

Exploring the Link Between Spiritual Leadership and Psychological Capital in Nursing Educators: A Cross-Sectional Correlational Study

Hui Dai¹, Sin-Yu Chen^{1*}

¹Department of Human Resource Development, National Kaohsiung University of Science and Technology, Kaohsiung 824004, Taiwan.

Abstract

Spiritual leadership is increasingly recognized for its role in enhancing employees' psychological resources and overall well-being. It may serve as a strategic organizational asset that supports followers' growth. This study investigated the prevalence of spiritual leadership and psychological capital among nursing educators and explored the nature of the relationship between these variables. A cross-sectional survey was conducted using validated instruments measuring spiritual leadership and psychological capital. Over a three-month period, 213 nursing educators participated in the study. Participants reported moderate to high levels of spiritual leadership (49.8% and 38.5%, respectively) and predominantly high psychological capital (63.4%). Analysis revealed a strong and statistically significant positive association between spiritual leadership and psychological capital ($R = 0.63$, $P = 0.001$). Regression results indicated that male educators were more likely to demonstrate higher levels of both spiritual leadership and psychological capital than female educators. The findings highlight the importance of fostering spiritual leadership to strengthen psychological capital among nursing educators, emphasizing its potential as a key driver of professional development. Nursing leaders should prioritize the cultivation of spiritual competencies to embed workplace spirituality into everyday managerial practices, enhancing team motivation and resilience.

Keywords: Spiritual leadership, Psychological capital, Nursing education

Introduction

The responsibilities of nursing leaders have increasingly extended to fostering the well-being and satisfaction of both nurses and patients. Recent events have highlighted the importance of cultivating more empathetic and supportive organizational cultures [1]. Nurse educators play a pivotal role in workforce development by mentoring staff, guiding leadership practices, integrating evidence-based approaches, and ultimately improving patient care outcomes [2]. Essential qualities of effective nurse educators include compassion, dynamism, supportiveness, empathy, caring, the ability to challenge, and comprehensive knowledge [3].

The modern workplace is shaped by significant global, cultural, and organizational changes, often resulting in challenging environments in the 21st century [4]. This has contributed to a widespread erosion of trust affecting employees and institutions worldwide. Consequently, organizations have shifted focus toward fostering employee optimism and resilience rather than emphasizing weaknesses and shortcomings [5]. Scholars in organizational behavior have similarly moved to study and promote positive aspects of organizational life. This evolution in thinking and focus on psychological capital underscores the need for holistic leadership approaches that address both the intellectual and emotional dimensions of employees—specifically, spiritual leadership, which is the focus of this study [6].

Corresponding author: Sin-Yu Chen

Address: Department of Human Resource Development, National Kaohsiung University of Science and Technology, Kaohsiung 824004, Taiwan

E-mail: ✉ sinyu_chen88@qq.com

Received: 16 May 2025; **Revised:** 03 October 2025; **Accepted:** 04 October 2025

How to Cite This Article: Dai H, Chen SY. Exploring the Link Between Spiritual Leadership and Psychological Capital in Nursing Educators: A Cross-Sectional Correlational Study. *J Integr Nurs Palliat Care*. 2025;6(1):155-66. doi:10.51847/KS7hATnLQP

Spiritual leadership

Spiritual leadership has historically lacked a single, universally accepted definition. However, consensus is emerging around Fry's perspective, which suggests that spiritual leaders cultivate an organizational vision and values grounded in individual and team relationships. By aligning their behaviors, attitudes, and values with these principles, they help employees recognize the significance of their work and develop a sense of appreciation and connection to the organization [4].

Research demonstrates that spiritual leadership within the workplace yields substantial benefits. Leaders who practice spiritual leadership inspire a strong sense of calling in their followers by communicating a clear and motivating vision, reinforcing core beliefs, and showing genuine care for others [7]. Additionally, such leaders demonstrate empathy and appreciation for employees, actively listen to feedback, and respond to staff needs, fostering a supportive environment where employees feel empowered and autonomous [8, 9].

Psychological capital

Psychological capital refers to the internal resources and satisfaction that enable individuals to effectively address challenges encountered in the workplace [10]. Studies consistently show that employees with high psychological capital perform better, whereas those with low levels often experience stress, anxiety, and decreased job satisfaction, impairing their work performance [11].

Importantly, psychological capital is malleable and can be developed through targeted organizational interventions, training, and professional development programs, making it a "state-like" quality rather than a fixed trait [12]. Educators with high psychological capital are better equipped to navigate challenges, embrace change, demonstrate positive behaviors in demanding situations, and maintain optimism about future outcomes, all of which contribute to greater job satisfaction [13].

Theoretical background

The influence of spiritual leadership on psychological capital can be effectively understood through the lens of the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory and Spiritual Leadership Theory (SLT) [4, 13]. Both frameworks suggest that spiritual leadership fosters the development of followers' psychological capital, which in turn enhances job engagement. Psychological capital refers to a positive psychological state characterized by self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience [14]. By demonstrating care, respect, and trust, spiritual leaders create a supportive and nurturing work environment, which helps employees develop their psychological resources [15, 16].

SLT distinguishes between two key dimensions of spiritual well-being: calling and membership. Calling originates from the work itself, while membership is derived from organizational affiliation [15]. Many individuals may view their job merely as a source of income or a stepping stone for career advancement. In contrast, some perceive work as a means to fulfill personal purpose, serve others, or contribute to the community—this sense of higher purpose is referred to as a "calling" [4, 17]. Calling is often described as "the experience of transcendence," wherein individuals find meaning and purpose in life through their work by positively impacting others [4]. Spiritual leaders can strengthen this sense of calling by providing meaningful vision, purpose, and opportunities for employees to make a difference, thereby enhancing both calling and psychological capital [4, 18].

Within SLT, calling is considered a crucial pathway through which spiritual leadership promotes positive employee outcomes. A strong sense of calling is linked to greater well-being, higher life satisfaction, and increased psychological capital [19]. Research also indicates that calling positively influences self-efficacy, one of the key components of psychological capital, and is associated with job satisfaction. Employees who feel a strong sense of calling tend to experience more positive emotions, which further support the development of psychological capital [20–22].

Significance of the study

Universities play a critical role in cultivating human capital, as the effectiveness of educational systems directly impacts national development. Nurse educators, in particular, represent a vital resource for society and the educational system, as they are instrumental in training skilled healthcare professionals. Enhancing their psychological capital is therefore essential, and spiritual leadership can be leveraged to foster these qualities, contributing to organizational growth [23]. In educational contexts, spiritual leadership is especially important because academic life involves a dynamic interplay between intellectual and spiritual development. Nurse educators who approach their work as a spiritual vocation are likely to demonstrate greater positivity, contribute more effectively, improve workplace conditions, and promote a higher quality of professional life [24].

Spiritual leadership and psychological capital are complementary constructs in the workplace, yet there is limited research globally examining their relationship. Understanding these variables is crucial for designing interventions and organizational policies aimed at enhancing spiritual leadership and psychological capital among nursing educators. This study aims to assess the levels of spiritual leadership and psychological capital among nursing

educators and investigate the relationship between them. Notably, this is the first study to explore this relationship among nursing educators in Egypt.

Study Design

This research employed a cross-sectional design conducted across all academic departments of the Faculty of Nursing at Alexandria University, Egypt. The departments involved were Medical and Surgical Nursing, Pediatric Nursing, Obstetrics and Gynecology Nursing, Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing, Nursing Administration, Community Health Nursing, Critical Care and Emergency Nursing, Nursing Education, and Geriatric Nursing.

Participants and sampling

Participants were selected using a convenience cluster sampling approach, with roughly 35 educators recruited from each academic rank. The faculty's total population of nursing educators is approximately 372, distributed as follows: professors (75), assistant professors (62), lecturers (88), assistant lecturers (60), and demonstrators/practical guides (87). Using Epi-Info, the minimum sample size was calculated to be 190, based on a 5% margin of error, a 50% expected frequency, and a 95% confidence interval. The final sample included 213 participants.

Eligible participants were full-time nursing educators (≥ 20 hours per week) with a minimum of six months of experience in their respective departments, actively engaged in teaching or educational activities, available during data collection, and willing to participate. Educators who did not meet these requirements were excluded from the study.

Data collection instruments

Data were gathered using a structured three-part questionnaire.

- **Socio-demographic Information:** Collected data included age, gender, marital status, number of children, residence, highest educational qualification, academic rank, department, total years of nursing experience since graduation, and tenure in the current position.
- **Spiritual Leadership:** The Spiritual Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) by Fry *et al.* (2005) was employed, comprising 17 items across three dimensions: Vision (5 items), Hope/Faith (5 items), and Altruistic Love (7 items). Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Scores were interpreted as low (<50%), moderate (50–<75%), or high (>75%) agreement. The SLQ demonstrated excellent reliability in this study (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.961$), similar to the original validation study ($\alpha = 0.980$).
- **Psychological Capital:** The 24-item Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ) by Luthans, Youssef, and Avolio (2017) was used, covering four constructs: self-efficacy, hope, resilience, and optimism, with six items per construct. Responses followed the same five-point Likert scale as the SLQ. Scores were categorized as low (<50%), moderate (50–<75%), or high (>75%) levels of psychological capital. Reliability in the current study was high ($\alpha = 0.965$) and consistent with previous studies ($\alpha = 0.910$). Permission to use the PCQ was obtained from Mind Garden (Order number: FHQGGJGOE; <https://www.mindgarden.com>).

Ethical considerations

Prior to initiating the study, approval was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee at the Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University. The purpose and procedures of the study were clearly explained to potential participants through email and WhatsApp messages. All participants were informed that their involvement was voluntary, that they could decline or withdraw at any point without consequences, and that the data collected would be used exclusively for research purposes. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants, and measures were taken to maintain anonymity and ensure confidentiality throughout the study.

Data collection

Permission to conduct the study was formally granted by the administration of the Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University. A pilot study was conducted with 25 nursing educators, who were not included in the main study, to evaluate the clarity, relevance, and practicality of the instruments. The pilot indicated that no adjustments were necessary. Reliability of the research tools was confirmed using Cronbach's alpha, which demonstrated good internal consistency. The main data collection phase took place from November 2021 to February 2022.

Statistical analysis

Collected data were summarized in tables. Continuous variables that did not follow a normal distribution were reported as medians with interquartile ranges (IQR), while categorical variables were described using frequencies and percentages. Spearman's correlation was used to examine the association between spiritual leadership and psychological capital, with correlation strength classified as weak, moderate, or strong. Statistical significance was defined as $p \leq 0.05$. Multinomial logistic regression analyses were performed for both scales, with the "low"

category serving as the reference group. Analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS version 28.0 (Armonk, NY, USA).

Results and Discussion

Of the 215 responses collected, two were excluded due to non-consent, leaving 213 participants for analysis. The demographic data (**Table 1**) showed that most participants were female (91.5%), and the majority were married (70.4%). Additionally, over half of the participants held a Ph.D. degree (54.9%).

Table 1. Distribution of the Studied Nurses Educators according to Demographic Data ($N = 213$)

| Variables | | N | % |
|--|---|----------------------|-------|
| Age | Median; IQR | 34 | 21 |
| Gender | Male | 18 | 8.5 |
| | Female | 195 | 91.5 |
| Marital Status | Single | 50 | 23.5 |
| | Married | 150 | 70.5 |
| | Divorced | 1 | 0.5 |
| | Widow | 12 | 5.5 |
| Educational Level | PhD | 117 | 55 |
| | Master's Degree | 63 | 29.5 |
| | Higher Diploma after Baccalaureate | 2 | 1 |
| Scientific Degree | Bachelor of Nursing | 31 | 14.5 |
| | Professor | 37 | 17.5 |
| | Assistant Professor | 36 | 16.75 |
| | Lecturer | 36 | 16.75 |
| | Assistant Lecturer | 35 | 16.5 |
| | Demonstrator | 35 | 16.5 |
| | Practical guides | 34 | 16 |
| Department | Nursing Management | 23 | 11 |
| | Psychiatric Nursing and Mental Health | 21 | 10 |
| | Nursing Education | 21 | 10 |
| | Pediatric Nursing | 17 | 8 |
| | Critical Care and Emergency Nursing | 26 | 12 |
| | Maternity, Gynecology, and Obstetrics Nursing | 24 | 11.25 |
| | Internal and Surgical Nursing | 42 | 19.25 |
| | Elderly Nursing | 16 | 7.5 |
| | Community Health Nursing | 23 | 11 |
| | Number of Years of Experience Within the Department | Less than five years | 45 |
| 5–10 years | | 51 | 24 |
| 10–15 years | | 40 | 19 |
| More than 15 years | | 77 | 36 |
| Number of Years of Experience Since Graduation | Less than five years | 77 | 36 |
| | 5–10 years | 48 | 22.5 |
| | 10–15 years | 28 | 13.5 |
| | More than 15 years | 60 | 28 |

N: Number %; Percentage IQR: Interquartile Range PhD: Doctor of Philosophy

The overall servant leadership (SL) score was at a moderate level (49.8%). Among the nursing educators' subscales, "altruistic love" showed the highest mean value (54%), whereas "hope and faith" had the lowest (28.6%). In terms of respondents' ratings, the greatest proportion identifying a subscale as "high level" was seen in "hope and faith" (65.3%), while the smallest proportion was in "altruistic love" (25.8%). On the other hand, the highest share of respondents rating a subscale as "low level" pertained to "altruistic love" (20.2%), with the lowest share observed for "hope and faith" (6.1%) (**Table 2**).

Table 2. Spiritual Leadership Scale Dimensions Score and Grades ($N = 213$)

| Spiritual Leadership Scale Dimensions | Score | | Grades | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|-----|--------|------|----------|------|------|------|
| | Median | IQR | Low | | Moderate | | High | |
| | | | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Vision | 18 | 5 | 26 | 12.2 | 94 | 44.1 | 93 | 43.7 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|----|----|----|------|-----|------|-----|------|
| Hope and Faith | 20 | 4 | 13 | 6.1 | 61 | 28.6 | 139 | 65.3 |
| Altruistic Love | 21 | 9 | 43 | 20.2 | 115 | 54.0 | 55 | 25.8 |
| Overall Spiritual Leadership Scale | 59 | 16 | 25 | 11.7 | 106 | 49.8 | 82 | 38.5 |

N: Number %: Percentage IQR: Interquartile Range

Table 3 indicates that the overall level of psychological capital is high (63.4%). Among the nursing educators' subscales, "self-efficacy" recorded the highest score (67.6%), whereas "optimism" had the lowest (46.9%). The highest proportion of participants who rated a subscale as "low level" was found in the "hope" subscale (5.2%), while the lowest was observed in "resilience" (3.3%). Additionally, the greatest proportion of respondents who rated a subscale as "moderate level" was for "optimism" (49.3%), whereas the smallest proportion was for "self-efficacy" (28.6%).

Table 3. Psychological Capital Scale Dimensions Score and Grades ($N = 213$)

| Psychological Capital Scale Dimensions | Score | | Grades | | | | | |
|--|--------|-----|--------|-----|----------|------|------|------|
| | Median | IQR | Low | | Moderate | | High | |
| | | | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Self-Efficacy | 24 | 5 | 8 | 3.8 | 61 | 28.6 | 144 | 67.6 |
| Hope | 28 | 6 | 11 | 5.2 | 68 | 31.9 | 134 | 62.9 |
| Resilience | 20 | 4 | 7 | 3.3 | 65 | 30.5 | 141 | 66.2 |
| Optimism | 22 | 5 | 8 | 3.8 | 105 | 49.3 | 100 | 46.9 |
| Overall Psychological Capital Scale | 93 | 18 | 5 | 2.3 | 73 | 34.3 | 135 | 63.4 |

N Number, % Percentage, IQR Interquartile Range

As shown in **Table 4**, a strong and statistically significant positive association was found between the total scores of the spiritual leadership scale and the psychological capital scale ($R = 0.635$, $p = 0.001$). Moderate positive correlations were also identified between optimism and vision ($R = 0.419$, $p = 0.001$), hope and faith ($R = 0.441$, $p = 0.001$), altruistic love ($R = 0.302$, $p = 0.001$), as well as the overall spiritual leadership score ($R = 0.406$, $p = 0.001$).

Additionally, strong positive relationships were evident between hope and vision ($R = 0.644$, $p = 0.001$), hope and faith ($R = 0.746$, $p = 0.001$), altruistic love ($R = 0.523$, $p = 0.001$), and the combined spiritual leadership score ($R = 0.660$, $p = 0.001$). Similarly, self-efficacy demonstrated strong and significant positive links with vision ($R = 0.610$, $p = 0.001$), hope and faith ($R = 0.678$, $p = 0.001$), altruistic love ($R = 0.506$, $p = 0.001$), and the total spiritual leadership score ($R = 0.629$, $p = 0.001$).

Table 4. Correlation Matrix between Spiritual Leadership Scale and Psychological Capital Scale

| Spiritual Leadership Scale | | Psychological Capital Scale | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|------------|----------|---------|
| | | Self-Efficacy | Hope | Resilience | Optimism | Overall |
| Vision | Correlation Coefficient | 0.610 | 0.644 | 0.537 | 0.419 | 0.622 |
| | P-Value | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| Hope and Faith | Correlation Coefficient | 0.678 | 0.746 | 0.655 | 0.441 | 0.715 |
| | P-Value | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| Altruistic Love | Correlation Coefficient | 0.506 | 0.523 | 0.421 | 0.302 | 0.497 |
| | P-Value | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| Overall | Correlation Coefficient | 0.629 | 0.660 | 0.552 | 0.406 | 0.635 |
| | P-Value | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 |

Spearman Correlation P -values ≤ 0.05 were considered statistically significant

As presented in **Table 5**, participants with a Ph.D. were estimated to be 1.87 times more likely to show strong agreement with the overall spiritual leadership statements compared to those holding only a Bachelor of Nursing degree (95% CI = 0.428–8.207). Academic rank also influenced agreement levels: professors demonstrated a substantially higher likelihood of strong and moderate agreement—11.903 and 2.764 times greater, respectively—than practical guides. Similarly, assistant professors, lecturers, assistant lecturers, and demonstrators were 1.450, 4.529, 3.479, and 3.941 times more likely to report high agreement levels compared with practical guides.

In terms of experience, those with 10–15 years in their department were 1.124 times more likely to express strong agreement and 1.594 times more likely to express moderate agreement than those with over 15 years of experience. Additionally, the dimensions of vision, hope and faith, altruistic love, self-efficacy, and hope emerged as significant predictors of both strong and moderate agreement regarding spiritual leadership ($p < 0.05$). Likewise,

lower to moderate scores in self-efficacy, hope, and resilience were also significant predictors of agreement levels ($p < 0.05$). The overall psychological capital score was found to significantly predict higher agreement with the spiritual leadership scale ($p < 0.05$).

Table 5. Multinomial Logistic Regression Model between Socio-Demographic, Clinical Data, and Spiritual Leadership Scale

| Variables | Moderate | | | | High | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|-------|---------|------------|-------------------------|--------|--------|
| | P-value | Odds Ratio | 95% Confidence Interval | | P-value | Odds Ratio | 95% Confidence Interval | | |
| | | | Lower | Upper | | | Lower | Upper | |
| Age | 0.214 | 0.959 | 0.899 | 1.024 | 0.709 | 0.986 | 0.913 | 1.064 | |
| Gender | Male | 0.476 | 0.521 | 0.087 | 3.134 | 0.869 | 0.858 | 0.140 | 5.271 |
| | Female | Ref | Ref | | | Ref | Ref | | |
| Educational Level | PhD | 0.605 | 0.695 | 0.175 | 2.757 | 0.404 | 1.875 | 0.428 | 8.207 |
| | Master's Degree | 0.347 | 0.510 | 0.125 | 2.075 | 0.665 | 0.712 | 0.154 | 3.297 |
| | Higher Diploma after Baccalaureate | 0.219 | 0.150 | 0.007 | 3.092 | 0.141 | 0.717 | 0.461 | 1.116 |
| | Bachelor of Nursing | Ref | Ref | | | Ref | Ref | | |
| | Scientific Degree | Professor | 0.502 | 2.764 | 0.142 | 53.721 | 0.110 | 11.903 | 0.572 |
| | Assistant Professor | 0.467 | 0.437 | 0.047 | 4.069 | 0.754 | 1.450 | 0.142 | 14.819 |
| | Lecturer | 0.315 | 2.422 | 0.432 | 13.584 | 0.089 | 4.529 | 0.795 | 25.811 |
| | Assistant Lecturer | 0.033 | 5.782 | 1.152 | 29.019 | 0.136 | 3.479 | 0.676 | 17.921 |
| | Demonstrator | 0.010 | 14.189 | 1.884 | 106.865 | 0.210 | 3.941 | 0.463 | 33.577 |
| | Practical Guide | Ref | Ref | | | Ref | Ref | | |
| Number of Years of Experience Within the Department | Less than 5 years | 0.345 | 0.248 | 0.014 | 4.473 | 0.905 | 0.835 | 0.043 | 16.344 |
| | 5–10 years | 0.278 | 0.199 | 0.011 | 3.670 | 0.705 | 0.566 | 0.030 | 10.795 |
| | 10–15 years | 0.737 | 1.594 | 0.105 | 24.102 | 0.934 | 1.124 | 0.070 | 17.989 |
| | More than 15 years | Ref | Ref | | | Ref | Ref | | |
| Number of Years of Experience Since Graduation | Less than 5 years | 0.743 | 0.733 | 0.115 | 4.669 | 0.481 | 0.512 | 0.079 | 3.297 |
| | 5–10 years | 0.685 | 0.607 | 0.055 | 6.742 | 0.774 | 0.699 | 0.061 | 8.024 |
| | 10–15 years | 0.360 | 0.299 | 0.022 | 3.966 | 0.614 | 0.510 | 0.037 | 6.965 |
| | More than 15 years | Ref | Ref | | | Ref | Ref | | |
| Vision | Score | 0.001 | 2.767 | 1.788 | 4.283 | 0.001 | 12.068 | 6.381 | 22.825 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-------|--------|-------|--------|
| Hope and Faith | Score | 0.008 | 2.464 | 1.265 | 4.801 | 0.001 | 18.457 | 5.347 | 63.714 |
| Altruistic Love | Score | 0.001 | 2.402 | 1.399 | 4.125 | 0.001 | 9.631 | 4.200 | 22.087 |
| Self-Efficacy | Low | 0.254 | 0.148 | 0.006 | 3.945 | 0.001 | 9.762 | 9.762 | 9.762 |
| | Moderate | 0.491 | 0.588 | 0.130 | 2.657 | 0.001 | 0.041 | 0.011 | 0.153 |
| | High | Ref | Ref | | | Ref | Ref | | |
| Hope | Score | 0.052 | 1.234 | 0.998 | 1.525 | 0.005 | 1.445 | 1.118 | 1.868 |
| | Low | 0.019 | 0.044 | 0.003 | 0.597 | 0.001 | 5.609 | 5.609 | 5.609 |
| | Moderate | 0.094 | 0.228 | 0.040 | 1.287 | 0.001 | 0.039 | 0.011 | 0.143 |
| Resilience | High | Ref | Ref | | | Ref | Ref | | |
| | Score | 0.143 | 1.145 | 0.955 | 1.371 | 0.001 | 1.521 | 1.206 | 1.920 |
| | Low | 0.812 | 1.739 | 0.018 | 164.914 | 0.001 | 0.021 | 0.002 | 0.201 |
| Optimism | Moderate | 0.389 | 1.904 | 0.440 | 8.246 | 0.001 | 0.035 | 0.009 | 0.133 |
| | High | Ref | Ref | | | Ref | Ref | | |
| | Score | 0.313 | 0.872 | 0.668 | 1.138 | 0.166 | 0.801 | 0.585 | 1.097 |
| Psychological Capital Scale | Low | 0.291 | 0.195 | 0.009 | 4.073 | 0.001 | 1.503 | 1.503 | 1.503 |
| | Moderate | 0.492 | 1.672 | 0.387 | 7.226 | 0.092 | 0.407 | 0.143 | 1.160 |
| | High | Ref | Ref | | | Ref | Ref | | |
| Psychological Capital Scale | Score | 0.963 | 1.004 | 0.847 | 1.190 | 0.823 | 0.977 | 0.798 | 1.196 |
| | Score | 0.001 | 1.069 | 1.034 | 1.106 | 0.001 | 1.179 | 1.125 | 1.236 |

PhD: Doctor of Philosophy Ref: Reference P-values ≤0.05 were considered statistically significant. The reference category is (Low Grade

According to **Table 6**, male respondents were somewhat more likely than females to display both high and moderate levels of agreement with the psychological capital scale, by factors of 1.563 and 1.600, respectively. Marital status also appeared to influence responses: single participants were 2.299 times more likely to report high agreement and 3.924 times more likely to report moderate agreement than those who were widowed. Similarly, divorced individuals showed considerably greater odds of agreement—2.373 times higher for strong agreement and 76.471 times higher for moderate agreement—compared with widowed respondents.

Educational attainment also played a role. Those holding a Ph.D. were estimated to have 3.387 times higher odds of reporting strong agreement on psychological capital items than participants with only a Bachelor of Nursing (95% CI=0.043–263.865). Respondents with a post-baccalaureate diploma were 1.260 times more likely to express moderate agreement than bachelor’s degree holders (95% CI=0.570–2.786). Departmental affiliation influenced results as well—educators in pediatric nursing were 5.071 and 5.757 times more likely to show high and moderate agreement, respectively, than those in community health nursing.

In addition, higher scores on the vision and hope and faith dimensions, as well as on the overall spiritual leadership scale, were significant predictors of strong agreement regarding psychological capital ($p < 0.05$). Moreover, having a master’s degree, holding the position of assistant lecturer or demonstrator, having fewer than five years of departmental experience, and total years since graduation all significantly predicted both moderate and high levels of agreement with the psychological capital measure ($p < 0.05$).

Table 6. Multinomial Logistic Regression Model between Socio-Demographic, Clinical Data, and Psychological Capital Scale

| Variables | Moderate | | | High | | | |
|-----------|----------|------------|-------------------------|---------|------------|-------------------------|-------|
| | P-value | Odds Ratio | 95% Confidence Interval | P-value | Odds Ratio | 95% Confidence Interval | |
| | | | Lower | Upper | | Lower | Upper |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|-------------------|----------|---------|------------|-------|----------|--------|------------|
| Age | | 0.269 | 1.137 | 0.905 | 1.428 | 0.086 | 1.221 | 0.972 | 1.533 |
| Gender | Male | 0.800 | 1.600 | 0.042 | 60.527 | 0.808 | 1.563 | 0.043 | 57.210 |
| | Female | Ref | Ref | | | Ref | Ref | | |
| Marital Status | Single | 0.622 | 3.924 | 0.017 | 893.331 | 0.756 | 2.299 | 0.012 | 435.948 |
| | Married | 0.813 | 0.552 | 0.004 | 74.543 | 0.695 | 0.390 | 0.003 | 43.590 |
| | Divorced | 0.810 | 76.471 | 3.406 | 1717.08 | 0.962 | 2.373 | 6.132 | 91.809 |
| | Widow | Ref | Ref | | | Ref | Ref | | |
| Educational Level | PhD | 0.738 | 0.462 | 0.005 | 42.444 | 0.583 | 3.387 | 0.043 | 263.865 |
| | Master's Degree | 0.008 | 0.005 | 0.000 | 0.251 | 0.020 | 0.010 | 0.000 | 0.484 |
| | Higher Diploma after Baccalaureate | 0.568 | 1.260 | 0.570 | 2.786 | 0.120 | 0.526 | 0.234 | 1.183 |
| | Bachelor of Nursing | Ref | Ref | | | Ref | Ref | | |
| Scientific Degree | Professor | 0.466 | 0.084 | 0.000 | 64.483 | 0.428 | 0.073 | 0.000 | 47.518 |
| | Assistant Professor | 0.463 | 0.096 | 0.000 | 49.916 | 0.430 | 0.086 | 0.000 | 38.156 |
| | Lecturer | 0.149 | 0.040 | 0.001 | 3.146 | 0.070 | 0.022 | 0.000 | 1.359 |
| | Assistant Lecturer | 0.000 | 1039.872 | 22.087 | 48957.034 | 0.001 | 536.191 | 12.850 | 22373.310 |
| | Demonstrator | 0.000 | 9726.743 | 115.081 | 822109.603 | 0.000 | 2950.992 | 37.246 | 233804.920 |
| | Practical Guide | Ref | Ref | | | Ref | Ref | | |
| Department | Nursing Management | 0.861 | 1.345 | 0.048 | 37.522 | 0.600 | 2.453 | 0.086 | 69.990 |
| | Psychiatric Nursing and Mental Health | 0.975 | 0.940 | 0.021 | 41.464 | 0.807 | 1.608 | 0.036 | 72.614 |
| | Nursing Education | 0.914 | 0.820 | 0.023 | 29.783 | 0.508 | 3.262 | 0.098 | 108.420 |
| | Pediatric Nursing | 0.318 | 5.757 | 0.185 | 178.796 | 0.357 | 5.071 | 0.160 | 161.022 |
| | Critical Care and Emergency Nursing | 0.847 | 0.715 | 0.024 | 21.711 | 0.824 | 1.467 | 0.050 | 43.100 |
| | Maternity, Gynecology, and Obstetrics Nursing | 0.539 | 0.367 | 0.015 | 8.993 | 0.847 | 1.362 | 0.059 | 31.547 |
| | Internal and Surgical Nursing | 0.135 | 0.084 | 0.003 | 2.153 | 0.089 | 0.059 | 0.002 | 1.538 |
| | Elderly Nursing | 0.816 | 0.621 | 0.011 | 34.094 | 0.775 | 1.779 | 0.034 | 92.107 |
| | Community Health Nursing | Ref | Ref | | | Ref | Ref | | |
| | Number of Years of | Less than 5 years | 0.010 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.113 | 0.012 | 0.000 | 0.000 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|----------|-------|-------|-------|----------|
| Experience Within the Department | | | | | | | | | |
| | 5–10 years | 0.233 | 0.019 | 0.000 | 12.600 | 0.238 | 0.023 | 0.000 | 12.020 |
| | 10–15 years | 0.682 | 3.476 | 0.009 | 1334.387 | 0.658 | 3.688 | 0.011 | 1187.497 |
| | More than 15 years | Ref | Ref | | | Ref | Ref | | |
| Number of Years of Experience Since Graduation | | | | | | | | | |
| | Less than 5 years | 0.000 | 9.637 | 7.447 | 12.470 | 0.000 | 2.088 | 1.771 | 2.461 |
| | 5–10 years | 0.000 | 4.551 | 3.436 | 6.027 | 0.000 | 1.553 | 1.308 | 1.843 |
| | 10–15 years | 0.000 | 5.354 | 1.902 | 15.070 | 0.000 | 1.820 | 1.820 | 1.820 |
| | More than 15 years | Ref | Ref | | | Ref | Ref | | |
| Vision | Score | 0.005 | 1.867 | 1.206 | 2.889 | 0.000 | 2.622 | 1.668 | 4.120 |
| Hope and Faith | Score | 0.210 | 1.836 | 0.710 | 4.747 | 0.020 | 3.262 | 1.205 | 8.832 |
| Altruistic Love | Score | 0.281 | 1.184 | 0.871 | 1.609 | 0.090 | 1.311 | 0.959 | 1.793 |
| Self-Efficacy | Score | 0.660 | 1.274 | 0.433 | 3.746 | 0.415 | 1.563 | 0.534 | 4.580 |
| Hope | Score | 0.468 | 1.466 | 0.522 | 4.122 | 0.356 | 1.623 | 0.581 | 4.539 |
| Resilience | Score | 0.448 | 1.580 | 0.485 | 5.141 | 0.245 | 2.015 | 0.618 | 6.569 |
| Optimism | Score | 0.643 | 1.246 | 0.492 | 3.155 | 0.235 | 1.759 | 0.692 | 4.473 |
| Spiritual Leadership Scale | Score | 0.052 | 1.266 | 0.998 | 1.607 | 0.003 | 1.448 | 1.132 | 1.853 |

PhD: Doctor of Philosophy Ref: Reference P-values ≤ 0.05 were considered statistically significant. The reference category is (Low Grade)

In recent years, leadership research has shifted its emphasis toward more ethical, spiritual, and human-centered models that promote justice, inclusion, and empowerment of employees, moving away from traditional hierarchical and authority-based leadership paradigms [25]. In the present study, nursing educators perceived their own leadership behaviors as being at a moderate level. This aligns with findings by Abouzaid [26] and Ali, Ibrahim, and Diab [27], who reported that spiritual leadership among nurse leaders generally ranged from moderate to high [26, 27]. Likewise, Ali, Ibrahim, and Diab observed that nurse managers demonstrated high levels of spiritual leadership in the dimensions of meaning/calling, vision, and hope/faith, while “altruistic love” received the lowest scores among the subscales [27].

The current findings revealed a high overall level of psychological capital among participants. This could be attributed to a supportive organizational culture, effective communication between nursing educators and their supervisors, and potentially lower levels of occupational stress. Similar results were reported by Çelik [28] and Ibrahim *et al.* [29], who found that most nurses exhibited strong psychological capital [28, 29]. However, this contrasts with the findings of Metwaly and Ahmed who noted lower psychological capital levels among their sample of nurses [30]. In the present study, the highest scores were observed in the “self-efficacy” subscale, whereas the lowest were in “optimism.” Percunda and Putri similarly identified self-efficacy and hope as the most prominent dimensions among nurses, followed by optimism and resilience [31].

A significant positive association was also found between spiritual leadership practices and psychological capital. In other words, the more nursing educators demonstrated spiritual leadership, the higher their psychological capital tended to be. This relationship can be interpreted through Fredrickson’s broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions, which suggests that positive affect at work expands individuals’ thought-action repertoires and

builds enduring personal resources [32]. When educators find purpose and meaning in their professional roles, they are likely to experience greater satisfaction, joy, and self-worth, which strengthen their psychological capital. Previous studies have similarly emphasized that positive psychological capital and constructive leadership—particularly spiritual leadership—can transform nursing environments by improving retention, productivity, and engagement while fostering a deeper sense of purpose among nurses and educators [33, 34]. These insights underscore the importance of integrating spiritual leadership development into professional training, organizational policy, and leadership education for nursing faculty.

Other scholars have also confirmed the connection between spiritual leadership and psychological capital. Chen and Li found that spiritual leadership positively influences employees' self-esteem and self-efficacy—two key components of psychological capital [15]. Similarly, Wu and Lee reported that higher levels of spiritual leadership were associated with increased psychological capital and stronger work engagement among nurses [22].

Spiritual leadership, as an emerging organizational approach, emphasizes humanistic and moral values such as compassion, honesty, generosity, cooperation, hope, and altruism. When these values are embodied in management practices, they cultivate belonging, identity, and purpose among employees, which, in turn, enhance self-efficacy. The present findings support this relationship, revealing a positive correlation between spiritual leadership and self-efficacy among nursing educators. This is consistent with Faghih Aram's research in Iran, which found that spiritual leadership was significantly associated with managers' and staff members' self-efficacy. The study also highlighted that altruistic love, faith at work, and organizational commitment contribute to improved performance and overall efficacy [35].

Furthermore, the positive association found between spiritual leadership and the dimensions of hope and optimism within psychological capital can be interpreted through the nature of workplace motivation. Nurses who are guided by spiritually oriented leaders are often better able to accomplish their professional goals, and such successes tend to strengthen their sense of motivation and optimism toward their work.

One particularly unexpected finding in this study was that male participants demonstrated higher levels of both spiritual leadership and psychological capital than their female counterparts, despite the relatively small proportion of males in the sample. This outcome might be attributed to the perception that male educators often display greater prudence, insight, and reflective judgment [36]. Radu similarly argued that men may possess traits traditionally associated with effective leadership, including the capacity to draw on experience (tradition), a willingness to innovate and take risks, strategic thinking, emotional composure, the ability to delegate and cooperate effectively, and persuasive communication skills that inspire others [37].

Additionally, nursing educators holding a Ph.D. were found to have higher levels of agreement with spiritual leadership and psychological capital compared to those with only a bachelor's degree. Likewise, individuals serving as assistant lecturers or demonstrators exhibited stronger spiritual leadership and psychological capital scores than those in other academic ranks. These findings suggest that higher educational attainment and active academic engagement may contribute to enhanced self-belief, motivation, and leadership orientation among nursing educators.

Limitations

This study has several notable limitations. First, due to its cross-sectional design, causal relationships between variables cannot be firmly established. Future research employing longitudinal or experimental designs would provide stronger evidence of directionality and causation. Second, as the study relied on self-reported data, the potential for response bias cannot be ruled out. Third, the relatively small sample size limits the generalizability of the findings and may have reduced statistical power. Subsequent research with larger and more diverse samples is recommended to validate these findings and explore causal mechanisms.

Moreover, future investigations should examine how spiritual leadership and psychological capital influence broader outcomes such as nursing educators' well-being, job satisfaction, and teaching effectiveness. Understanding these relationships could provide valuable insights for leadership development programs and organizational interventions within academic nursing settings.

Conclusion

In summary, the present study found that nursing educators generally exhibited moderate to high levels of both spiritual leadership and psychological capital. A strong and statistically significant positive relationship was observed between these two constructs, suggesting that enhanced spiritual leadership is associated with greater psychological capital among nursing educators.

While certain demographic and professional factors—such as gender, academic rank, and educational level—appeared to influence these relationships, further investigation is warranted to clarify their underlying dynamics. Future studies should continue to explore these associations using larger samples and more robust research designs

to deepen understanding and support evidence-based strategies for cultivating effective, spiritually grounded leadership in nursing education.

Acknowledgments: None.

Conflict of interest: None.

Financial support: None.

Ethics statement: None.

References

1. Paal P, Neenan K, Muldowney Y, Brady V, Timmins F. Spiritual leadership as an emergent solution to transform the healthcare workplace. *J Nurs Manag.* 2018;26:335–7. doi:10.1111/jonm.12637
2. Bartels J. Your career as a nurse educator. *Imprint.* 2005;52(1):42–4.
3. Gutierrez JV. Making of a great Filipino nurse educator. *Open J. Nurs.* 2020;10(05):563–94.
4. Fry LW. Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *Leadersh Q.* 2003;14:693–727. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.001
5. Avey JB, Luthans F, Jensen SM. Psychological capital: a positive resource for combating employee stress and turnover. *Hum Resour Manag.* 2009;48(5):677–93. doi:10.1002/hrm.20294
6. Baykal E, Zehir C. Mediating effect of psychological capital on the relationship between spiritual leadership and performance. *E M: Ekon. Manag.* 2018;21(3):124–40. Available from: <http://hdl.handle.net/11025/31067>
7. Dalla Rosa A, Vianello M. Linking calling with workaholism: examining obsessive and harmonious passion as mediators and moderators. *J Career Assess.* 2020;28(4):589–607. doi:10.1177/1069072720909039
8. Shi JM, Zhao SWU, Yu-Han WU. Spiritual leadership and career calling, a research based on self-determination theory. *Bus Manag J.* 2018;40:138–52.
9. Yang X, Meng Y, Qiu Y, Feng Y. Why am I willing to speak up? The impact of spiritual leadership on employee voice behavior. *Front Psychol.* 2019;10:2718. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02718
10. Gholami Motlagh F, Nobahar M, Raiesdana N. The relationship of moral intelligence and social capital with job satisfaction among nurses working in the emergency department. *Int Emerg Nurs.* 2020;52:100911. doi:10.1016/j.ienj.2020.100911
11. NGO TT. Impact of psychological capital on job performance and job satisfaction: a case study in Vietnam. *J. Asian Finance Econ. Bus.* 2021;8(5):495–503. doi:10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no5.0495
12. Lupşa D, Virga D, Maricuţoiu LP, Rusu A. Increasing psychological capital: a pre-registered meta-analysis of controlled interventions. *Appl Psychol.* 2020;69(4):1506–56. doi:10.1111/apps.12219
13. Hameed S, Bano S, Ahmed J. The effects of self-esteem, social capital and psychological capital on job satisfaction with mediating role of social capital. *J. Manag. Sci.* 2022;16(1):19–38.
14. Luthans F, Youssef CM, Avolio BJ. *Psychological capital: developing the human competitive edge.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press; 2007.
15. Chen CY, Li CI. Assessing the spiritual leadership effectiveness: the contribution of follower's self-concept and preliminary tests for moderation of culture and managerial position. *Leadersh Q.* 2013;24(1):240–55. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.11.004
16. Newman A, Ucbasaran D, Zhu FE, Hirst G. Psychological capital: A review and synthesis. *J Organ Behav.* 2014 Feb;35(S1):S120–38. doi:10.1002/job.1916
17. Duffy RD, Dik BJ. Research on calling: what have we learned and where are we going? *J Vocat Behav.* 2013;83(3):428–36. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2013.06.006
18. Fry LW, Vitucci S, Cedillo M. Spiritual leadership and army transformation: theory, measurement, and establishing a baseline. *Leadersh Q.* 2005;16(5):835–62. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.07.012
19. Luthans F, Youssef CM, Sweetman DS, Harms PD. Meeting the leadership challenge of employee well-being through relationship psychcap and health psychcap. *J. Leadersh. Organ. Stud.* 2013;20(1):118–33. doi:10.1177/1548051812465893
20. Duffy RD, Allan BA, Dik BJ. The presence of a calling and academic satisfaction: examining potential mediators. *J Vocat Behav.* 2011;79(1):74–80. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2010.11.001
21. Siu OL, Cheung F, Lui S. Linking positive emotions to work well-being and turnover intention among Hong Kong police officers: the role of psychological capital. *J Happiness Stud.* 2015 Apr;16(2):367–80. doi:10.1007/s10902-014-9513-8
22. Wu WL, Lee YC. How spiritual leadership boosts Nurses' work engagement: the mediating roles of calling and psychological capital. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020;17(17):6364. doi:10.3390/ijerph17176364

23. Mirkamali SM, Thani FN. A study on the quality of work life (QWL) among faculty members of University of Tehran (UT) and Sharif University of Technology (SUT). *Procedia Soc Behav Sci.* 2011 Jan;1(29):179–87. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.223
24. Ghazzawi IA. Crafting the whole employee: job satisfaction, job commitment, and faith—a new conceptual framework and research agenda. *Bus Rev.* 2009;12(2):300–9.
25. Bilgetürk M, Baykal E. How does perceived organizational support affect psychological capital? the mediating role of authentic leadership. *Organizacija.* 2021;54(1):82–95. doi:10.2478/orga-2021-0006
26. Abouzaid K. Perspective of spiritual leadership among head nurses and its relation with staff nurses job empowerment. (Unpublished master's thesis): Faculty of nursing, Banha University; 2019.
27. Ali ES, Ibrahim MM, Diab GM. Spiritual leadership and its relation to organizational trust among nurses at Menoufia University hospitals. *Menoufia Med. J.* 2021;6(1):31–50.
28. Çelik M. The effect of psychological capital level of employees on workplace stress and employee turnover intention. *Innovar.* 2018;28(68):67–75. doi:10.15446/innovar.v28n68.70472
29. Ibrahim IA, Elwekel N, Osman ZH, El-Gilany AH. Nurses' work environment and psychological capital: predictors of workplace bullying. *Egypt. J. Health Care.* 2020;11(3):92–103.
30. Metwaly SM, Ahmed H. The impact of psychiatric nurses' psychological capital on their burnout and coping style. *Egypt. Nurs. J.* 2018;15(3):302. doi:10.4103/ENJ.ENJ_21_18
31. Percunda AD, Putri NK. Hospital nurses' psychological capital and work engagement—are they really related? The case of an Indonesian hospital. *J Health Transl Med.* 2020;18:52–9.
32. Fredrickson BL. The broaden-build theory of positive emotions. *Am Psychol.* 2001;56(3):218–26.
33. Jahandar P, Tafreshi MZ, Rassouli M, Atashzadeh-Shoorideh F, Kavousi A. Nurses' perspective on spiritual leadership: A qualitative study based on Fry's spiritual leadership model. *Electron Physician.* 2017;9(11):5721–31. doi:10.19082/5721
34. Yang HM. Effects of the positive psychological capital, professional self-concept and self-leadership on nursing work outcome: focused on the nurses in small and medium hospitals. *The Journal of the Korea Contents Association.* 2018;18(11):87–97. doi:10.5392/JKCA.2018.18.11.087
35. Faghil AB. The relationship between spiritual leadership and self-efficacy of high school managers and staffs in Shahre Rey. *Islamic Perspective on Educational Science.* 2017;5(8):139–50. doi:10.30497/edus.2017.63577
36. Khataybeh GS, Rhman AS, Darawsha NA. The spiritual leadership of the principals of Al-Ramtha District schools and its relationship to the Teachers' mental health during the Corona pandemic from the Teachers' viewpoint. *IUG Journal Education and Psychological Sciences.* 2022;30(2):589–609. doi:10.33976/IUGJEPS.30.2/2022/22
37. Radu C, Deaconu A, Frăsineanu C. Leadership and gender differences—are men and women leading in the same way? In: Alvinus A, editor. *Contemporary leadership challenges* [internet]. London: IntechOpen; 2017 [cited 2022 Dec 09]. Available from: <https://www.intechopen.com/chapters/52779>. doi:10.5772/65774