, F., & Youssef-Morgan, C. M. (2017). Psychological capital: An evidence-based positive approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *4*(1), 339–366. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych032516-113324

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

Maduforo, A. N., Scott, S., & Scott, D. (2024). Leadership Development for Contemporary

Post-Secondary Academic Leaders: Challenges, Content and Approach. *Sage Open*, *14*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241253647

Manurung, A. D. R. (2016). *Alat Ukur Skala Positive Psychological Capital*. Universitas Mercu Buana Jakarta, Indonesia.

Maylano, R., & Tampubolon, L. H. (2024). Analysis of Cross-Cultural Understanding on Leadership Style: A Case Study of Thai and Indonesian Cultures on PT 'Tomyum'Tbk. *Jurnal Manajemen Indonesia*, *24*(2), 147–156.

Mohsendokht, M., Kontovas, C., Chang, C.-H., Qu, Z., Li, H., & Yang, Z. (2025). Resilience analysis of seaports: a critical review of development and research directions. *Maritime Policy & Management*, 1–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/03088839.2025.2483410

Morandini, S., Fraboni, F., De Angelis, M., Puzzo, G., Giusino, D., & Pietrantoni, L. (2023). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Workers' Skills: Upskilling and Reskilling in Organisations. *Informing Science: The International Journal of an Emerging Transdiscipline*, *26*, 039–068. https://doi.org/10.28945/5078

Muadzah, S., & Suryanto, S. (2024). Organizational culture and resilience systematic literature review. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen, Ekonomi, & Akuntansi (MEA)*, *8*(2), 1426–1440. https://doi.org/10.31955/mea.v8i2.4175

Nazaruddin, E., Hidayat, U. M., Hasanah, A., Zahra, M., & Rozi, M. F. (2024). Strategi Perubahan dan Pengembangan Organisasi DPM dalam Upaya Memperbaiki Citra dan Eksitensi DPM UNAND Kampus 2 Payakumbuh Pada Periode 2023/2024. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, *4*(5), 3905–3914. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31004/innovative.v4i5.15468

Panadero, E. (2017). A Review of Self-regulated Learning: Six Models and Four Directions for Research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 422. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00422

Polatcan, M. (2023). The Influence of Leadership Self-efficacy on College Students' Leadership Practice: The Mediating Role of Motivation to Lead. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, *11*(2), 138–166. https://doi.org/10.17583/ijelm.9551

Putwain, D. W., Mallaburn, A., & Held, T. (2024). Science motivation, academic achievement, career aspirations in early adolescents. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *116*, 102577. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2024.102577

Rahmawati, N. A., & Inayati, N. L. (2024). Student Management in Improving the Quality of Student Organizations. *JIE (Journal of Islamic Education)*, *8*(2), 283–293. https://doi.org/10.52615/jie.v8i2.336

Ruben, B. D., De Lisi, R., & Gigliotti, R. A. (2023). *A guide for leaders in higher education: Concepts, competencies, and tools*. Milton Park: Taylor & Francis.

Sabbah, M. (2024). Transformational Leadership and Business Continuity: A systematic review of empirical studies. *Management Research Quarterly*, *1*(2), 4–24. https://doi.org/10.63029/kyzckn37

Sahertian, P., & Jawas, U. (2021). Culture and excellent leaders: case of indigenous and non-indigenous Indonesian leaders. *Heliyon*, *7*(11), e08288. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08288

Saleh, S., Karaeng, J., & Akib, H. (2024). The Influence of Conflict Management Style on the

Satisfaction of Student Institution Management. *Journal of Social Science and Economics (JOSSE)*, *1*(3), 102–115. https://doi.org/10.70188/4kevb829

Sarwar, U., Aamir, M., Bichao, Y., & Chen, Z. (2023). Authentic leadership, perceived organizational support, and psychological capital: Implications for job performance in the education sector. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*(1084963). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1084963

Sarwar, U., Tariq, R., & Yong, Q. Z. (2022). Principals' leadership styles and its impact on teachers' performance at college level. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.919693

Schmidt, C. V. H., & Flatten, T. C. (2022). Crossover of resources within formal ties: How job seekers acquire psychological capital from employment counselors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *43*(4), 604–619. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2578

Shie, E.-H., & Chang, S.-H. (2022). Perceived Principal's Authentic Leadership Impact on the Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Well-Being of Teachers. *Sage Open*, *12*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221095003

Shih, Y.-H., Hsu, M. C., & Chang, C. L. (2025). Sustainability Transformations in Higher Education: Global Perspectives on The Challenges and Solutions. *International Journal of Education and Humanities*, *5*(1), 126–139. https://doi.org/10.58557/(ijeh).v5i1.290

Stratman, J. L., & Youssef-Morgan, C. M. (2019). Can positivity promote safety? Psychological capital development combats cynicism and unsafe behavior. *Safety Science*, *116*, 13–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2019.02.031

Strydom, D. B. (2021). Ethical leadership and performance: The effect of follower individualism-collectivism. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, *21*(2), 261–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/14705958211013395

Tang, L., & Zhu, X. (2024). Academic self-efficacy, grit, and teacher support as predictors of psychological well-being of Chinese EFL students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1332909

Terry, G. (2014). *Dasar-Dasar Manajemen*. Jakarta: Bina Aksara.

Uen, J.-F., Vandavasi, R. K. K., Lee, K., Yepuru, P., & Saini, V. (2021). Job crafting and psychological capital: a multi-level study of their effects on innovative work behaviour. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, *27*(1/2), 145–158. https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-08-2020-0068

Vinarski-Peretz, H., & Kidron, A. (2024). Antecedents of public managers' collective implementation efficacy as they actualize new public services. *Public Money & Management*, *44*(5), 418–427. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2023.2203869

Wu, M., Kader Cassim, F. A., Priambodo, A., & Ko, C. (2022). Psychological Capital's impact on the leadership-organizational climate preference relationship in potential leaders ~ A study comparing teachers and sportsmen~. *Heliyon*, *8*(5), e09310. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09310

Yang, Y., Du, S., He, H., Wang, C., Shan, X., Gu, H., & Zhao, J. (2021). The Role of Leadership Level in College Students' Decision-Making: Evidence From Event-Related Potential Analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.637323

Yeo, Y. H., Lee, J. H., & Lee, K.-H. (2025). A study of the effects of situational strength on self-efficacy and happiness: comparing individualist and collectivist cultures. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *16*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1563643

Yuwono, W., Ewaldo, D., Khornida Marheni, D., & Saputra, S. (2025). The Influence of Leadership Style Mediated by Intellectual Capital and Innovation on International Manufacturing Company Performance. *Dinasti International Journal of Education Management And Social Science*, *6*(3), 2286–2300. https://doi.org/10.38035/dijemss.v6i3.4028

Zaeimzadeh, S. M., & Jafari, A. (2023). The relationship of academic buoyancy and learning experiences with critical thinking of students in COVID-19: mediating psychological capital. *Educational Technologies in Learning*, *6*(19), 84–104. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22054/jti.2023.66620.1346

Zulkarnain, Z., Hadiyani, S., Novliadi, F., & Gusria, A. (2025). Work-life balance as a moderator between job embeddedness and turnover intention. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, *23*(0), a3063. https://doi.org/10.4102/SAJHRM.v23i0.3063