



Benevolent Leadership and Interpersonal Deviant Behaviors in Higher Education

Yükseköğretimde Yardımsever Liderlik ve Kişilerarası Sapkın Davranışlar

Hakan Vahit ERKUTLU*

• Received: 06.03.2017 • Accepted: 21.08.2017 • Published: 14.09.2017

ABSTRACT: This study examines the relationship between benevolent leadership and interpersonal deviance and the mediating effects of psychological capital and psychological ownership on that relationship in higher education. The study sample included 1190 faculty members along with their 78 department chairs in 13 universities selected by the cluster random-sampling method in İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Antalya, Adana, Bursa, Samsun, Kayseri, Erzurum and Gaziantep. It was completed in 9 January – 24 February 2017. Faculty member's perceptions of psychological capital, psychological ownership and benevolent leadership were measured using "the Psychological Capital Questionnaire" developed by Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio (2007), "the Psychological Ownership Scale" developed by Avey, Avolio, Crossley, & Luthans (2008) and Cheng, Chou, & Farh's (2000) "Benevolent Leadership Scale" respectively. Bennett and Robinson's (2000) "Interpersonal Deviance Scale" was used to assess department chair's perception of the interpersonal deviance. Results revealed a significant negative relationship between benevolent leadership and interpersonal deviance and fully mediating effects of psychological capital and psychological ownership on that relationship.

Keywords: Benevolent leadership, interpersonal deviance, psychological capital, psychological ownership

ÖZ: Bu çalışmanın amacı yükseköğretimde yardımsever liderlik ve kişilerarası sapkınlık arasındaki ilişkiyi ve bu ilişkide psikolojik sermaye ve psikolojik sahiplik kavramlarının aracılık rollerini araştırmaktır. Bu çalışmanın örneklemini İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Antalya, Adana, Bursa, Samsun, Kayseri, Erzurum ve Gaziantep'te tesadüfi küme örnekleme yöntemi ile seçilmiş olan 13 üniversitedeki 1190 öğretim üyesi ve onların 78 bölüm başkanı oluşturmaktadır. Çalışma 9 Ocak- 24 Şubat 2017 tarihleri arasında tamamlanmıştır. Öğretim üyelerinin psikolojik sermaye, psikolojik sahiplik ve yardımsever liderlik algılamaları sırasıyla Luthans, Youssef ve Avolio (2007) tarafından geliştirilen "Psikolojik Sermaye Ölçeği", Avey, Avolio, Crossley ve Luthan (2008) tarafından geliştirilen "Psikolojik Sahiplik Ölçeği" ve Cheng, Chou ve Farh'ın (2000) "Yardımsever Liderlik Ölçeği" kullanılarak ölçülmüştür. Bölüm başkanlarının kişilerarası sapkınlık algılamalarını değerlendirmek için Bennett ve Robinson'un (2000) "Kişilerarası Sapkınlık Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Sonuçlar yardımsever liderlik ile kişilerarası sapkınlık davranışı arasında olumsuz ve önemli bir ilişki ve bu ilişkide psikolojik sermaye ve psikolojik sahiplik kavramlarının tam aracılık rolleri bulunduğunu göstermiştir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Yardımsever liderlik kişilerarası sapkınlık, psikolojik sermaye, psikolojik sahiplik

1. INTRODUCTION

Workplace deviance has become the focus of an increasing number of research studies (e.g., Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, & Barrick, 2004; Sackett & DeVore, 2001). Workplace deviance is defined as "voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both" (Robinson & Bennett, 1995:556). Examples of deviant behavior include withholding effort, stealing, and acting rudely to coworkers.

Robinson and Bennett (1995) identified two primary types of workplace deviance. Interpersonal deviance is targeted at members of the organization and includes behaviors such as saying something hurtful or acting rudely to a coworker. Organizational deviance is directed at the organization and includes such actions as stealing and withholding effort.

* Assoc. Prof., Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Management, Nevşehir-Turkey. email: erkutlu@nevsehir.edu.tr

This study focuses on interpersonal deviance because such behaviors have direct detrimental effects on members within an organization, which eventually affect the organization as a whole (Ferguson & Barry, 2011). For example, victims of interpersonal deviance were claimed to have experienced general and mental stress (Vartia, 2001). This reduction in psychological well-being of the victims may negatively affect their job attitudes such as job satisfaction and commitment (Hershcovis & Barling, 2010), which may result in reduction of their work effort (Porath & Pearson, 2010). If this is not controlled, in the long run, organizations may have serious problems in maintaining quality, and productivity of their workforce, because interpersonal deviance is significantly associated with turnover intentions (Hershcovis & Barling, 2010).

According to social exchange theory by Blau (1964), employee behavior is strongly influenced by the supportiveness of leaders. When employees perceive that they receive support, trust, and other tangible and intangible benefits from their leaders, they develop an obligation to reciprocate with appropriate work attitudes such as organizational commitment, involvement and performance (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). In contrast, when employees experience poor leader-member relations and receive inferior resources, responsibilities, and outcomes for the same job title, they are likely to reciprocate with negative behaviors. Several studies have shown that employees often engage in deviant behavior when they perceive that their supervisor treats them worse than their peers (Gilliland, 1993; Skarlicki & Folger 1997). More specifically, employees who endure unfavorable differential treatment by their supervisor are likely to respond with negative behaviors, such as improper personal conduct or insubordination.

Given the prevalence and substantial costs of deviant behavior, most research has focused on identifying its antecedents. Contemporary research has focused on two main categories of antecedent variables: individual differences and reactions to organizational experiences (Bennett & Robinson, 2003). Individual difference research has conceptualized deviant behavior as a reflection of different personality traits (e.g., low conscientiousness) or examined how personality traits moderate the relations of other variables with deviance (Cullen & Sackett, 2003). In contrast, the literature on reactions to workplace experiences have cast deviant behavior as motivated by the need to express one's displeasure with organizational experiences and/or to reconcile perceived disparities between how one behaves and how one is treated by the organization and its members (Bennett & Robinson, 2003). In this study, we focus on individual differences namely benevolent leadership (as a leadership style), psychological capital and psychological ownership to assess whether they relate to levels of interpersonal deviant behaviors. Benevolent leadership refers to leaders treating followers as family members, showing concern for followers' well-being in both the work domain and private life (Wang & Cheng, 2010). Interpersonal deviance is a form of counterproductive workplace behavior that is directly harmful to other individuals within an organization (Bennett & Robinson 2000). As defined by Avey, Luthans, & Jensen (2009), psychological capital refers to "an individual's positive psychological state of development" and is characterized by an individual's level of confidence (self-efficacy), optimism, striving towards goals (hope) and resiliency. Finally, psychological ownership is the psychologically experienced phenomenon in which an employee develops possessive feelings with his/her workplace.

1.1. The aim of this study

This study aims to examine the mediating effects of psychological processes (psychological capital and psychological ownership) on the relationship between department chairs' benevolent leadership and faculty members' interpersonal deviance. The research questions of this study are:

1. Are department chairs' benevolent leadership behaviors related to faculty members' interpersonal deviance behaviors?

2. Are psychological capital and psychological ownership mediate the relationship between benevolent leadership and interpersonal deviance?

It has the potential to make several contributions to the deviant employee behavior literature and broader organizational behavior field. First, it is a response to the call for more research on psychological factors that may serve as mediators, moderators, or even antidotes to deviant behavior and their effects (Colbert et al., 2004; Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Second, given that psychological factors and individual differences variables are central to most models of deviant employee behavior (Judge, Scott, & Ilies, 2006), it is important to examine the direct and mediating effects of psychological factors in a single study.

Therefore, the pursuit of the identification of the major psychological factors leading the employees to deviant behaviors gives us some concrete ideas in terms of possible remedies for both faculty members and educational institutions.

1.1.1. Benevolent leadership and interpersonal deviance

Benevolent leadership can be stated as a form of individualized care within a work domain, such as allowing opportunities to correct mistakes, avoiding the public humiliation of subordinates, providing coaching and mentoring, striving to solve subordinates' work problems and showing concern for subordinates' career development. It can also be expressed as a form of individualized care within a non-work domain, such as treating subordinates as family members, helping subordinates during their personal emergencies, and showing holistic concern beyond professional relationships (Wang & Cheng, 2010).

Benevolent leadership is effective in increasing subordinates' productivity because it makes subordinates feel obligated to reciprocate and obey the leader (Farh, Cheng, Chou, & Chu, 2006). Previous studies consistently revealed that benevolent leadership strongly promotes subordinates' deference to, gratitude to, and identification with the leader (e.g., Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang, & Farh, 2004; Farh et al., 2006). Literature on paternalistic leadership also evidenced the positive effect of benevolent leadership on a variety of favorable subordinate outcomes, such as satisfaction with the leader, organizational commitment, job performance, and organizational citizenship behavior (Wang & Cheng, 2010).

Belongingness theory (Baumeister & Leary, 1995) suggests that one of the primary human drives is the need to belong, or to form strong positive interpersonal relationships. The need to belong is a powerful, fundamental human need that individuals constantly strive to satisfy (Baumeister & Leary, 1995); when one's sense of belonging is thwarted (i.e., lower than desired), this can result in adverse reactions such as high interpersonal deviance (Thau, Aquino, & Wittek, 2007). Consistent with belongingness theory, research about benevolent leadership suggest that it encourages employees engage in more extra-role behaviors and commitment to their organizations which are the end-results of employees' need to belong, or to form strong positive interpersonal relationships, which in turn, lead to low levels of interpersonal deviance. Therefore, it is expected that benevolent leadership will cause a decrease in follower deviance behaviors.

Hypothesis 1: Benevolent leadership is negatively related to interpersonal deviance.

1.1.2. The mediating effects of psychological capital and psychological ownership

Psychological capital can be defined as an individual's positive psychological state of development that is characterized by: (1) having confidence (self-efficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks; (2) making a positive reference (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future; (3) persevering toward goals and, when necessary, redirecting paths to goals (hope) in order to succeed; and (4) when beset by problems and

adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond (resilience) to attain success (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007).

We propose that benevolent leadership is related to psychological capital. For example, benevolent leaders could analyze all relevant information received from inside and outside the organization and then openly share that information with employees. Benevolent leaders could also solicit views from employees and then utilize their ideas to strengthen them (Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumba, 2005). Kirkman and Rosen (1999) argued that when leaders utilize employees' ideas, employees become more confident in their abilities. In other words, leaders sharing information provides employees with opportunities to develop collective intuition, expand their knowledge, learn from each other, and acquire new skills. This, in turn, raises employees' individual efficacy (Jones & George, 1998), a key component of psychological capital (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). In addition to efficacy, each of the other psychological resource components of hope, optimism, and resilience that make up psychological capital may also contribute to the relationship between benevolent leadership and psychological capital.

Benevolent leaders are described as having the ability to remain realistically hopeful, even when they encounter extremely difficult situations (Karakas & Sarigollu, 2011). They are more likely to stick closer to objective information in building employees' hope. Thus, over time, benevolent leaders are viewed as a more credible source of input and feedback to their followers when a significant challenge or problem arises. They also are likely to achieve this through their honest character, their focus on employee involvement, strength development, and participation (Karakas, 2009). Thus, these benevolent leadership characteristics and actions all seem fundamental to nurturing hope and, in turn, psychological capital.

Benevolent leaders can also increase employees' optimism through modeling. They can influence employees' optimism by increasing their awareness and understanding about the importance of organizational goals and success. By doing so, benevolent leaders model desired followers' behavior. Benevolent leaders are more likely to exhibit enhanced active and adaptive coping skills and are less likely to adopt avoidant coping styles when faced with challenges or setbacks (Luthans & Avolio, 2003). When leaders use active, adaptive, and positive approaches toward problem solving, they are more likely to motivate and challenge group members to do the same (Peterson, 2000), resulting in high levels of optimism and thus enhanced psychological capital.

Finally, benevolent leaders should be able to enhance followers' resiliency by moving positive goals to the forefront of their awareness (Masten & Reed, 2002). Such a genuine focus over time should build credit for leaders who are able to tap into their reserves of psychological resources (Masten & Reed, 2002) in order to sustain employees through periods of adversity and challenge. These developmental strategies are likely to contribute to benevolent leaders' ability to influence employees' resiliency and, thus, their psychological capital. Moreover, because of their heightened self-awareness, benevolent leaders understand what they are capable of accomplishing (Gardner et al., 2005). They are more likely to be role models of resiliency for their followers. This perspective is supported by social learning theory (e.g., Bandura, 1977) which suggests that employees may emulate the values and behaviors of influential role models.

On the other hand, psychological capital is proposed to be negatively related to interpersonal deviance. The individual components of psychological capital can specifically be contrasted with deviance. Snyder (2002) suggests that hope is driven toward the twin positive outcomes of goal accomplishment and finding ways to accomplish individual and organizational goals. By nature, then, deviant behaviors are contrary to these goals and, therefore, not behaviors that are normally exhibited by those high in hope. Resilience is directed toward positive adaptation in the face of adversity. Therefore, those high in resilience are looking for

positive reactions and adaptations, not negative emotions and cynicism. Hence, deviant behaviors are clearly not in the category of positive adaptations and, therefore, are not likely by those high in resilience.

Self-efficacy is directed toward gathering the needed motivation and confidence toward succeeding at a given task. In opposition, deviant behaviors are clearly behaviors that are aimed more toward demotivation of an individual relative to organizational goals. Therefore, these behaviors are clearly not behaviors displayed by individuals who are looking to succeed at a given task. Lastly, optimists have a generally positive orientation toward the future. Given that deviant behaviors by nature are geared toward a negative result, they are clearly not behaviors normally displayed by people high in optimism (Norman, Avey, Nimmicht, & Pigeon, 2010).

Therefore, we argue that psychological capital acts as a mediator through which benevolent leadership influences interpersonal deviance.

Hypothesis 2. Employee perceptions of psychological capital mediate the relationship between benevolent leadership and interpersonal deviance.

O'Reilly (2002, p. 19) noted "when managers talk about ownership, what they typically want to instill is not financial ownership but psychological ownership – a feeling on the part of the employees that they have a responsibility to make decisions that are in the long term interest of the company." Psychological ownership is defined as "the state in which individuals feel as though the target of ownership or a piece of that target is theirs," and reflects "an individual's awareness, thoughts, and beliefs regarding the target of ownership". The target of ownership in the workplace can be tangible or intangible, and examples of targets are a novel idea, a strategic initiative, or a specific project and its implementation (Avey, Wernsing, & Palanski, 2012).

Benevolent leaders are those who are perceived to genuinely care about their subordinates and convey authentic concern in relationships (Caldwell & Hayes, 2007). In turn, subordinates that perceive their leaders as benevolent are also more likely to reciprocate this care, concern and equity by being motivated to work harder, persist longer, engage in extra-role behaviors (i.e., OCBs), and higher psychological ownership (Burke, Sims, Lazzara, & Salas, 2007).

In addition to equity concerning employee rights, benevolent leaders are more likely to demonstrate and promote accountability among followers (Karakas, Sarigollu, & Manisaligil, 2013). Leaders who are consistently accountable for their actions may be viewed as having a higher level of integrity and trusted to stand by their actions. Based on the tenets of social learning theory (e.g., Bandura 1977), employees learn the process of accountability through direct and indirect experiences such as observing ethical leaders hold people accountable for results and how results are achieved. These observations and interactions among employees provide a form of social information that, over time, creates the norms for social behaviors in this group (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). In addition, employees are held accountable, and directly experience the enforcement of standards held by the leader for the group. Thus, employees of benevolent leaders are more likely to hold each other and themselves accountable, which is an aspect of psychological ownership.

The third mechanism for how benevolent leaders promote psychological ownership in followers is through fostering norms that promote an environment of belongingness for employees. Niu, Wang, and Chang (2009) suggest benevolent leaders pay attention to individuals by listening to their employees thereby giving them a voice in their daily work environment. As implied in the job characteristics model, and further by Avey, Avolio, Crossley and Luthans (2008), employees who are listened to and have input into their work environment are more likely to feel that they belong in the organization as a whole and the work group specifically. Contrarily, employees who are ignored and isolated emotionally detach from the organization and do not feel as though they belong. Therefore, when benevolent leaders seek to

include followers through keeping their best interests in mind and listening to their concerns, they foster an environment where employees can feel this sense of belongingness, a core component of psychological ownership.

When employees feel ownership in an organization, they tend to engage in positive behaviors driven by the sense of responsibility accompanying feelings of ownership. The transactional exchange between employees and their organization is such that the organization satisfies the needs of participants, who in turn reciprocate by developing feelings of ownership, a corresponding sense of responsibility, and lower interpersonal deviance (Avey, Luthans, & Jensen, 2009). Therefore, we expect psychological ownership to serve as a mediator through which benevolent leadership influences interpersonal deviance.

Hypothesis 3. Psychological ownership mediates the relationship between benevolent leadership and organizational deviance.

2. METHOD

2.1. Sample

This study employed a cross-sectional quantitative relational design. Relational research aims to investigate the relationship between changes in one variable with another, whereby variables are not manipulated and are measured unobtrusively (Terre-Blanche, Durrheim, & Painter, 2006).

This study's population consisted of faculty members in Turkish Universities. The sample of this study included 1,190 faculty members along with their 78 superiors (department chairs) from 13 universities in İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Antalya, Adana, Bursa, Samsun, Kayseri, Erzurum and Gaziantep cities. These universities were randomly selected from a list of 193 universities in the country (The Council of Higher Education Turkey, 2017).

This study was completed in 9 January – 24 February 2017. A cluster random-sampling method was used to select sample. In this sampling method, first, all the universities in Turkey were stratified into seven strata according to their geographic regions. Then, universities in each stratum were proportionally selected by a cluster random sampling; faculty members working at the selected universities comprised the study sample. The sample for this study consisted of 3 universities from Marmara Region, 3 universities from Central Anatolia Region, 2 universities from Aegean Region, 2 universities from Mediterranean Region, 1 university from Blacksea Region, 1 university from East Anatolian Region and 1 university from Southeast Region of Turkey. A research team consisting of 6 research assistants visited the universities in this study and received approvals from the deans of economics and administrative sciences, fine arts, engineering and education to distribute the questionnaires. Participants were told that the study was designed to collect information on the deviant behaviors and perceptions of their relationship with superiors (department chairs) in the higher education workforce. They were given confidentially assurances and told that participation was voluntary. The questionnaires were collected immediately.

A randomly selected group of faculty members from randomly selected departments completed the benevolent leadership, psychological capital and psychological ownership scales (73–99 faculty members per university, totaling 1190 out of 1300 participants). Those faculty members' immediate superiors (department chairs) completed the interpersonal deviance scale (3–9 department chairs per university, 78 department chairs in total). Department chairs reports of interpersonal deviance were used instead of faculty members' reports in order to avoid same-source bias when examining psychological capital and psychological ownership's relationships with deviant behaviors and department chairs' benevolent leadership behavior relationship. 47 percent of the faculty members were female with an average age of 36.79 years. Moreover, 60

percent of the department chairs were male with an average age of 39.13 years. The response rate was 91.54 percent in the study.

2.2. Measures

Benevolent leadership. Eleven items of Cheng, Chou, & Farh's (2000) benevolent leadership scale were used to test leader benevolence. Their scale's internal reliability coefficient was 0.94. Their sample consisted of 605 low- to mid-level managers and employees from 60 Taiwanese companies. On a 6-point Likert-type scale that ranges from 1, "not at all," to 6, "frequently," the employees reported the frequency of perceiving their supervisors' benevolent behavior. Sample items include "my supervisor tries to understand the cause when I do not perform well," and "my supervisor will help me when I am in an emergency." Turkish adaptation of the Benevolent Leadership scale was carried out by Okten and Cenkci (2012). Their scale's internal reliability coefficient was 0.94. Their sample consisted of 227 MBA students in a foundation university in Turkey. The result of exploratory factor analysis showed that Turkish version of the benevolent leadership scale has a single factor structure. In this study, the Cronbach's α of this measure was 0.89.

Interpersonal deviance. Employees' supervisors completed the seven-item Bennett and Robinson (2000) Interpersonal Deviance scale. Their sample consisted of 352 employees in service companies in USA. Their scale's internal reliability coefficient was 0.78. Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)). Sample items include "Made fun of someone at work", "Said something hurtful to someone at work" and "Acted rudely toward someone at work." Turkish adaptation of the Interpersonal Deviance scale was carried out by Iyigun and Cetin (2012). Their sample consisted of 510 sales representatives in 10 drug manufacturing companies in Turkey. Its exploratory factor analysis showed a single factor structure with internal reliability coefficient of 0.67. Their sample consisted of 503 sales representatives in Turkey. In our study, the Cronbach's α of this measure turned out to be 0.90.

Psychological capital. It was measured using Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio's (2007) "the psychological capital questionnaire" or PCQ. The 24-item PCQ (6 items for each subscale of hope, resilience, optimism, and efficacy) has responses put into a six-point Likert-type scale with categories ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Sample items include: "At the present time, I am energetically pursuing my work goals" (hope); "I can get through difficult times at work because I've experienced difficulty before" (resiliency); "I feel confident contacting people outside the company (e.g., suppliers, customers) to discuss problems" (self-efficacy); and "When things are uncertain for me at work, I usually expect the best" (optimism). Their scale's internal reliability coefficient was 0.89. Their sample consisted of 364 employees from a wide cross-section of industries including manufacturing, service, sales, and government. To get a composite PsyCap score, all six responses for each of the four subscales were summed and averaged to first get a subscale composite average for each of the four subscales. Then, the averages for each of the four subscales were added together and averaged to get a composite average for each subject's PsyCap score. Turkish version of the PCQ was carried out by Cetin and Basim (2012). Their sample consisted of 235 first and middle-level managers at the ministries in Turkey. It revealed a valid and reliable factor structure with four subscales with internal reliability coefficient of 0.91. In our study, the Cronbach's α for this measure came out to be 0.86.

Psychological ownership. It was measured with Avey, Avolio, Crossley, & Luthans's (2008) 12-item instrument for psychological ownership. Example items are "I am confident setting high-performance goals in my organization.", "I would challenge anyone in my organization if I thought something was done wrong.", "this place is home for me." and "I feel being a member in this organization helps define who I am." Their scale's internal

reliability coefficient was 0.90. Their sample consisted of 845 employees with their immediate superiors. As this instrument's items were originally developed in English, they were translated into Turkish by an academic who was bilingual in Turkish and English. Following Brislin's (1980) translation-back-translation procedure, we obtained a back-translation from another bilingual academic to ensure that the English and Turkish versions of the items were comparable at a high degree of accuracy. We then pilot tested the Turkish version using 50 faculty members. Based on feedback from the pilot test, we reworded a few items to ensure clarity. In this study, the psychological ownership instrument yielded an adequate internal reliability ($\alpha = 0.92$).

Control variables. Participants' age, gender and organizational tenure (in years) were controlled since prior research has found them to be significant predictors of interpersonal deviance (Thau et al. 2009). Therefore, their omission when examining the influence of benevolent leadership on interpersonal deviance could potentially bias the regression results. We therefore included participants' age, gender and tenure as controls in all our analyses.

Before the data analysis, we performed a confirmatory factor analysis. First, we examined whether or not the assumptions of confirmatory factor analysis were met. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), there are five assumptions for confirmatory factor analysis. These are; sample size and missing data, normality, outliers, multicollinearity and singularity, and residuals. The adequate sample size for confirmatory factor analysis is defined as minimum 16:1 ratio (sample size: observed variable) in Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). The current study has the sample size of 1190 and the observed variables are benevolent leadership, interpersonal deviance, psychological capital and psychological ownership. So the ratio of sample size to observed variable is 298:1 (1190:4). So the sample size is adequate for the study. The missing values were replaced with series mean, so there were no missing values. For multicollinearity, it is the simplest way to run correlations (Pallant, 2007). If the correlations are above 0.80, it will be considered removing the cases. All correlations are significant and below 0.80. For normality assumption, skewness and kurtosis values were checked. All the values are between -2 and +2, so it was concluded that normality assumption was met. Univariate outliers were checked by using boxplots as described in Pallant (2007). There were six outliers. They were excluded from the study. Additionally, multivariate outliers were checked by using Mahalanobis distances again as explained in Pallant (2007). No case was evaluated as multivariate outlier. After the assumptions of confirmatory factor analysis were met, we performed a confirmatory factor analysis to assess the convergent and discriminant validity of our constructs: benevolent leadership, psychological capital, psychological ownership and interpersonal deviance, using the item parceling method that is recommended by Bagozzi and Edwards (1998). The constructs were randomly modeled by one and three parcels, respectively. We performed a confirmatory analysis using AMOS 20.0 to test whether the four-dimensional model fits our data. The results show good support for the hypothesized model. Each item loaded significantly with its intended factor. With the specified items loading on their respective dimension, the four-factor structure yielded a good fit ($\chi^2/df=2.19$, CFI=0.96, TLI=0.94, GFI=0.89, NNFI=0.96, AGFI=0.95, SRMR=0.04, RMSEA=0.05).

2.3. Data Analysis

In the analysis of the data, Statistical package program (SPSS 21.0) was used. To determine if psychological capital and psychological ownership mediated the relationship between benevolent leadership and interpersonal deviance in this study, we followed procedures for testing multiple mediation outlined by MacKinnon (2000); a straightforward extension of Baron and Kenny's (1986) causal step approach. First, the independent variable (benevolent leadership) should be related to the dependent variable (interpersonal deviance) and it is in this step that we test Hypothesis 1. Second, the independent variable (benevolent leadership) should

be significantly related to the mediator variables (psychological capital and psychological ownership). Finally, the mediating variables (psychological capital and psychological ownership) should be related to the dependent variable with the independent variable (benevolent leadership) included in the equation. It is in this step that we test Hypotheses 2 and 3. If the first three conditions hold and the beta weights for the independent variable (benevolent leadership) drops from step 2 to step 3 but remains significant, partial mediation is present. If the independent variable (benevolent leadership) has an insignificant beta weight in the third step, and the mediator (psychological capital and psychological ownership) remains significant, then full mediation is present.

3. FINDINGS

The purpose of this study is to examine the mediating effects of psychological capital and psychological ownership on the relationship between department chairs' benevolent leadership and faculty members' interpersonal deviance.

Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations and correlations of the study variables. In this study, the Cronbach's α was 0.89 for benevolent leadership, 0.90 for interpersonal deviance, 0.86 for psychological capital and 0.92 for psychological ownership. All the scales used in this study yielded adequate internal reliabilities.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations^a

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Faculty member's age (in years)	36.79	2.23									
2. Faculty member's gender	0.53	.47	.06								
3. Faculty member's tenure (in years)	7.12	2.13	.21**	.06							
4. Department chair's age	39.13	2.16	.02	.01	.04						
5. Department chair's gender	0.60	.40	.01	.03	.03	.04					
6. Department chair's tenure	8.16	1.13	.03	.02	.04	.18*	.03				
7. Psychological capital	3.39	.89	.10	.09	.10	.09	.04	.14*			
8. Psychological ownership	3.66	.96	.13	.07	.11	.12	.07	.16*	.23**		
9. Benevolent leadership	3.23	.79	.09	.09	.06	.16*	.06	.08	.29**	.26**	
10. Interpersonal deviance	3.96	.63	-.11	.10	-.17*	-.10	.07	-.07	-.32***	-.34***	-.37***

^a $n = 1190$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

As shown in the Table 1, all relationships are in the predicted directions. Relevant to our hypotheses, benevolent leadership is negatively and significantly related to interpersonal deviance ($r = -.37$, $p < .001$) and positively related to psychological capital ($r = .29$, $p < .01$), and psychological ownership ($r = .26$, $p < .01$). In addition, Table 1 shows that both psychological capital and psychological ownership are negatively and significantly related to interpersonal deviance ($r = -.32$, $p < .001$; $r = -.34$, $p < .001$ respectively).

The results presented in Table 2 (model 2) show that benevolent leadership is significantly and negatively related to interpersonal deviance ($\beta = -.36$, $t = 5.56$, $p < .001$), thus providing support for the direct effect of benevolent leadership on deviance (Hypothesis 1).

Table 2 Results of the Standardized Regression Analysis for the Mediated Effects of Benevolent Leadership via Psychological capital and Psychological ownership^a

Variables	Psychological capital	Psychological ownership	Interpersonal deviance			
			Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Faculty member's age	.09(1.35)	.11(1.65)	-.10(-1.10)	-.09(-1.03)	-.06(-0.86)	-.04(-0.59)
Faculty member's gender	.08(1.20)	.06 (0.90)	.09(1.20)	.07(1.01)	.07(0.93)	.03(0.43)
Faculty member's tenure	.10(1.40)	.10(1.13)	-.16*(-2.40*)	-.15*(-2.23*)	-.13*(-1.96*)	-.10(-1.41)
Department chair's age	.08(1.20)	.10(1.09)	-.09(-1.15)	-.08(-1.10)	-.06(-0.79)	-.02(-0.31)
Department chair's gender	.03(0.50)	.06 (0.90)	.06(0.70)	.05(0.76)	.05(0.66)	.01(0.15)
Department chair's tenure	.13*(1.95*)	.14*(2.10*)	-.06(-0.53)	-.05(-0.71)	-.03(-0.41)	-.01(-0.12)
Benevolent leadership	.27***(4.14***)	.23***(3.45***)		-.36***(-5.46***)		.10(1.39)
Psychological capital					-.31***(-4.65***)	-.29**(-4.35**)
Psychological ownership					-.33***(-5.06***)	-.32***(-4.93***)
<i>R</i> ²	.43	.30	.05	.12	.18	.17
Adjusted <i>R</i> ²	.40	.26	.04	.11	.16	.16
ΔR^2			.09**	.09**	.09*	.00
<i>F</i>	9.13***	8.26***	2.67*	4.69**	7.19***	9.63***

^a *n* = 1190. Entries are standardized regression coefficients. T-values in parentheses. * *p* < .05. ** *p* < .01. *** *p* < .001.

As the mediation hypotheses in this study imply that benevolent leadership is related to both psychological capital and psychological ownership, the first part of the second step in the mediation analysis involved regressing psychological capital, psychological ownership and the control variables on benevolent leadership. The results in Table 2 indicate that benevolent leadership has significant, positive relationships with both psychological capital ($\beta = .27$, $t = 4.14$, $p < .01$) and psychological ownership ($\beta = .23$, $t = 3.45$, $p < .01$), thus offering support for the main effects of benevolent leadership on psychological capital and psychological ownership.

In addition, in forwarding the mediation hypotheses, negative relations between psychological capital and psychological ownership and interpersonal deviance was presumed. The second part of the second step of the mediation analysis, therefore, involved regressing interpersonal deviance on psychological capital and psychological ownership. Rather than performing a separate regression analysis for each mediating variable, psychological capital and psychological ownership, all variables were simultaneously entered in a single regression analysis to correct for any multicollinearity problems. Results reported in Table 2 (model 3) confirm the two presumed relationships. They indicate that psychological capital has a significant, negative relationship to interpersonal deviance ($\beta = -.31$, $t = -4.65$, $p < .001$) and show that psychological ownership is negatively related to interpersonal deviance ($\beta = -.33$, $t = -5.06$, $p < .001$).

In the final step of the mediation analysis, interpersonal deviance was regressed on benevolent leadership, psychological capital, psychological ownership and the control variables. As predicted, results (model 4) indicate that the significant relationships between benevolent leadership and interpersonal deviance become non-significant when psychological capital and psychological ownership are entered into the equation ($\beta = .10$, n.s.). At the same time, the effect of psychological capital ($\beta = -.29$, $t = -4.35$, $p < .01$) and psychological ownership ($\beta = -.32$, $t = -4.93$, $p < .001$) on interpersonal deviance remained significant. Complementing the causal step approach, a Sobel test was conducted to determine the significance of the mediated effect of benevolent leadership on interpersonal deviance via psychological capital and psychological ownership. The results confirm the mediating effects of psychological capital ($z = 3.13$, $p < .001$) and of psychological ownership ($z = 3.39$, $p < .001$). Together, these results suggest that psychological capital and psychological ownership mediate the relationship between benevolent leadership and interpersonal deviance, a pattern of results that supports Hypotheses 2 and 3. However, psychological capital has a small effect and psychological ownership has a moderate effect on interpersonal deviance as suggested by Cohen (1988) who states that relationships with a correlation coefficient larger than 0.3 or 0.5 are defined as moderate or strong, respectively.

4. DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

In this study, we analyzed a theory-driven model of the effect of benevolent leadership on an undesired outcome (interpersonal deviance) that is mediated by the employees' perceptions of psychological capital and psychological ownership. Following Hofmann, Morgeson, and Gerras (2003), we used ordinary least squares (OLS) regression to estimate the effect sizes for the models because the overall R² values in OLS provide an unbiased assessment of the percentage of the variance accounted for by the main and mediation effects. The mediating roles of psychological capital and psychological ownership were analyzed by using procedures for testing multiple mediation outlined by MacKinnon (2000); a straightforward extension of Baron and Kenny's (1986) causal step approach.

The results of this study revealed that benevolent leadership was negatively related to interpersonal deviance and both psychological capital and psychological ownership fully mediated the negative relationship between benevolent leadership and employee deviant behaviors. Findings are consistent with previous research suggesting that benevolent leadership is more likely to cause lower interpersonal deviance (Cheng et al., 2004; Farh et al., 2006; Thau, Aquino, & Wittek, 2007), higher psychological capital (Gardner et al., 2005; Karakas & Sarigollu, 2011; Karakas, 2009; Masten & Reed, 2002) and higher psychological ownership (Caldwell & Hayes, 2007; Burke et al., 2007, Karakas, Sarigollu, & Manisaligil, 2013; Niu, Wang, & Chang, 2009).

The results of this study revealed that more benevolent leadership behavior is likely to decrease employees' deviant behaviors. As the leaders use more benevolent leadership behavior, trust and satisfaction between the leader and employees rises. Such trust and satisfaction in leader has proven to be an important component in predicting various behavioral and performance outcomes such as organizational commitment, involvement and higher performance (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Dirks and Ferrin's (2002) study investigated the relationship between trust in leadership and behavioral and performance outcomes. As employees trust and confide in their leaders, they become more willing to openly communicate with him / her, feel that it is safe to bring up new ideas and take risks involved in coming up with ideas that basically defy the norm, have confidence to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks, make an optimistic orientation about succeeding now and in the future (higher psychological capital) and feel that they have a responsibility to make decisions that are in the long term interest of the organization (higher psychological ownership) which, in turn, lead to a decrease in employees deviant behaviors in organizations. Mayer and Gavin (2005) suggest that employees, who do not trust or are not satisfied with their leaders, will divert energy toward "covering their backs," thus adding support to the argument that many organizational level behavioral failures or undesirable attitudes and behaviors such as workplace deviance can be directly tied to a lack of support, trust and satisfaction between leaders and employees.

This study has a number of theoretical implications regarding benevolent leadership and interpersonal deviance. One theoretical implication is that social exchange theory appears to serve as useful theoretical lenses to understand why benevolent leadership relates to employee behavior in organizations. The findings of this study support predictions derived from social exchange theory suggesting that because benevolent leaders (department chairs in this study) are deemed trustworthy and fair, employees (faculty members) will be motivated to behave in ways that are desired by their leader. Specifically, they will aim to reciprocate obligations to their leader because they have received fair treatment and they know that engaging in behaviors in line with their manager will ultimately be rewarded. Thus, our findings are consistent with the central tenets of social exchange theory.

A second implication of this research is that it is important to extend theory on interpersonal deviance by incorporating psychological processes (psychological capital and ownership) as antecedents. Although we did examine two theoretically relevant mediators and test their effects simultaneously, other mechanisms could help explain the relationship between benevolent leadership and employee deviant behaviors. For example, Deng and Chen (2013) found that both job satisfaction mediated this relationship. Future research might provide a more exhaustive test of other potential mediators such as supervisor support, dedication, and cohesion. Moreover, the results of this study suggest to investigate other situational and personal factors such as leader-member exchange relationship (Lian, Ferris, & Brown, 2012), organizational politics (Basik, 2010), organizational culture (Chan et al., 2008), locus of control (Illies & Reiter-Palmon, 2008), and self-monitoring (Tepper, 2007) in explaining benevolent leadership and employee deviant behaviors. The findings in this study may be sample-specific to Turkish higher education and in need of replication. In different settings, other situational factors, such as the type of industry in which an organization operates, or organizational climate, might become relevant. In developing theoretical explanations for the role of situational and personal factors, researchers are encouraged to consider aspects of the situation that are most important and relevant to the population under investigation.

Our study has several important practical implications for educational administrators such as faculty deans and department chairs. First, by showing psychological capital and psychological ownership as mediators, our results suggest that when determining how to reduce employee deviant behaviors, department chairs should consider the nature of the relationship they develop with their direct reports and how to raise faculty members' hope, optimism, self-efficacy and commitment levels. Once high levels of psychological capital and psychological ownership are achieved, faculty members are likely to have higher confidence to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks, have higher levels of identification with department chair and organization, make a positive expectation about succeeding, persist toward goals and, when necessary, redirecting paths to goals in order to succeed and put forth more effort, thereby lowering their deviant behaviors.

Second, our findings also suggest that benevolent leadership may not only be appropriate but is also instrumental for the effective functioning of organizations. Specifically, our results demonstrate that benevolent leadership can have an impact not only on individual outcomes such as psychological capital and/or psychological ownership, but also on interpersonal deviance. Thus, organizations may find it useful to emphasize both leader and follower selection and training so that benevolent behaviors are exhibited by and rewarded in employees. Fortunately, successful programs that can be used to train employees to act in a just manner exist (Cole & Latham, 1997). This sort of approach, aimed specifically at benevolent leadership principles, might increase not only employee performance, but also employee self-efficacy, leader-subordinate relationship quality, identification with the organization, and decrease counterproductive work behaviors.

Finally, taken together, our findings suggest that in order to reduce interpersonal deviance, it is in the best interests of organizations to have employees with high levels of psychological capital and ownership. In other words, employees with higher levels of psychological capital and ownership have lower interpersonal deviance. This study also suggests that organizations should carry out programs to train and increase managers' ability to lower employee deviant behaviors. Training programs can teach cross-cultural knowledge, communication skills, and so on. These programs will help managers learn how to deal with interpersonal relationships and how to self-manage.

The main strength of the investigation in this study was its multilevel research design. Most research on workplace deviance and benevolent leadership has been conducted within

single organizations, precluding an assessment of the way in which contextual variables influence deviant employee behavior or benevolent leadership. The multilevel design was capable of capturing the complexity of individual behaviors by considering different contexts. A second strength was the use of an independent sample to measure interpersonal deviance. Measuring workplace deviance from a secondary source allowed us to minimize same-source bias. The best way to avoid or minimize any potential same-source bias is to collect measures for different constructs from different sources (Chang, van Witteloostuijn, & Eden, 2010). Third, the use of a Turkish sample added to the growing literature examining interpersonal deviance and benevolent leadership in non-Western settings.

This study has potential limitations as well. First, this study only focused on the individual level to investigate the relationship between benevolent leadership and individual outcome (employee deviant behaviors); future studies should focus on different levels, such as the team level, to investigate the relationships among benevolent leadership, situational and/or personal mediators, and team outcomes. Future research also needs to examine the influence of national or organizational culture on the proposed relationships. Second, since we utilized a cross-sectional design in our study, conclusions about the direction of causality in our model cannot be drawn. Longitudinal research is needed, therefore, to firmly establish the direction of causality for the model presented here.

In summary, despite the importance of benevolent leadership and its effects in organizations, research investigating the potential mechanisms through which benevolent leadership influences workplace deviance has been lacking. This study makes an important contribution by examining how and why benevolent leadership is more effective in lowering employee deviant behaviors by highlighting the importance of psychological processes (psychological capital and ownership). Thus, we provide a more complete picture on how to translate benevolent leader behavior into follower action such as lower employee deviant behaviors. We hope the present findings will stimulate further investigations into the underlying mechanisms and the conditions under which benevolent leadership relates to various individual and group outcomes, including work engagement, organizational identification and workplace bullying.

5. REFERENCES

- Avey, J., Luthans, F., & Jensen, S. (2009). Psychological capital: a positive resource for combating employee stress and turnover. *Human Resource Management, 48*, 677–693.
- Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., Crossley, C. R., & Luthans, F. (2008). Psychological ownership: Theoretical extensions and analysis of a multi-dimensional theory-based measure. *Journal of Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 30*, 173-191.
- Avey, J. B., Wernsing, T. S., & Palanski, M. E. (2012). Exploring the Process of Ethical Leadership: The Mediating Role of Employee Voice and Psychological Ownership. *Journal of Business Ethics, 107*(1), 21-34.
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Edwards, J. R. (1998). A general approach to representing constructs in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*, 45–87.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychology research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 1173–1182.
- Basik, K. (2010). Expanding the boundaries of behavioral integrity in organizations. (Dissertation thesis), Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 497–529.

- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a Measure of Workplace Deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 349–360.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2003). The Past, Present and Future of Workplace Deviance Research. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science* (pp. 247–281). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Academic Press.
- Brislin, R. W. (1980). Translation and content analysis of oral and written material. In H. C. Triandis & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 389–444). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97*, 117–134.
- Burke, C. S., Sims, D. E., Lazzara, E. H., & Salas, E. (2007). Trust in leadership: A multi-level review and integration. *Leadership Quarterly, 18*(6), 606–632.
- Caldwell, C., & Hayes, L. A. (2007). Leadership, trustworthiness, and the mediating lens. *Journal of Management Development, 26*(3), 261–281.
- Cetin, F., & Basim, H. N. (2012). Örgütsel Psikolojik Sermaye: Bir Ölçek Uyarlama Çalışması. *Amme İdare Dergisi, 45*(1), 121–137.
- Chang, S. J., van Witteloostuijn, A., & Eden, L. (2010). From the Editors: Common method variance in international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies, 41*, 178–184.
- Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., & Farh, J. L. (2000). A triad model of paternalistic leadership: The constructs and measurement. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies, 14*, 3–64.
- Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., Wu, T. Y., Huang, M. P., & Farh, J. L. (2004). Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: Establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 7*(1), 89–117.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd. ed.) Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Colbert, A. E., Mount, M. K., Harter, J. K., Witt, L. A., & Barrick, M. R. (2004). Interactive Effects of Personality and Perceptions of the Work Situation on Workplace Deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 599–609.
- Cole, N. D., & Latham, G. P. (1997). Effects of training in procedural justice perceptions of disciplinary fairness by unionized employees and disciplinary subject matter experts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 699–705.
- Cullen, M. J., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Personality and counterproductive workplace behavior. In M. R. Barrick & A. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Personality and work* (pp. 150–182). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Deng, Z. H., & Chen, W. Z. (2013). Empirical Research on the Effects of Paternalistic Leadership on Employee's Work Attitude and Behavior: Job Satisfaction as a Mediating Variable. *Journal of Dalian University of Technology, 1*, 6–15.
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 611–628.
- Farh, J. L., Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., & Chu, X. P. (2006). Authority and benevolence: Employees' responses to paternalistic leadership in China. In A. S. Tsui, V. Bian & L. Cheng (Eds.), *China's domestic private firms: Multidisciplinary perspectives on management and performance* (pp. 230–260). New York: Sharpe.
- Ferguson, M., & Barry, B. (2011). I know what you did: The effects of interpersonal deviance on bystanders. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16*(1), 80–94.
- Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumba, F. O. (2005). Can you see the real me? A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 343 – 372.
- Gilliland, S. E. (1993). The Perceived Fairness of Selection Systems: An Organizational Justice Perspective. *The Academy of Management Review, 18*(4), 694–734.
- Hershcovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2010). Towards a multifoci approach to workplace aggression: A meta-analytic review of outcomes from different perpetrators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*, 24–44.
- Hofmann, D. A., Morgeson, F. P., & Gerras, S. J. (2003). Climate as a moderator of the relationship between leader-member exchange and content specific citizenship: Safety climate as an exemplar. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 170–178.

- Illies, J. J., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2008). Responding destructively in leadership situations: The role of personal values and problem construction. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82(1), 251-272.
- Iyigun, N.O. & Cetin, C. (2012). Psikolojik kontratın örgütsel sapma üzerindeki etkisi: ilaç sektöründe bir araştırma. *Öneri Dergisi*, 10 (37), 15-29.
- Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (1998). The experience and evolution of trust: Implications for cooperation and teamwork. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 531-546.
- Judge, T. A., Scott, B. A., & Ilies, R. (2006). Hostility, job attitudes, and workplace deviance: Test of a multilevel model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 126-138.
- Karakas, F. (2009). *Benevolent leadership*. McGill University, Montreal.
- Karakas, F., & Sarigollu, E. (2011). Benevolent leadership: conceptualization and construct development. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 108(4), 537-553.
- Karakas, F., Sarigollu, E., & Manisaligil, A. (2013). The use of benevolent leadership development to advance principles of responsible management education. *Journal of Management Development*, 32(8), 801 - 822.
- Kark, R., & Van Dijk, D. (2007). Motivation to lead, motivation to follow: The role of self-regulatory focus in leadership processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 500-528.
- Kirkman, B. L., & Rosen, B. (1999). Beyond self-management: antecedents and consequences of team empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 58-74.
- Lian, H., Ferris, D. L., & Brown, D. J. (2012). Does power distance exacerbate or mitigate the effects of abusive supervision? It depends on the outcome. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(1), 107-123.
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Authentic leadership: A positive developmental approach. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 241-261). San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- MacKinnon, D. A. (2000). Contrasts in multiple mediator models. In J. S. Rose, L. Chassin, C. C. Presson & S. J. Sherman (Eds.), *Multivariate applications in substance use research: New methods for new questions* (pp. 141-160). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Masten, A. S., & Reed, M. (2002). Resilience in development. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 74-88). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Mayer, R. C., & Gavin, M. B. (2005). Trust in management and performance: who minds the shop while the employees watch the boss? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 874-888.
- Niu, C. P., Wang, A. C., & Cheng, B. S. (2009). Effectiveness of a moral and benevolent leader: Probing the interactions of the dimensions of paternalistic leadership. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 12, 32-39.
- Norman, S. M., Avey, J. B., Nimnicht, J. L., & Pigeon, N. G. (2010). The Interactive Effects of Psychological Capital and Organizational Identity on Employee Organizational Citizenship and Deviance Behaviors. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 17(4), 380-391.
- Okten, A. B., & Cenkci, T. (2012). The impact of paternalistic leadership on ethical climate: The moderating role of trust in leader. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 108, 525-536.
- O'Reilly, C. E. (2002). *The wrong kind of ownership*. *Across the Board*, 1, 19-20.
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows*. Crows Nest: Allen and Unwin.
- Peterson, C. (2000). The future of optimism. *American Psychologist*, 55, 44-55.
- Porath, C. L., & Pearson, C. M. (2010). The cost of bad behavior. *Organizational Dynamics*, 39, 64-71.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multidimensional Scaling Study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 555-572.
- Sackett, P. R., & DeVore, C. J. (2001). Counterproductive Behaviors at Work. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 145-164). London: Sage.

- Salancik, G., R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 224–259.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 434 – 443.
- Snyder, C. R. (2002). Hope theory: Rainbows in the mind. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13(4), 249-276.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management Development*, 33, 261–289.
- Terre-Blanche, M., Durrheim, K., & Painter, D. (2006). *Research in practice: Applied methods for the social sciences*. South Africa: University of Cape Town Press.
- Thau, S., Aquino, K., & Wittek, R. (2007). An extension of uncertainty management theory to the self: The relationship between justice, social comparison orientation, and antisocial work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 250-258.
- Thau, S., Bennett, R. J., Mitchell, M. S., & Marrs, M. B. (2009). How management style moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and workplace deviance: An uncertainty management theory perspective. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108, 79-92.
- The Council of Higher Education. (2017). Üniversitelerimiz. from https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr/yuksekgoretimIstatistikleri/2016/2016_T107v2.pdf
- Vartia, M. A. (2001). Consequences of workplace bullying with respect to the well-being of its targets and observers of bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 63, 63-69.
- Wang, A., & Cheng, B. (2010). When does benevolent leadership lead to creativity? The moderating role of creative role identity and job autonomy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 106-121.

Uzun Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı yükseköğretimde yardımsever liderlik ve kişilerarası sapkınlık arasındaki ilişkiyi ve bu ilişkide psikolojik sermaye ve psikolojik sahiplik kavramlarının aracılık rollerini araştırmaktır. Bu amaç için şu sorulara yanıtlar aranmıştır: 1. Fakültede bölüm başkanının yardımsever liderlik düzeyi ile öğretim üyelerinin kişilerarası sapkınlık düzeyleri arasında bir ilişki var mıdır? 2. Bölüm başkanının yardımsever liderliği ile öğretim üyelerinin sapkın davranışları arasındaki ilişkide öğretim üyelerinin psikolojik sermaye ve psikolojik sahiplik düzeylerinin aracılık rolleri bulunmakta mıdır?

Bu çalışmanın örneklemini İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Antalya, Adana, Bursa, Samsun, Kayseri, Erzurum ve Gaziantep'te tesadüfi küme örnekleme yöntemi ile seçilmiş olan 13 üniversitedeki 1.190 öğretim üyesi ve onların bölüm başkanları oluşturmaktadır. Çalışma Ocak-Şubat 2017 tarihleri arasında tamamlanmıştır. Katılımcılara, çalışmanın yüksek eğitim işgücü içerisinde öğretim üyelerinin kişilerarası sapkınlık davranışları ve bölüm başkanlarının yardımsever liderlik düzeyleri konularında bilgi toplamak için tasarlandığı bildirilmiştir. Katılımın gönüllü olduğu ifade edilmiştir. Anketler hemen toplanılmıştır. Çalışmada toplam 1300 öğretim üyesine psikolojik sermaye, psikolojik sahiplik ve yardımsever liderlik anketleri verilmiş olup bunlardan 1190'ının anketleri kullanabilecek durumda geri alınmıştır. Kişilerarası sapkınlık davranış anketi ise aynı deneklerinin tüm anketleri doldurdıkları zaman oluşabilecek ön yargıları engellemek için psikolojik sermaye, psikolojik sahiplik ve yardımsever liderlik anketlerini dolduran öğretim üyelerinin bağlı bulunduğu bölüm başkanlarına doldurtulmuştur. Çalışmadaki öğretim üyelerinin %47'si kadın olup yaş ortalaması 36.79 yıldır. Ayrıca bölüm başkanlarının %60'ı erkek olup yaş ortalaması 39.13 yıldır. Anketlerin geri dönüş oranı %91.54'tür.

Bu çalışmada dört farklı ölçek kullanılmıştır. Öğretim üyelerinin psikolojik sermaye düzeyleri Luthans, Youssef ve Avolio (2007) tarafından geliştirilmiş bulunan ve 24 maddeden oluşan "Psikolojik Sermaye Ölçeği" kullanılarak ölçülmüştür. Ölçekte yer alan örnek maddeler "Şu sıralarda enerji için biçimde iş amaçlarımı gerçekleştirilmeye çalışıyorum.", "İş yerinde bazı şeyler benim için belirsizlik taşırsa bunların arasından en iyisinin gerçekleştirilmesine inanırım." biçimindedir. Ölçeğe verilen yanıtlar 1 (kesinlikle katılmıyorum) ile 6 (tamamen katılıyorum) arasında değişmektedir. Ölçeğin Türkçe'ye uyarlama çalışması Çetin ve Basım (2012) tarafından yapılmıştır. Çalışmamızda bu ölçeğin güvenilirlik katsayısı 0.86'dır. Öğretim üyelerinin psikolojik sahiplik düzeyini ölçmek için Avey, Avolio, Crossley ve

Luthan (2008) tarafından geliştirilmiş olan “Psikolojik Sahiplik Ölçeği” kullanılmıştır. Ölçek 12 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Örnek maddeler olarak “Bu örgütün bir üyesi olduğumu hissetmek kim olduğumu tanımlamama yardımcı olur”, “İş yerim benim evim gibidir.” verilebilir. Orijinali İngilizce olan ölçek İngilizceden Türkçeye 2 akademisyen tarafından tercüme edilmiş, geri tercüme yöntemi kullanılarak kontrol edilmiştir (Brislin, 1980). Çalışmamızda bu ölçeğin güvenilirlik katsayısı 0.92’dir. Bölüm başkanının yardımsever liderlik düzeyinin ölçümü için Cheng, Chou ve Farh (2000) tarafından geliştirilmiş bulunan “Yardımsever Liderlik Ölçeği” kullanılmıştır. Ölçek 11 maddeden oluşmakta olup: “İşyeri performansım iyi olmadığı zaman bölüm başkanım bunun nedenlerini bulmaya çalışır.” örnek bir madde olarak verilebilir. Ölçek soruları 1 (asla) ile 6 (her zaman) arasında bir ölçekte değerlendirilmiştir. Ölçeğin Türkçe’ye uyarlama çalışması Ökten ve Cenkçi (2012) tarafından yapılmıştır. Çalışmamızda bu ölçeğin güvenilirlik katsayısı 0.89’dur. Çalışmada kullanılan son anket Bennett ve Robinson (2000) tarafından geliştirilmiş bulunan ve 7 maddeden oluşan “Kişilerarası Sapkınlık Davranışı Ölçeği”dir. Ölçekte yer alan örnek maddeler “İşyerinde diğerleriyle alay etmiştir.”, “İşyerinde birine uygunsuz biçimde davranmıştır.” biçimindedir. Ölçeğe verilen yanıtlar 1 (kesinlikle katılmıyorum) ile 5 ((tamamen katılmıyorum) arasında değişmektedir. Ölçeğin Türkçe’ye uyarlama çalışması İyigün ve Çetin (2012) tarafından yapılmıştır. Çalışmamızda bu ölçeğin güvenilirlik katsayısı 0.90’dır.

Bu çalışmada, aracılık rollerinin test edilmesinde MacKinnon (2000) tarafından detayları açıklanan yöntem izlenilmiştir. Çalışmanın sonuçları, bölüm başkanlarının yardımsever liderlik düzeyleri ile öğretim üyelerinin sapkın davranışları arasında olumsuz bir ilişkinin varlığını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Ayrıca öğretim üyelerinin psikolojik sermaye ve psikolojik sahiplik düzeyleri, yardımsever liderlik ve sapkın davranışlar arasındaki olumsuz ilişkide aracı rolleri göstermişlerdir.

Takipçilerin lidere güven duymasında liderlik tarzının ve lider davranışlarının önemi büyüktür. Liderlerin davranışları takipçilerin güven düzeyini belirler (Mayer ve Gavin, 2005). Yardımsever lider, meşruluğunu takipçilerin kendisine duyduğu güven ile kazanır. Yardımsever liderlik, liderin çalışanları ile bire bir ilişkiler geliştirdiği, onların yetenekleri, ihtiyaçları, kişisel hedefleri, istekleri ve potansiyellerini tanıdığı ve çalışanları için en iyi olanı yapmaya odaklanan bir liderlik tarzıdır (Farh, Liang, Chou ve Cheng, 2008; Wang ve Cheng, 2010). Her bir çalışanın kendisine has (özü) karakteristikleri ve ihtiyaçlarını anlayan yardımsever liderler, daha sonra çalışanlarına kendi potansiyellerini açığa çıkarmaları ve geliştirmeleri için destek verirler (Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May ve Walumba, 2005). Yardımsever liderler, kendileri de bir rol model olarak, kendileri ve çalışanları arasında bilgi, kaynak ve geribildirim akışını hızlandırarak karşılıklı güveni pekiştirirler. Ayrıca yardımsever liderler, takipçilerini önceden bilgilendiren, onları kararlara katan ve inisiyatif veren, başka bir deyişle takipçilerini güçlendiren liderlerdir. Yardımsever liderlerin kişisel düzeyde astları ile ilgilenmeleri ve onların mesleki ve kişisel anlamda gelişimlerini takip etmeleri, etik değerlere uygun davranışları ve dürüst olmaları da bire bir güven ile ilişkili unsurlar olarak çalışanların kendilerini herhangi bir endişe duymaksızın rahat bir biçimde ifade etmelerine yol açmaktadır.

Bu araştırmanın sonuçları, yüksek öğretimdeki yöneticilerin (bu çalışmada bölüm başkanları) yardımsever liderlik davranışının kendi bölümlerindeki öğretim üyelerinin kişilerarası sapkın davranışlarını azaltabileceğini ortaya koymuştur. Yardımsever liderlik çalışanların kendilerine bireysel ilgi gösteren, sorunlarının çözümünde kendilerine yardımcı olan, güvenli bir yönetim altında çalıştıklarını hissetmelerine ve kendilerini yaptıkları iş ile ilgili konularda kontrol ve karar verme inisiyatifine sahip olduklarını algılamalarına yol açmaktadır. Bu durum çalışanların kendilerini herhangi bir korku ve endişe duymaksızın ifade etmelerine, iş başarma konusunda yeterli olduklarını hissetmelerine, olumlu düşünmelerine ve iyimser olmalarına ve buldukları örgütü sahiplenmelerine yol açıp daha az sapkın davranışlarda bulunmalarına neden olacaktır. Bu nedenle yardımsever liderliğin bulunduğu örgütlerde çalışanların daha yüksek psikolojik sermaye ve sahiplik düzeylerine sahip olmaları onların örgüt içerisinde olumsuz davranışlarını en düşük düzeylere indirmeleri sonucunu doğuracaktır.

Bu araştırmanın bulgularının üniversitelerdeki pratiklere ve yönetim süreçlerine bazı yansımaları olabilir. İlk olarak yardımsever liderliğin olumlu örgütsel sonuçları beraberinde getirmesi nedeniyle üniversite üst yönetimleri birim/program/bölüm yöneticilerinin daha fazla yardımsever liderlik davranışları benimseyip uygulayabilmeleri için yönetimsel eğitim programları düzenleyebilirler. Ayrıca yardımsever liderlik davranışları sergileyen yöneticiler ödüllendirilebilir. Çalışmanın bir başka bulgusu yüksek psikolojik sermaye ve psikolojik sahipliğe sahip olan öğretim üyeleri daha az kişilerarası sapkın davranışlarda bulunmaktadır. Bu nedenle öğretim üyelerinin umut, psikolojik dayanıklılık, öz yeterlilik

ve iyimserlik bileşenlerinden oluşan psikolojik sermaye ile buldukları bölümleri psikolojik yönden sahiplenmeleri, kendilerini üniversiteleri ile özdeşleştirmelerini ifade eden psikolojik bir durum” olarak ifade edebileceğimiz psikolojik sahiplik düzeylerinin artması için eğitim programları düzenlenip, ödül ve teşvikler kullanılabilir. Akademik personel seçim ve performans değerlendirilmesinde yine yüksek psikolojik sermaye ve psikolojik sahiplik potansiyeline sahip olabilecek adaylar daha olumlu değerlendirilebilir.