ATATÜRK ÜNİVERSİTESİ / ATATÜRK UNIVERSITY

İKTİSADİ VE İDARİ BİLİMLER DERGİSİ / JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS AND ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES

Effects of Servant Leadership on Psychological Capitals and Productivities of Employees

Elif BAYKAL[1]

Abstract: Focusing on human strength and flourishing, positive organizational behavior opened a new era in organizational behavior studies and reshaped scholars' and practitioners' demands from leadership. More human focused leaders have become acceptable and popular including servant leadership, one of the main points we have focused in this study. In our research model, being inspired from positive organizational behavior and one of its famous constructs, positive psychological capacities; the developable, measurable and managable psychological powers of individuals, we designed a model testing effects of servant leadership on psychological capacities of individuals in organizational settings and psychological capitals effect on employee productivity. We tested our model on white collar workers in İstanbul region of Turkey, by applying face to face and online surveys. Later, we analyzed our data in SPSS 20.0 program and we found that as we have supposed servant leadership behavior of leaders has a positive effect on positive psychological capacities of individuals which in turn effects positively their productivities.

Keywords: Positive Organizational Behavior, Servant Leadership, Psychological Capital, Productivity.

Hizmetkar Liderliğin Çalışanların Pozitif Psikolojik Sermayeleri ve Üretkenlikleri Üzerine Etkisi

Öz: *Bireyin gücüne ve gelişimine odaklanan pozitif örgütsel davranış, örgütsel davranış çalışmalarında yeni bir dönem başlattı ve araştırmacıların ve uygulayıcıların liderlikten beklentilerini yeniden şekillendirdi. Bu çalışmada odaklanılan ana noktalardan biri olan hizmetkar liderlik de dahil olmak üzere, artık insan odaklı liderlik daha fazla kabul görmeye başladı ve daha popüler hale geldi. Araştırma modelinde, pozitif örgütsel davranıştan ve onun ünlü kavramlarından biri olan pozitif psikolojik kapasiteden yani bireylerin geliştirilebilir, ölçülebilir ve yönetilebilir psikolojik güçleri yönelerinden ilham alarak, hizmetkar liderliğinin örgüt ortamında bireylerin psikolojik kapasiteleri üzerindeki etkilerini ve çalışan verimliliğini test eden bir model tasarlanmıştır. Model Türkiye'nin İstanbul bölgesinde beyaz yakalı işçiler üzerinde yüz yüze ve internet üzerinden anketler uygulayarak test edilmiştir. Daha sonra, verilerimizi SPSS 20.0 programında analiz edilmiştir. Bu çalışma ile liderlerin hizmetkar liderlik davranışlarının, bireylerin verimliğini olumlu yönde etkileyen pozitif psikolojik kapasiteleri üzerindeki olumlu bir etkisi olduğu ve pozitif psikolojik kaynak kapasitesinin verimliliği etkilediği teyit etmiştir.*

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Pozitif Örgütsel Davranış, Hizmetkar Liderlik, Psikolojik Sermaye, Üretkenlik.*

[1]Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, İstanbul Medipol Üniversitesi, İşletme ve Yönetim Bilimleri Fakültesi, İşletme Bölümü, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4966-8074

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Modern iş hayatında, aşırı rekabetçilik, yorucu çalışma şartları ve baskıcı hiyerarşik yapı çalışanlar üzerinde yoğun stres ve endişe yaratmakta ve bu zorlayıcı koşullar çalışan dostu ve destekleyici liderlere olan ihtiyacı gündeme getirmektedir. Bu baskıcı ortamda, hizmetkar liderlik tarzı, liderin takipçilerinin iyiliğini gözeten, ahlaki ve insan odaklı liderlik stillerinden biri olarak kabul edilmektedir. Hizmetkar liderler yöneticiliği çalışanlara hizmetle birleştiren insan odaklı ve iyi niyetli bir liderlik biçimi olarak kabul edilmektedir. Söz konusu liderler, ilgili, şefkatli, otantik ve motive edici yönleri ile ön plana çıkarlar. Bu liderlik tarzı çalışanların menfaatini herşeyin önünde tutması ile diğer birçok liderlik tarzından ayrılır. Araştırma modelinde, pozitif örgütsel davranıştan ve onun ünlü kavramlarından biri olan pozitif psikolojik kapasiteden yani bireylerin geliştirilebilir, ölçülebilir ve yönetilebilir psikolojik güçleri yönelerinden ilham alarak, hizmetkar liderliğinin örgüt ortamında bireylerin psikolojik kapasiteleri üzerindeki etkilerini ve çalışan verimliliğini test eden bir model tasarlanmıştır. Çalışmada önemli bir yer tutan psikolojik sermaye kavramı pozitif örgütsel davranış literatüründe önemli bir yer tutan, geliştirilebilen, değişim gösteren ve öğretilebilen ikinci dereceden bir yapıdır. Umut, öz yeterlilik, iyimserlik ve rezilyans alt boyutlarından oluşur. Bu çalışmada, örgüt ortamındaki bireyin sahip olduğu psikolojik güçleri sembolize eden bu dört boyutun uygun liderlik biçiminin desteğiyle örgütte bireylerin daha verimli olmasına yardımcı olacağı düşünüldüğü için hizmetkar liderliğin psikolojik sermayeye ve psikolojik sermayenin de yüksek verime yol açıp açmadığı incelenmiştir. Araştırmada söz konusu ilişkileri inceleyen 8 ayrı hipotez oluşturulmuştur. Bu hipotezlerden ilk dördü hizmetkar liderliğin psikolojik sermayenin alt boyutları üzerindeki etkilerini incelerken, diğer dört boyut ise psikolojik sermayenin verimlilik üzerindeki etkileri incelemiştir. Model Türkiye'nin İstanbul bölgesinde beyaz yakalı işçiler üzerinde yüz yüze ve internet üzerinden anketler uygulayarak test edilmiştir. Araştırma anketi, İstanbul'daki orta ve büyük ölçekli ve hizmet sektörü işletmelerinde çalışan beyaz yakalı personele uygulanmıştır. Araştırmada, psikolojik sermaye Luthans'ın (2007) dört boyutu ve 16 maddelik psikolojik sermaye ölçeği ile ölçülmüştür. Bu ölçekte iyimserliğin ilk boyutu 6 soru, ikinci boyutu 7 soru ile öz-yeterlik, üçüncü boyutu 6 soru ile psikolojik esneklik ve dördüncü boyut beş soru ile ölçülmüştür. Hizmetkar liderliği ölçmek için ise Barbuto ve Wheeler'ın (2006) Hizmetkar liderlik ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Bilgeliği ölçmek için 5 madde, duygusal iyileşme için 4 madde, özgecilik için 4 madde, ikna edici haritalama için 5 madde, örgütsel hizmet için 5 madde olmak üzere toplam 23 soru kullanılmıştır. Son olarak, örgütün verimliliğini ölçmek için Fry'ın (2003) manevi liderlik ölçeğinden verimlilik ile ilgili 7 madde alınmıştır. Daha sonra, verilerimizi SPSS 20.0 programında analiz edilmiştir. Sırasıyla faktör analizi, korelasyon analizi ve regresyon analizi uygulanmıştır. Hipotez testleri sonucunda hizmetkar liderliğin psikolojik sermaye üzerindeki etkisini test eden bütün hipotezler desteklenmiş, yine aynı şekilde psikolojik sermayenin tüm alt boyutlarının verimlilik üzerindeki etkisini gösteren diğer dört hipotezimiz de

desteklenmiştir. Bu çalışma ile liderlerin hizmetkar liderlik davranışlarının, bireylerin verimliğini olumlu yönde etkileyen pozitif psikolojik kapasiteleri üzerindeki olumlu bir etkisi olduğu ve pozitif psikolojik kaynak kapasitesinin verimliliği etkilediği teyit etmiştir. Çalışmanın orjinalliği, pozitif örgüt okulunda psikolojik sermaye üzerindeki pozitif etkisi genel kabul görmüş otantik liderliin yanısıra hizmetkar liderliğinde psikolojik sermaye üzerindeki pozitif etkisini teyit etmesinden gelmektedir.Bu çalışmanın sonuçları hizmetkar liderliğin de pzoitif liderlik tarzları arasında sayılması gerektiği niteliğinde bir destek olarak kabul edilebilir.

Introduction

Contemporary leaders are functioning in the digital era and through a fierce competition. These leaders and their followers demand for purpose, meaning and connection (Barroca, Neto, & Silveira, 2017). Being exposed to excessive competitive pressure and fierce rivalry these leaders often find it difficult to figure out the best way to deal with their followers and succeed in their tasks while satifsying their employees. On the one hand, modern era with its astonishing and awareness-increasing communication tools made the followers more enlightened regarding their rights and obligations and increased their demands from their organizations and leaders. And recently, theorists saw that there is an urgent need for more ethical, values–based leaders (Hoch et al., 2016, Dede and Ayrancı, 2014, Baykal, 2019).

In such an atmosphere the need for more human-focused more caring and dedicated leaders ascended. Moreover, burdens of this competitive world, exhausting work hours and psychological pressures on employees holding lower hierarchical positions made employee-friendly and decent leaders more appealing. Servant leadership style, explains one of those decent, moral and human focused leadership styles wherein the leader considers the good of his followers as a priority at work. They are the kind of leaders that melt their inclination to lead with their intrinsic motivation to serve in the same pot. They are prominent with their tendency to empower and develop their followers. While leading they do not hesitate to express their humility, authenticity, care, and motivation to serve (Van Dierendonck, 2011). Their distincitive property is their inclination to select the needs of their followers as their highest priority (Hoch et al., 2016). Servant leadership emerged as an important approach to leadership, since it it gives importance to integrity in the organization, focuses on follower needs, and prioritizes bringing out the best in their followers (Liden et al., 2015). Indeed, they combat with selfish behaviors in the organizations and emphasized altruism and brotherhood. Under servant leadership, followers that are exposed to the altruistic behaviors of their leaders feel themselves valued and empowered. In this study we proposed that employees feeling empowered and supported by ther leaders tend to have higher psychological capacities which in turn would result in more productive individuals.

In order to make our point clearer, we first examine extant literature regarding servant leadership. And than we will focus on the concept of

psychological capital, theory based and evidence based psychological capacities of indivuduals that are measurable, developable and managable encompassing the constructs of hope, optimism, resilience and self efficacy. And in the last two parts we will explain our model and the field study applied in order to test this model. We will give results of our analysis regarding the field research about the model. And we will discuss our analysis results.

1.Servant Leadership

According to contemporary leadership theorists, Greenleaf (1970) is accepted as the creator of servant leadership theory, that considers the needs of followers as his first priority. In Greenleaf's (1970) approach servant leaders are the kind of leaders that has the natural feeling of serving. They have a concious inclination to serve (Greenleaf, 1970: 13). Parris and Peachy (2013) explained servant leadership theory as a viable theory helping organizations in improving the well-being of employees. Although serving others is an inner attitude for servant leader, servant leader is not the same as servant. They do not give up their duties and obligations as a leader while serving others. Moreover, they are initiative takers, they take risks and are often effective as a leader (Sousa and Van Dierendonck, 2017). Namely, they are the kind of leaders that both initiates and takes the risk of his failures (Greenleaf 2002 :29). Greenleaf explains the servant-leader as the "primus inter pares" namely, he is considered as first among equals that does not use his or her power to get things done, rather tries to convince others to do things. He is succesful in inspiring people and directing them in the demanded direction. But he does not resort to oppression and intimidation while carrying on his managerial duties.

A servant leader can be conceived as a role model for his followers that holds the organization in trust (Reinke, 2004) while remaining aware of their needs and situations. In fact, he is sincerely committed to empowering the employees in his organization with the aim of succeeding professionally and personally (Reinke, 2004). Servant give importance to personal integrity, namely they are obsessed with authenticity between their behaviors and words and their ideas and beliefs. Further more they believe that organizations' obligations towards their followers should go beyond corporate goals and extend to the whole society (Lapointe and Vanderberghe, 2018: 99). And they often prefer to do their best in order to bring out the full potential of their shareholders especially their followers (Liden et al., 2015: 254).

According to servant leadership philosophy when leaders' tend to serve the interests of all their stakeholders rather than primarily serving their own self-interests, followers will experience higher levels of well-being and growth, and in turn they will also adopt a service orientation as their leader (Panaccio et al., 2014). Moreover, servant-leaders contribute to positive job attitudes on the side of their followers by satisfying the psychological needs (Van Dierendonck, 2011). That is why Servant leaders make their followers feel empowered, that contributes to more self-confident, satisfied, and courageous employees (Baykal,

Zehir ve Köle, 2018: 29). For example; using a sample of 181 Canadians, Lapointe and Vandenberghe (2018) tried to figre out effects of servant leadership behavior. Their results showed that servant leadership is effective on normative commitment and negatively related to antisocial behaviors. Annd affective commitment has a mediator effect between servant leadership and employee voice behaviors. Similarly, Sousa and Dierendonck's (2017) tested how servant leadership generated follower engagement, and they found that humble leaders like Servant leaders tend to show highest level of follower engagement regardless of their rank in organizational hierarchy.

Furthermore, Panaccio et al. (2014) also applied a study in order to understand and in what kind of situations servant leadership behavior effects extra-role behaviors of employees positively. In this study it is assumed that psychological contract can have a mediating effect in the relationship between servant leadership and two main kinds of extra-role behaviors: organizational citizenship behaviors and innovative behaviors. And the study showed that psychological contract fulfillment is a key mechanism through which servant leaders affects follower extra-role behaviors. Similarly, Hsiao, Lee, and Chen (2015) studied the effects of servant leadership on customer value co-creation. They examined how servant leadership affects customer value co-creation in Taiwan context on 650 people. Results showed that servant leadership can trigger customer value creation and psychological capital and service oriented organizational citizenship act as mediators in this relationship. And recently, Harju, Schaufeli and Hakanen (2018) applied a longitudinal study on a sample of 237 employees, with the aim of investigating the effects of servant leadership behavior on boredom at workplace and examined the mediator role of job crafting. Findings of the study showed that team-level servant leadership is an antecedent of lower levels of job boredom by boosting job crafting. We can also come acroos studies on opennes and authenticity of the servant leadership. For example; Tuan (2017) examined organizational citizenship behavior, knowledge sharing and servant leadership relationship. The study was applied on 562 employees and 197 department in Vietnam context. Results proved the mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior for the positive association between servant leadership and knowledge sharing.

In fact, servanthood culture of servant leadership ensures the situation wherein followers are trusted and empowered thus resulting in better performing individuals (Liden, 2008:163). On the one hand, community building and establishing good relationships in this community is also an efficient way of establishing productive structures. Servant leaders are the kind of leaders that recognize the benefits of community and the communities that they create are considered as good for employee morale and productivity (Wong and Page 2003: 3). Although there is scarely any empirical evidence to supporting the positive efffect of spiritual leadership on organizational productivity servant leadership researchers such as Joseph and Winston (2005) suggest that servant leadership can increase an organization's productivity and performance (p. 16).

2.Psychological Capital

Positive psychology is a modern psychological approach that focuses on strengths and positivities in life handles the average individual' with a focus to find out useful, acceptable and developing phenemona (Sheldon and King, 2001: 216). Having its roots in positive psychology, positive organizational behavior is described as the realm of study that focuses on positively oriented human strengths and positive psychological capitals that are measurable, developable, and managable for higher performance (Luthans, 2002b: 59). It can also be considered as a core construct involving these psychological capacities, namely; hope, efficacy, resiliency, and optimism (Wang et al., 2014; 6). Each of these four elements of psychological capital refers to the positive psychological resources of individuals that lead to positive work outcomes (Wang et al., 2014: 8).

In positive psychology hope can be described as a positive motivational *state* encopassing the motivations for successful (a) agency, namely goal directed energy and (b) pathways, plans to meet the goals (Snyder, 1991: 287). That is to say, hope in positive psychology encompasses of three main components: agency, pathways and goals (Avolio, Avey and Norman, 2007: 545). Or as Snyder (2000) claims, hope involves the *will* to succeed and the capability to see, clarify and search for and find the way to success. And as Masten (2001) explains resilience explains the inclination to positive coping and adaptation in the face of significant risks and adversities. In psychological capital perspective, resilience can be considered as the capacity to rebound and bounce back from adversities, uncertainties, conflicts, failures, positive changes, progresses and increased responsibilities (Luthans, 2002a:702). On the other hand, as Seligman (1998) defines, optimism as internal and stable attributions about positive events and attributing external, unstable, and specific attributions about negative situations. That is to say as Luthans (2002a) suggests, optimism as a psychological capacity concept can be explained with a positive attribution of events, that encompasses positive feelings and attitudes and necessitates being realistic (Baykal, 2018). However, it is not merely an uncontrolled process that lacks required evaluation, rather it is a realistic evaluation of what can be accomplished in a particular case and contributes to higher levels of efficacy and hope (Luthans et al., 2007: 547). Similar to the concept hope, the concept of optimism is also a goal-based construct operating when an outcome is important (Snyder, 2002: 257). And self efficacy refers to an optimistic sense of personal efficacy to overcome the problems (Bandura, 1998: 56). Self-efficacy is a positive belief and an employee's conviction about one's potential to trigger the motivation, and cognitive behaviors that are required to successfully accomplish a definite task within a certain context (Avolio, Avey and Norman, 2007: 548). Employees can be more or less efficacious in some specific tasks, that is to say self efficacy is something task-specific.

According to Luthans and Jensen (2002) these four positive psychological capital constructs have conceptual independence. Namely, psychological capital is a second order construct involving hope, optimism, self effiacy and resilience

concepts. Psychological capabilities are trait-like properties that can be improved and changed over time (Seligman, Steen, Park, & Peterson, 2005: 411). Supporting the view that psychological capital is a second order construct including the four above mentioned concepts Bandura (1997) claims that people in self-efficacy are also inclined to be more resilient, and Snyder (2000) insists that people with high levels of hope are also inclined to have more self-efficacy and tend to be more resilient after temporary hopelessness (p. 39). Namely, as Luthans et al. (2005) claims despite the fact that each of these components of psychological capital shows discriminant validity across multiple samples when compared with each other but there is evidence supporting it to be an overall core construct. That is to say, a common underlying relationship ties them together, namely psychological capital is a higher-order core factor. As explained in the psychological capital's definition, this commonality or underlying link is a a unique mechanism overlapping across each of the constructs contributing to a motivational inclination to be succesful in attaining tasks and goals (Avolio, Avey and Norman, 2007: 548).

3.Hypothesis and Research Model

A.Servant Leadership and Psychological Capacity

In comparison to other leadership styles, servant leadership involves more human focused attitude towards their organizations, subordinates, customers, and other shareholders and higher levels of social responsibility (Greenleaf, 1977). According to van Dierendonck (2011), servant leaders care for their subordinates, give importance to their individual needs, spend energy for their development, and emphasize the quality of leader- member relationships. Servant leaders are vision providers for their organizations. They are credible and trustworthy leaders. They influence their followers by bringing out the best in them. They use one-on-one communication in order to conceive the capabilities, requirements, demands, and potentials of their individiuals (Van Dierendonck and Patterson, 2015: 119).

The inherent dilemma in Servant leadership: namely; serving and leading simultaneously (Van Dierendonck 2011, p. 1231) can be conceived a bit confusing. It can be misunderstood as something like being a superior and ınferior at the same time. According to Ng and Koh (2010) the inclination to contribute to the growth of followers underlies the motivation of leader to serve his them. In other words, the leader willingly work hard to increase the capacities of followers, encourage them to improve. Patterson (2010) suggests that compassion is an essential component of servant leadership that explains their motivation in serving others. Greenleaf (1977) suggests that servant leadership is inclined to make their followers better, more intelligent, freer, more independent and more likely to become servants (p. 62). That is why we expect followers under servant leadership to gain higher levels of psychological capacity. As Russell and Stone (2002) claims the compassionate love of servant leaders towards their followers encompasses a genuine appreciation for their capabilities and an intimate care for

them. Through their love for their followers, servant leaders creates hope and courage in them. Supporting this point of view, Caldwell and Dixon (2009) suggested that leaders that work with follower love in terms of caring, spending time and effort for their welfare and being obsessed with happiness of followers create a change of focus on the side of the leader and helps them see and improve the worths and potentials of followers.

Boyatzis et al. (2006) claims that coaching followers with compassion, as most servant leaders do, creates significant psychological and social effects, effecting positively the well-being of both followers and the leader. Since they visibly appreciate, value, encourage, and care for their followers (Russel, 2001: 79) it would be meaningful to view them as congruent catalyzers for enhancing psychological capacities of these followers. According to Kouzes and Posner (1993), in ths unique leadership, leaders trigger hope and courage in their followers by openly explaining their ideas and beliefs, creating positive images, and by sharing their love and support to the followers. In other words, they empower the followers by structuring tasks in such a way that followers feel more effective and motivated (Russel, 2001: 80) thus increasing their psychological capacities. Being inspired by the related literature we hypothesized that:

H1: Servant leadership has a significant effect on optimism capacity of followers.

H2: Servant leadership has a significant effect on self efficacy capacity of followers.

H3: Servant leadership has a significant effect on resilience capacity of followers.

H4: Servant leadership has a significant effect on hope capacity of followers.

B.Psychological Capacity and Productivity

Psychological capital affects individual motivational propensities and efforts that result in higher performance (Avey et al., 2011: 135, Narcikara, 2017:124). As mentioned before psychological capital is a positively oriented higher-order construct (Luthans & Youssef, 2007) that describes the states of individuals wherein they have self confidence, optimism, hope and resilience (Luthans, et al., 2007: 3) which in return results in myriad positive work outcomes encompassing specifically the work performance. In fact, psychological capital contributes to productivity of individuals owing to the centrality of positive evaluation of conditions and increasing the probability attaining goals successfully based on motivated efforts and performance (Luthans et al., 2005). Supporting this view, in their study on psychological capital and its organizational effects Walumbwa et al. (2011) found that collective psychological capital is effective on group citizenship behavior and group performance. In parallel with these results, Avey et al. (2011) claim that individuals higher in psychological capital tend to perform higher in a long time period. This is the result of higher levels of self efficacy, hope towards solving problems and succeeding, higher levels of positive expectations about results,

namely, optimism and higher levels of resiliency that helps healing quickly in times of crises.

In the related literature, there are myriad number of studies confirming the positive relationship between psychological capital and performance. For example; In Luthans et al. (2008) study the effects of positive psychological capital and the mediating effect of supportive organizational climate in the relationship between psychological capital and corporate level performance has been examined. Results confirmed that show that psychological capital of employees positively effects their performance, job satisfaction, and organizational. And in Avey et al.'s (2011) study investigating effects of psychological capital on employee attitudes especially on performance, the analysis results demonstrated that there are significant positive relationships between psychological capital and desirable employee attitudes including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, psychological well-being, organizational citizenship behaviour and performance. In a more recent study, Mathe et al. (2017) study tested the relationships among psychological capital, service quality, customer satisfaction, and team performance in hospitality industry. Results of the study confirmed that collective psychological capital is positively related to all these above mentioned variables. And later in Carmona–Halty, Salanova, Llorens, and Schaufeli's (2018) study on 639 Chilean high school students, it is confirmed that psychological capital is directly associated with academic performance of students. Alessandri, Consiglio, Luthans, & Borgogni (2018) also applied a study investigating effects of psychological capital on white collar employees in Italian context. Results of their study showed that psychological capacity increases job engagement which in turn increases job performance. In another study, Abbas and Raja (2015) investigated investigated psychological capital - innovative work performance and job relted stress relationships. The study was conducted in Pakistan and results demonstrated that psychological capital had a positive effect on innovative job performance and negatively related to job related stress. Being inspired from these studies we hypothesized that:

H5: Optimism has a significant effect on productivity of followers.
H6: Self efficacy has a significant effect on productivity of followers.
H7: Resilience has a significant effect on productivity of followers.
H8: Hope has a significant effect on productivity of followers.

4.Methodology
A.Selection of Research Sample and Collection of Research Data

The research has been applied on white collar personnel working in medium and large scale and service sector enterprises in Istanbul. White-collar employees are accepted as applicants because of their high capacity to understand theoretical concepts. They are highly educated, and they are used to hierarchical and bureaucratic structures, and have more knowledge about business culture, vision, policies and performance when compared to blue-collar employees.

In the field research, data were collected by easy sampling method. In order to collect the the necessary data, both face to face interviews were applied and a special link was created via Google forms in order to apply the survey via internet. The survey questionnaire was sent to nearly 5000 e-mail addresses as an online link. And two distinct reminders have been sent to applicants in order to increase the return rate of the survey.

B.Measurement Tools

In the study, Likert-type data collection tool used in the measurement of research items that was composed of answers including (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) No idea, (4) Agree and (5) Totally Agree. Psychological capital was measured by the Luthans' (2007) four dimensions and 16 items psychological capital scale. The first dimension of optimism on this scale was 6 questions, the second dimension was self-efficacy with 7 questions, the third dimension was psychological resilience with 6 questions, and the fourth dimension was measured with five questions. And in order to measure servant leadership, Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) Servant leadership scale has been used. We used a total of 23 questions including 5 items for measuring wisdom, 4 items for emotional healing, 4 items for altruism, 5 items for persuasive mapping, 5 items for organizational servanthood. And lastly, 7 items have been barrowed from Fry's (2003) spiritual leadership scale in order to measure productivity of the organization.

32.3% of the applicants consisted of senior executives, 15.9% were middle managers and 50.8% were hierarchical managers and officers. 35% of the people participated in our study were male and 65% of them were female. Moreover, 59.7% of the participants were university graduates and 26.9% were post graduates, namely we has a highly educated sample in our study owing to the fact that most of them were white collar workers doing officework.

Exploratory factor analysis was performed by using Principal Component Analysis and Promax Rotation method to investigate whether the observed variables has been loaded to the supposed factor structure. Principal Components Analysis was preferred because it is accepted as the most proper analysis in exploratory factor analysis and Promax rotation method was recommended because it was recommended to use in cases where the relationship between variables was high (Hair et al., 2010).

Furthermore, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sample adequacy test and Bartlett sphericity test were applied to test the suitability of the data set for the factor analysis. As a result of the analyzes, KMO value was found to be 0,910 with a desired level of over 0,50 and Bartlett's test was significant at a significance level of 0.001. In addition, the diagonal values in the anti-image corelation gibi matrix were investigated and found that these values were adequate, namely, more than 0.5 as expected. According to this, the sample data were found to be suitable for factor analysis (Hair et al. 2010).

In the exploratory factor analysis, the lower limit of factor loadings and communality values were accepted as 0,5 (Hair et al., 2010). The variables which did not provide these values or were not loaded to the predicted factor structure were excluded from the scale so as not to impair the factor structure. Cronbach's Alpha value was used to measure the internal consistency of the factors and Cronbach's Alpha value of each factor was found to be over 0.7 namely, factor structures had internal consistency. The relevant factor structure is given in the table below.

5.Results

In the study, regression analysis has been used in order to test the hypotheses and to understand the directions in the relations. In order to test our research model we applied 5 different regression models. The first four of them were designed to examine the relationship between servant leadership is about the relationship behavior and psychoogical capacity of followers. The last one was designed to examine the relationship between psychological capital and productivity. We preferred to test effects of servant leadership on psychological capital with 4 different regression models with the aim of seeing the effect of Servant leadership behavior on each seperate sub dimension of psychological capital, namely, optimism, hope, self efficacy and resilience.

When Table 5 is examined, it can be seen that servant leadership have a significant effect on optimism (Adjusted R Square:,238, Sig:,000) so H1 hypothesis is accepted. This positive relationship is established through the subdimensions of altruism and servanthood. There is also a meaningful relationship between servant leadership and self efficacy (Adjusted R Square:,048, Sig:,000) and this positive effect occured owing to the positive effect of servanthood dimension on self efficacy, there is also a positive relationship between servant leadership and resilience but it is rather a weak one through servanthood (Adjusted R Square:,048, Sig:,005) and servant leadership has a positive effect on hope again through servanthood (Adjusted R2 :,221, sig:,000) So, regression results also confirm H2, H3 and H4. It is noteworthy that all the positive effect of servant leadership occured on psychological capital has came about through the subdimension of servanthood rather than the other four subdimensions, that are wisdom, emotional healing, altruism, persuasion. Servanthood seem to have a more encompassing effect among all these dimensions that shadows the others. And in the fifth model we can see the positive effects of psychological capital on productivity (Adjusted R2 :,238, sig:,000), through all the subdimensions of psychological capital except self efficacy supporting the H5, H7 and H8 hypothesis. When we look at the model in general we can say talk about a positive effect of servant leadership on psychological capacity of followers and again a positive effect of psychological capacity on productivity which confirms our suggestions regarding the hypothesis.

Effects of Servant Leadership on Psychological Capitals and Productivities of Employees

Independent Variable	Psychological Capital (Optimism)		Psychological Capital (Self Efficacy)		Psychological Capital (Resilience)		Psychological Capital (Hope)		Productivity	
	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t
Constant	2,114	7,992	3,418	17,395	2,948	12,281	2,388	12,38	1,329	3,693
SL_Wisdom	-0,166	-1,948	0,045	0,709	0,071	0,919	0,079	1,265	…..	
SL_Emotional Healing	0,13	1,757	0,007	0,127	0,007	0,11	0,045	0,839		
SL_Altruism	0,244	3,645**	-0,028	-0,566	-0,003	-0,058	-0,007	-0,151		
SL_Persuasion	0,003	0,027	-0,003	-0,047	0,04	0,453	0,094	1,324		
SL_Servanthood	0,218	2,275**	0,179	2,508**	0,14	1,607*	0,211	3,01**		
PC_Optimism									0,256	4,27**
PC_Self efficacy									-0,054	-0,514
PC_Resilience									0,214	2,613**
PC_Hope									0,264	2,824**
F	19.974		3.470		3.440		14.798		19.974	
Adjusted R Square	0.238		0.048		0.048		0.221		0.238	
Sign.	0.000		0.000		0.005		0.000		0.000	

7.Discussion

As Greenleaf proposed, servant leadership is about serving a the benefits of others, especially the followers over leaders' self-interest. Servant leaders are talented leaders in finding way for the flourishing of their followers, for creating a supportive, encouraging and challenging work climate (Van Dierendonck and Patterson, 2015: 127). Servant leaders incorporates behaviours that are effective and positively deviant, contributing to strong trust and empowerment (Hanse, Harlin, Jarebrant, Ulin & Winkel, 2016: 5). They, tend to be deeply committed to their followers' spiritual, personal and professional development (Joseph and Winston, 2004:10) that increases effects of their psychological capacities on productivity. For example; in Melchar and Bosco (2010) servant-leader behaviors have found to be effecting organizational performance. In another study, In Liden, Wayne, Liao, and Meuser (2014) found that servant leaders guide followers' attitude towards prioritizing the needs of customers above their own has been tested. They saw that servant leadership behaviors create a serving culture among followers, which directly influences unit performance. Namely, their study confirmed that serving culture has been positively related both to corporate performance and employee performance. In another study, which is applied in Turkey, Baykal, Zehir and Köle (2018) investigated effects of servant leadership on 527 white-collar workers. Their results proved that servant leadership affects empowerment and gratitude feelings of followers positively, and these feelings in turn affect innovativeness and performance of the organization.

Although scarce in numbers, there are studies confirming effects of servant leadership on group level performance. For example; in Sousa and Van Dierendonck's study, showed that this positive leadership style has a positive effect on group level performance. Similarly, Huang et al. (2016) applied a study in Chinese context and found that servant leadership had a positive effect on firm performance through service climate in tourism industry. In another study, Song, Park and Ryan (2015), found positive effects of servant leadership on knowledge-sharing climate; and they showed that knowledge-sharing climate had a mediator effect in the relationship between servant leadership and team performance.

As Laub (1999) and Parolini (2005) claims in this study we supposed that organizations that led by servant leadership can create a healthy, servanthood-focused organizational culture will increase the capabilities of both their followers and contribute to their psychological capitals that in return will allow the employees exercise their own abilities more conveniently. Although we did not investigated the direct effect of servant leadership on productivity as in the examples given above, we found a positive effect of servant leadership on psychological capital which in turn effect employee productivity that creates higher performance.

According to positive organizational behavior scholars psychological capital has a considerable positive effect on employee productivity (Larson and Luthans, 2009: 79). It has the tendency to improve individual's power to combat

with difficulties of life and to perceive one's own strength more self confidently. Individuals that have higher psychological capital are often more prone to conceive world more positively, thus they feel more self-efficant in accomplishing their tasks. In the extant literature there are various studies explaining the effects of psychological capital on high performance and efficiency. For example; Avolio, Avey and Norman's (2007) study provided evidence for positive constructs such as hope, resilience, efficacy, and optimism having a shared link which can be considered as a second order factor and named as psychological capital that can be measured and related to performance and satisfaction. Furthermore, a recent metaanalysis of Avey, Reichard, Luthans, & Mhatre, 2011 showed that psychological capital has an important affect on desired work attitudes and satisfactory levels of performance. Empirical evidence from the Chinese factory workers study (Luthans et al., 2005) showed that psychological capital concepts namely, hope, optimism, and resilience each relates positively to performance outcomes. But, in this study the combination of these factors, namely psychological capital as a second order factor showed a higher relationship than any one of them individually.

Although scarce in numbers, as in the case in our study, there are also studies showing effects of servant leadership on productivity via some of the subdimensions of psychological capital. For example; in Bande et al.'s (2016) study, providing insight into the effect of servant leadership in salespersons' proactive and adaptive behaviors was aimed. The study applied on 145 industrial salespeople in Spain showed that servant leadership increases salespeople's adaptivity and proactivity through its positive effects on self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation thus contributing to higher performance. Interestingly in our study, in comparison to Bande et al.'s study we could not find a positive relationship between self efficacy and productivity. In sum, our results confirms the results of empirical studies in the extant literature, but further studies are needed to test the possible mediator and moderator effects of psychological capital in servant leadership- productivity or performance relationship.

Managerial Implications and Limitations of the Study

In positive organizational behavior authentic leadership style is regarded as the most congruent type of leadership style owing to its positive effects on followers. Most scholars are convincted that psychological capacities of individuals in an organizatonal setting can be increased through proper leadership styles and it is pervasively confirmed that authentic leadership is a proper leadership style in increasing this capacity. But we believed that a serving attitude and a more intense human focus would also increase psychological capacities of individuals and would result in higher productivity. Our analysis confirmed this supposition and give extra credit for the belief that servant leadership can also be accepted among the positive leaadership styles that can contribute to higher psyhological capitals on the side of followers. Our results can inspire leaders in profit and non profit organizations and may encourage them to adopt a more

benevolent, supportive and serving attitude in their relationships with their followers without the fear of losing money because of this caring and human-focused attitude. Namely, this study confirmed that being kind and serving followers is not a hindrance for more productive followers.

On the one hand, the study also have some limitations. First of all the field research of the study has been applied in a limited geography and in a limited number of industries. A more encompassing sample can be used in further studies. Moreover, the model can be designed in a more comprehensive manner including a myriad of alternative positive organizational outputs such as organziational citizenship, organziaitonal commitment, job satisfaction, lower turnover and absenteism levels etc. Also cross cultural studies can be designed in order to make benchmarks among different cultures.

References

Abbas, M., & Raja, U. (2015). Impact of psychological capital on innovative performance and job stress. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, *32*(2), 128-138.

Al Hila, A. A., & Al Shobaki, M. J. (2016). The Role Of Servant Leadership In Achieving Excellence Performance In Technical Colleges-Provinces Of Gaza Strip. *International Journal of Management Research and Business Strategy*, *6*(1), 69-91.

Alessandri, G., Consiglio, C., Luthans, F., & Borgogni, L. (2018). Testing a dynamic model of the impact of psychological capital on work engagement and job performance. *Career Development International*, *23*(1), 33-47.

Avey, J. B., Reichard, R. J., Luthans, F., & Mhatre, K. H. (2011). Meta-analysis of the impact of positive psychological capital on employee attitudes, behaviors, and performance. *Human resource development quarterly*, *22*(2), 127-152.

Bande, B., Fernández-Ferrín, P., Varela-Neira, C., & Otero-Neira, C. (2016). Exploring the relationship among servant leadership, intrinsic motivation and performance in an industrial sales setting. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, *31*(2), 219-231.

Bandura A. (1997). *Self-self efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

Bandura A. (1998). Personal and collective efficacy in human adaptation and change. In Adair JG, Belanger D, Dion KL (Eds.), *Advances in psychological science, Vol. 1: Personal, social and cultural aspects* (pp. 51–71). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.

Barroca, A., Neto, C., & Silveira, A. (2017). Servant leadership through arts–a state of the art. *Review of Business and Legal Sciences/Revista de Ciências Empresariais e Jurídicas*, (29), 181-193.

Baykal, E. (2018). Promoting Resilience Through Positive Leadership During Turmoil. International Journal of Management and Administration, 2(3), 34-48.

Baykal, E. (2019) "Rol-içi ve Rol-Üstü Performansın İşyeri Ruhsallığı ile Arttırılması." *Uluslararası Hukuk ve Sosyal Bilim Araştırmaları Dergisi,* 1(1), 15-25.

Baykal, E., & Zehir, C. (2018). Mediating effect of psychological capital on the relationship between spiritual leadership and performance. *Economics and Management*.

Baykal, E., Zehir, C., & Kole, M. (2018). Effects of Servant Leadership on Gratitude, Empowerment, Innovativeness and Performance: Turkey Example. *Journal of Economy Culture and Society*, *57*, 29-52.

Boyatzis, R. E., Smith, M. L., & Blaize, N. (2006). Developing sustainable leaders through coaching and compassion. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 5, 8–24.

Carmona–Halty, M., Salanova, M., Llorens, S., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2018). How Psychological Capital Mediates Between Study–Related Positive Emotions and Academic Performance. *Journal of Happiness Studies*,1-13.

Dede, N. P., & Ayranci, E. (2014). Exploring the connections among spiritual leadership, altruism, and trust in family businesses. *Quality & Quantity*, 48(6), 3373-3400.

George, W. (2003). Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. New York: Paulist Press.

Greenleaf, R. K. 1970. *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis: Robert K. Greenleaf Center.

Hanse, J. J., Harlin, U., Jarebrant, C., Ulin, K., & Winkel, J. (2016). The impact of servant leadership dimensions on leader–member exchange among health care professionals. *Journal of nursing management*, *24*(2), 228-234.

Harju, L. K., Schaufeli, W. B., & Hakanen, J. J. (2018). A multilevel study on servant leadership, job boredom and job crafting. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *33*(1), 2-14.

Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, *44*(2), 501-529.

Hsiao, C., Lee, Y. H., & Chen, W. J. (2015). The effect of servant leadership on customer value co-creation: A cross-level analysis of key mediating roles. *Tourism Management*, *49*, 45-57.

Huang, J., Li, W., Qiu, C., Yim, F. H. K., & Wan, J. (2016). The impact of CEO servant leadership on firm performance in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *28*(5), 945-968.

Hur, W. M., Rhee, S. Y., & Ahn, K. H. (2016). Positive psychological capital and emotional labor in Korea: the job demands-resources approach. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *27*(5), 477-500.

Kouzes, J.M. and Posner, B.Z. (1993), Credibility: How Leaders Gain and Lose It, Why People Demand It, JosseyBass Publishers, San Francisco, CA.

Lapointe, É., & Vandenberghe, C. (2018). Examination of the relationships between servant leadership, organizational commitment, and voice and antisocial behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *148*(1), 99-115.

Larson, M., & Luthans, F. (2006). Potential added value of psychological capital in predicting work attitudes. *Journal of leadership & organizational studies*, *13*(2), 75-92.

Li, Y., Wang, Z., Yang, L. Q., & Liu, S. (2016). The crossover of psychological distress from leaders to subordinates in teams: The role of abusive supervision, psychological capital, and team performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *21*(2), 142.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Liao, C., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *57*(5), 1434-1452.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., Wu, J., & Liao, C. (2015). Servant leadership: Validation of a short form of the SL-28. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *26*(2), 254-269.

Luthans F, Avolio B, Walumbwa F, Li W. (2005). The psychological capital of Chinese workers: Exploring the relationship with performance. *Management and Organiza- tion Review, 1*, 247–269.

Luthans F. (2002a). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 695–706.

Luthans F. (2002b). Positive organizational behavior: Developing and managing psychological strengths. *Academy of Management Executive, 16*, 57–72.

Luthans, F., & Jensen, S. M. (2002). Hope: A new positive strength for human resource development. *Human resource development review*, *1*(3), 304-322.

Luthans, F., & Youssef-Morgan, C. M. (2017). Psychological capital: An evidence-based positive approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *4*, 339-366.

Luthans, F., & Youssef, C.M. (2007). Emerging positive organiza- tional behavior. Journal of Management, 33(3), 321–349.

Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel psychology*, *60*(3), 541-572.

Luthans, F., Norman, S. M., Avolio, B. J., & Avey, J. B. (2008). The mediating role of psychological capital in the supportive organizational climate—employee performance relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior:*

The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, *29*(2), 219-238.

Luthans, F., Norman, S. M., Avolio, B. J., & Avey, J. B. (2008). The mediating role of psychological capital in the supportive organizational climate—employee performance relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *29*(2), 219-238.

Luthans, F., Youssef, C.M., & Avolio, B.J. (2007). Psychological capital. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Masten AS. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist, 56*, 227–239.

Mathe, K., Scott-Halsell, S., Kim, S., & Krawczyk, M. (2017). Psychological capital in the quick service restaurant industry: a study of unit-level performance. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *41*(7), 823-845.

McMurray, A. J., Pirola-Merlo, A., Sarros, J. C., & Islam, M. M. (2010). Leadership, climate, psychological capital, commitment, and wellbeing in a non-profit organization. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *31*(5), 436-457.

McQuiston, D. H. (2018). Blending Customer-Orientated Sales, Servant Leadership, and Biblical Principles of Servanthood into a New Sales Framework: The Serving Salesperson. *Christian Business Academy Review (CBAR)*, *13*.

Meneghel, I., Salanova, M., & Martínez, I. M. (2016). Feeling good makes us stronger: How team resilience mediates the effect of positive emotions on team performance. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *17*(1), 239-255.

Narcıkara, E. (2017). *Spiritüel Liderlik Davranışının Algılanan Performans Üzerine Etkisi (Doktora Tezi).* Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Ortega-Maldonado, A., & Salanova, M. (2018). Psychological capital and performance among undergraduate students: the role of meaning-focused coping and satisfaction. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *23*(3), 390-402.

Ozturk, A., & Karatepe, O. M. (2018). Frontline hotel employees' psychological capital, trust in organization, and their effects on nonattendance intentions, absenteeism, and creative performance. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 1-23.

Panaccio, A., Henderson, D. J., Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Cao, X. (2015). Toward an understanding of when and why servant leadership accounts for employee extra-role behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *30*(4), 657-675.

Parris, D.L., & Peachey, J.W. (2013) A systematic literature review of servant leadership theory in organizational contexts. Journal of Business Ethics, 113, 377-393.

Patterson, K. (2010). Servant leadership and love. In D. van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), Servant leadership, devel- opments in theory and research (pp. 67–76). Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Peterson, S. J., Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Zhang, Z. (2011). Psychological capital and employee performance: A latent growth modeling approach. *Personnel Psychology*, *64*(2), 427-450.

Reinke, S. J. (2004). Service before self: Towards a theory of servant-leadership. *Global Virtue Ethics Review*, *5*(3), 30-57.

Russell, R. F. (2001). The role of values in servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *22*(2), 76-84.

Russell, R. F., & Gregory Stone, A. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *23*(3), 145-157.

Ryan, K.D. and Oestreich, D.K. 1998), Driving Fear out of the Workplace: Creating the High- trust, High-performance Organization, Jossey- Bass, San Francisco, CA.

Seligman MEP, Steen TA, Park N, Peterson C. (2005). Positive psychology progress: Empirical validation of interventions. *American Psychologist, 60*, 410–421.

Sheldon K, King L. (2001). Why positive psychology is necessary. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 216–217.

Snyder CR. (2000). *Handbook of hope*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Snyder CR. (2002). Hope theory: Rainbows in the mind. *Psychological Inquiry, 13*(4), 249–276.

Snyder, C. R. (Ed.). (1997). *Hope for the journey: Helping children through good times and bad*. Basic Books (AZ).

Song, C., Park, K. R., & Kang, S. W. (2015). Servant leadership and team performance: The mediating role of knowledge-sharing climate. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, *43*(10), 1749-1760.

Van Dierendonck, D., & Patterson, K. (2015). Compassionate love as a cornerstone of servant leadership: An integration of previous theorizing and research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *128*(1), 119-131.

Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., & Oke, A. (2011). Authentically leading groups: The mediating role of collective psychological capital and trust. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32(1), 4-24.

Wang, H., Sui, Y., Luthans, F., Wang, D., & Wu, Y. (2014). Impact of authentic leadership on performance: Role of followers' positive psychological capital and relational processes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *35*(1), 5-21.

Wong, P. T., & Page, D. (2003). Servant leadership: An opponent-process model and the revised servant leadership profile. In *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*.