

Servant Leadership and Voice Behavior in Higher Education

Yükseköğretimde Hizmetkâr Liderlik ve Dile Getirme Davranışı

Hakan ERKUTLU *, Jamel CHAFRA **

ABSTRACT: This study examines the relationship between servant leadership and voice behavior and the mediating roles of psychological empowerment and psychological safety on that relationship in higher education. The study sample encompasses a total of 793 faculty members along with their deans from randomly selected 10 state universities in İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Kayseri, Konya, Bursa, Samsun and Gaziantep during 2012-2013 spring semester. Faculty member's perceptions of psychological empowerment, psychological safety and voice behavior were measured using the psychological empowerment scale developed by Spreitzer (1995), the psychological safety scale developed by Edmondson (1999) and van Dyne and LePine's (1998) voice behavior scale respectively. Ehrhart's (2004) servant leadership scale was used to assess faculty dean's perception of the servant leadership. The results revealed a significant positive relationship between servant leadership and voice behavior and mediating roles of psychological empowerment and safety on that relationship.

Keywords: servant leadership, voice behavior, psychological empowerment, psychological safety

ÖZ: Bu çalışmanın amacı yüksek eğitimde hizmetkâr liderlik ve dile getirme davranışı arasındaki ilişkiyi ve bu ilişkide psikolojik güçlendirme ve psikolojik güvenlik kavramlarının aracılık rollerini araştırmaktır. Bu çalışmanın örneklemini 2012-2013 ilkbahar döneminde İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Kayseri, Konya, Bursa, Samsun ve Gaziantep'te rastlantısal yöntemle seçilen 10 devlet üniversitesindeki 793 öğretim üyesi ve onların dekanları oluşturmaktadır. Öğretim üyelerinin psikolojik güçlendirme, psikolojik güvenlik ve dile getirme davranışları sırasıyla Spreitzer (1995) tarafından geliştirilen psikolojik güçlendirme ölçeği, Edmondson (1999) tarafından geliştirilen psikolojik güvenlik ölçeği ve van Dyne ve LePine'in (1998) dile getirme davranışı ölçeği kullanılarak ölçülmüştür. Fakülte dekanlarının hizmetkâr liderlik algılamalarını değerlendirmek için Ehrhart'ın (2004) hizmetkâr liderlik ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Sonuçlar hizmetkâr liderlik ile dile getirme davranışı arasında olumlu ve önemli bir ilişki ve bu ilişkide psikolojik güvenlik ve psikolojik sözleşme tatmin kavramlarında aracılık rolleri bulunduğunu göstermiştir.

Anahtar sözcükler: hizmetkâr liderlik, dile getirme davranışı, psikolojik güçlendirme, psikolojik güvenlik

1. INTRODUCTION

Business leadership literature's interest has mainly concentrated on leaders who set aside self-interest for the betterment of their followers and organizations (George, 2003). In regard to this, organizations have focused on the scientific study of positive human qualities. Although dysfunctional behaviors of individuals are still of research interest, much remains to be learned about humans' capacity to engage in positive behaviors (Cameron, Dutton, and Quinn 2003). In the current investigation, leader behaviors that are based on serving the needs of their followers and organizations were explored.

For an organization to achieve effectiveness, it is imperative that the unique talents of its employees be recognized, utilized, and developed. Leaders can play a critical role in helping employees to realize their potential (Liden, Wayne and Sparrowe, 2000). An approach to leadership called servant leadership focuses on developing employees to their fullest potential in the areas of task effectiveness, community stewardship, self-motivation, and future leadership capabilities (Greenleaf, 1977).

* Associate professor, Nevsehir University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, erkutlu@nevsehir.edu.tr

** Lecturer, Bilkent University School of Applied Management and Technology, jamel@tourism.bilkent.edu.tr

Despite the growing popularity of servant leadership practice and the emergence of a promising stream of researches affirming its potential utility in organizations (Hunter, Neubert, Perry, Witt, Penney and Weinberger, 2013), most researches, to date, has focused on construct development (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006; van Dierendonck, 2011). There remains a need to better understand the scope and magnitude of the influence that servant leadership has on a range of multilevel outcomes such as organizational commitment, citizenship behavior and voice behavior. Further, more advanced research designs and more comprehensive explorations of antecedents and outcomes are necessary to help scholars and managers better understand how to apply best servant leadership and what benefits can be expected from an emphasis on this particular leadership style.

The aim of this study is to examine the mediating effects of psychological empowerment and psychological safety on the relationship between servant leadership and employee voice behaviors in universities. This study makes several contributions to the servant leadership and voice behavior literature as well as in the organizational behavior field. First, it uncovers psychological factors that may serve as mediators to the servant leadership-voice behavior relationship. Second, given that leadership behaviors and individual differences variables are central to most models of employee voice behavior (Detert and Burrell 2007), it is important to examine the direct and mediating effects of both leadership behaviors and individual factors in a single study.

Therefore, the pursuit of the identification of the major individual differences variables leading faculty members to voice behaviors may give us some concrete ideas in terms of possible remedies for both faculty members and educational institutions.

1.1. Servant Leadership and Voice Behavior

Servant leadership is based on the premise to bring out the best in their followers. Leaders rely on one-on-one communication to understand the abilities, needs, desires, goals, and potential of those individuals. With knowledge of each follower's unique characteristics and interests, leaders can assist followers in achieving their potential. This encouragement is done through building self-confidence (Lord, Brown and Freiberg, 1999), serving as a role model, inspiring trust, and providing information, feedback, and resources. Servant leadership differs from traditional approaches to leadership in that it stresses personal integrity and focuses on forming solid long-term relationships with employees. It also is unique in that it extends outside the organization—servant leaders serve multiple stakeholders, including their communities and society as a whole (Graham, 1991). Servant leadership shows promise as a way to build trust with employees (Liden, Wayne, Zhao and Henderson, 2008).

Employee's trust in his or her leader can be defined as a psychological state involving positive expectations about the leader's intentions or behaviors with respect to oneself in situations entailing risk (Premeaux and Bedeian, 2003). Considering the sources of such trust perceptions, Mayer, Davis and Schoorman (1995) provided a model proposing that when followers believe their leaders have ability, benevolence, and integrity, they will be more comfortable engaging in behaviors that put them at risk. Following this theoretical analysis of the role of trust in risk taking, trust is the “willingness to take risk”, and the level of trust is an indication of the amount of risk that one is willing to take (Schoorman, Mayer and Davis, 2007). Consistent with this perspective on the facilitative effect of trust, many studies have documented that when employees trust their leaders, positive work outcomes result; for example, cooperation, organizational citizenship behaviors, enhanced group performance and organizational performance (Dirks, 2000). Because speaking up with comments and suggestions about

workplace issues can be a risky endeavor, perceptions of leader trust may also play an important role in employees' decisions to voice in the context of the workgroup.

Given the risks associated with employees' voice and due to the power that leaders hold over employees' resources and outcomes, trust in leader may play an important role in employees' decisions to voice their opinions (Premeaux and Bedeian, 2003). In literature, the arguments for a direct and positive effect of trust on risk-taking behavior are straightforward (Dirks and Ferrin, 2002). Specifically, the more employees trust their leader, the more likely they will feel safe and comfortable about the ways in which their leader will respond towards their voice behavior. In turn, this should increase their willingness to actually engage in expressing their concerns and opinions. In contrast, having low levels of leader trust is likely to inhibit the willingness of employees to accept vulnerability towards their leader, which, in turn, decreases the likelihood that one will take the risk of engaging in voice behaviors. Thus, employees' perceptions of the trustworthiness of their leader should promote their voice behavior. Accordingly, it is expected that servant leadership will positively relate to employee voice behavior by building trust in leader.

Hypothesis 1: Faculty members' perceptions of their dean's servant leadership will be positively related to faculty members' voice behavior.

1.2. The Mediating Roles of Psychological empowerment and Psychological safety on the relationship between Servant leadership and Voice Behavior

Psychological safety refers to individuals' perceptions of the consequences of taking interpersonal risks in their work environment (Edmondson, 2004; Kahn, 1990). It can be regarded as a psychological climate, a property of individuals denoting their perception of the psychological impact that the work or study environment has on his or her personal wellbeing (James and James, 1989). Proponents of psychological climate theory posit that individuals respond primarily to cognitive representations of environments "rather than to the environments per se" (James and Sells, 1981). Each individual constitutes his or her own psychological climate of the same environment. Perceptions may, nevertheless, differ based on personal belief systems and individual biases. We, therefore, consider psychological safety to operate on the individual-level.

Edmondson (2004) suggests that supportive leadership behavior can be particularly important in strengthening sense of psychological safety. Servant leaders are described as trustworthy and as treating their people with support, care, concern and fairness (van Dierendonck, 2011). First, by being accessible, servant leaders can promote psychological safety by breaking down the barriers, which prevent effective communication and discussion. Second, servant leaders' propensity to invite suggestions and inputs from their followers is likely to signal them that their feedback is valued and respected. This, in turn, should encourage employees to voice their opinions, thereby reinforcing their feelings of psychological safety.

Furthermore, Edmondson (2004:252) proposes that the existence of trusting relationships among team members can play a pivotal role in engendering feelings of psychological safety. She suggests that if the relationships between leader and employees are characterized by trust and mutual respect for each other, "individuals are more likely to believe that they will be given the benefit of the doubt – a defining characteristic of psychological safety". Servant leaders are more concerned with establishing trusting relationships with followers through solicitation of employees' ideas without any form of self-censorship (Errol and Bruce, 2005). They establish positive connections with followers, expressing concern and practicing two-way communication. They are seen as approachable, provide information about the values and principles behind

important organizational decisions, solicit input, and practice effective listening skills (Searle and Barbuto 2011). These behaviors appear closely tied to the openness, concern, and follower trust that play key roles in promoting feelings of psychological safety (May, Gilson and Harter, 2004).

When employees are free of fears and concerns about expressing their opinions, the perceived costs of speaking up are minimized. Consequently, the benefits of voice outweigh the costs, leading to a more positive evaluation of voice. In contrast, when psychological safety is lacking, employees feel that they cannot freely express themselves, and these fears and concerns cause employees to avoid publicly expressing their opinions and concerns (Zhao and Olivera, 2006). Consistent with this reasoning, perceptions of psychological safety have been reasoned to facilitate voice because such perceptions increase the ease and reduce the felt risk of presenting new ideas (Edmondson, 1999; Kahn, 1990). Therefore, based on the above arguments, we claim that psychological safety acts as an important mechanism through which servant leadership influences voice behavior.

Hypothesis 2: Employee perceptions of psychological safety partially mediate the relationship between servant leadership and voice behavior.

Empowerment has been posited as another mechanism through which servant leadership influences followers' behaviors (Russell and Stone, 2002). Psychological empowerment is conceptualized as a psychological state that encompasses four cognitions: competence, an individual's belief in his or her capability that he or she can be effective; impact, the degree to which an individual can influence strategic, administrative, or operating outcomes at work; meaningfulness, the value of a work goal or purpose, judged in relation to an individual's ideals or standards; and self-determination, an individual's sense of having choice in initiating and regulating actions. These cognitions act in concert to foster a proactive, self-confident orientation towards one's work (Spreitzer, 1995). Leaders matter because they create organizational cultures and practices that determine employees' degree of involvement in the decision-making processes. Servant leaders are described as understanding followers' needs for meaning in their work and the confidence that comes with being trusted to act with initiative and autonomy (van Dierendonck, Nuijten and Heeren, 2009). When leaders transparently share information and utilize followers' inputs in making decisions, followers are more likely to experience meaningfulness, impact, and self-determination in their work because they are taking more responsibility (Conger and Kanungo 1988; Thomas and Velthouse, 1990).

One of the most significant characteristics of servant leadership is empowering and developing people (van Dierendonck, 2011) which emphasizes the delegation of authority to increase intrinsic motivation, accentuating accountability by not only giving people clear goals to strive for but also holding them responsible for achieving these goals, and requiring managers to share knowledge and information to ensure that employees develop the necessary skills. In view of the available research and above logic, we expect a positive relationship between servant leadership and psychological empowerment.

There is also considerable empirical evidence showing empowerment is positively related to outcomes such as followers' commitment, involvement, work productivity, and performance at the individual and group/team levels (Spreitzer, Kizilos and Nason, 1997). Feelings of psychological empowerment have been positively related to voice behavior where individuals feel more responsibility for helping in ways that are not specified in their job descriptions (Frazier and Fainshmidt, 2012). Wat and Shaffer (2005) argued that a higher quality social exchange relationship experienced by more empowered individuals helped explain the relationship they observed between psychological empowerment and employee voice behavior.

It follows from the above discussion that psychological empowerment will help to mediate the relationship between servant leadership and voice behavior. Therefore, we propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Employee's perception of psychological empowerment partially mediates the relationship between servant leadership and employee voice behavior.

2. METHOD

2.1. Samples

The sample for this study was drawn from 10 state universities in Turkey. These universities were randomly selected from a list of 104 state universities in the country (Higher Education Council of Turkey, 2013).

This study was completed in April - May 2013. Participants were told that the study was designed to collect information on the faculty members' voice behaviors and their perceptions of faculty deans' servant leadership behavior 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 completed the voice behavior, psychological empowerment and psychological safety scales (63 - 133 faculty members per university, totaling 793). Those faculty members' deans completed the servant leadership scale (3 - 7 deans per university, totaling 46). In order to avoid same-source bias, Deans' reports of servant leadership were used instead of faculty members' reports. Fifty-three percent of the faculty members were female with an average age of 29.33 years. Moreover, 69 percent of the deans were male with an average age of 53.13 years. The response rate was 86 percent.

2.2. Measures

Psychological empowerment. Spreitzer's (1995) 12 items scale measuring four dimensions of psychological empowerment was used. The dimensions are meaning, competence, impact and self-determination. Sample items include "My job activities are personally meaningful to me", "I am confident about my ability in my job", "I can decide on my own on ways to finish my work" and "I could influence the decisions of my team". All participants were instructed to reflect on their perception of the climate on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (always). The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was .90 in this study.

Voice behavior. A six-item employee voice questionnaire developed and validated by van Dyne and LePine (1998) was used. Faculty members indicated how frequently each statement fitted their own behavior. Response scale ranged from "almost never" (1), to "almost always" (7). Sample items are "I develop and make recommendations concerning issues that affect this workgroup" and "I communicate my opinions about work issues to others in this group even if my opinion is different and others in the group disagree with me". A factor analysis for the voice behavior in this study was conducted and revealed that 6 items gathered under one factor and the total variance was .69. The Cronbach's α for the scale was .86 and the factor loads varied between .63 and .93 in the study.

Servant leadership. We assessed servant leadership from the dean's perspective with Ehrhart's (2004) 14-item measure. This scale included seven dimensions averaged together to

form one servant leadership score. Example items included “I create a sense of community among faculty members,” “I make the personal development of faculty members a priority,” and “I hold faculty members to high ethical standards”. A factor analysis for the servant leadership in this study was conducted. The principal components analysis method was used to extract a set of independent factors. The varimax rotation method was then applied to clarify the underlying factors. Factor analysis revealed that 14 items gathered under one factor and the total variance was .66. The Cronbach’s α for the scale was .91 and the factor loads varied between .66 and .89 in this study.

Psychological safety. Edmondson’s (1999) psychological safety scale was used. This measure assesses the extent to which a member in an organization feels psychologically safe to take risks, speak up, and discuss issues openly. Following the results of a factor analysis, we adopted five items from this scale. Responses were made on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (to a large extent). The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale was .83 in this study.

Control variables. We controlled faculty member’s *age and tenure*, as these could affect faculty member’s voice behavior (Janssen and Gao, 2013).

3. RESULTS

Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations and correlations for the study variables. Ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analyses were used to test the hypotheses in this study. The mediating roles of psychological safety and psychological empower were analyzed by using procedures for testing multiple mediation outlined by MacKinnon (2000). As a straightforward extension of Baron and Kenny’s (1986) causal step approach, this procedure involves estimating three separate regression equations. Since mediation requires the existence of a direct effect to be mediated, the first step in the analysis here involved regressing servant leadership on voice behavior and the control variables. The results presented in Table 2 (model 2) show that servant leadership is significantly and positively related to voice behavior ($\beta = .37, p < .001$), thus providing support for the direct effect of servant leadership on faculty member voice behavior (Hypothesis 1).

As the mediation hypotheses in this study imply that servant leadership is related to both psychological safety and psychological empowerment, the first part of the second step in the mediation analysis involved regressing psychological safety, psychological empowerment and the control variables on servant leadership. The results in Table 2 indicate that servant leadership has a significant, positive relationships with psychological safety ($\beta = .30, p < .001$) and psychological empowerment ($\beta = .32, p < .001$), thus offering support for the main effects of servant leadership on psychological safety and psychological empowerment.

In addition, as far as the mediation hypotheses are concerned, a positive relation between psychological safety or psychological empowerment and faculty members’ voice behaviors was presumed. The second part of the second step of the mediation analysis, therefore, involved regressing voice behavior on both psychological safety and psychological empowerment. Rather than performing a separate regression analysis for each affect-related variables, psychological safety and psychological contract fulfillment, they were simultaneously entered in a single regression analysis to correct any multicollinearity among these variables. The results reported in Table 2 (model 3) confirm the two presumed relationships. The results indicate that both psychological safety and psychological empowerment have significant and positive relationships to voice behavior ($\beta = .35, p < .001$; $\beta = .32, p < .001$ respectively).

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	29.16	1.26									
2. Faculty member's gender	.63	.37	.06								
3. Faculty member's tenure (years)	9.29	1.19	.23*	.04							
4. Dean's age	49.63	.89	.01	.04	.01						
5. Dean's gender	.73	.27	.03	.06	.03	.03					
6. Dean's tenure (years)	17.26	1.63	.09	.09	.04	.19*	.03				
7. Psychological safety	3.33	.86	.09	.03	.06	.10	.06	.07			
8. Psychological empowerment	3.91	.89	.11	.04	.09	.11	.07	.10	.32***		
9. Servant leadership	3.79	.69	.06	.09	.06	.12*	.03	.13*	.31***	.33***	
10. Voice behavior	3.66	.66	.13*	.05	.12*	.09	.06	.09	.36***	.34***	.39***

^a *n* = 591. * *p* < .05. ** *p* < .01. *** *p* < .001.

In the final step of the mediation analysis, voice behavior was regressed on servant leadership, psychological safety, psychological empowerment and the control variables. As predicted, the results (model 4) indicate that the significant relationship between servant leadership and voice behavior becomes non-significant when psychological safety and psychological empowerment are entered into the equation ($\beta = .10$, n.s.). At the same time, the effect of psychological safety ($\beta = .33$, $p < .001$) and psychological empowerment ($\beta = .30$, $p < .001$) on voice behavior remained significant. These results suggest that psychological safety and psychological empowerment mediate the relationship between servant leadership and voice behavior, a pattern of results that support Hypotheses 2 and 3.

Table 2: Results of the standardized regression analysis for the mediated effects of servant leadership via psychological safety and psychological empowerment^a

Variables	Voice behavior					
	Psychological safety	Psychological empowerment	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Faculty member's age	.06	.10	.12*	.11	.11	.09
Faculty member's gender	.03	.03	.05	.04	.03	.01
Faculty member's tenure	.05	.08	.12*	.10	.09	.06
Dean's age	.05	.09	.08	.07	.03	.03
Dean's gender	.03	.06	.05	.04	.03	.01
Dean's tenure (years)	.06	.10	.07	.06	.04	.03
Servant Leadership	.30***	.32***		.37***		.10
Psychological safety					.35***	.33***
Psychological empowerment					.32***	.30***
<i>R</i> ²	.31***	.33***	.23**	.26**	.28**	.31***
<i>Adjusted R</i> ²	.29**	.27**	.19**	.23**	.26**	.29**
<i>F</i>	6.23**	8.66**	2.63**	3.23**	4.68**	6.19**
ΔR^2	.13*	.12*	.09*	.06*	.04*	.03*

^a *n* = 591. * *p* < .05. ** *p* < .01. *** *p* < .001.

4. DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

To our knowledge, this is the first attempt to simultaneously test the role of psychological safety and psychological empowerment as to strengthen the understanding on how servant

leadership affects voice behavior. Our results showed that faculty dean's servant leadership was positively related to faculty members' psychological safety and psychological empowerment, which, in turn, were all positively related to faculty members' voice behavior. These results are consistent with previous researches suggesting that servant leadership is related to voice behavior (Liden et al. 2008; Premeaux and Bedeian, 2003) and psychological safety and empowerment have mediating effects (van Dierendonck, 2011; Wat and Shaffer, 2005).

It is generally considered that servant leaders develop close relationships with their subordinates and these relationships are characterized by high quality exchanges (high level of LMX quality), psychological safety and empowerment (Epitropaki and Martin, 2005). Such exchanges and psychological climate are characterized by mutual trust, respect and obligation (Kim, Bateman, Gilbreath and Andersson, 2009), by positive support, common bonds, open communication, shared loyalty (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995) and affection (Liden, Wayne and Stilwell, 1993). When employees observe that they receive support, trust, and other tangible and intangible benefits from their leaders, they develop an obligation to reciprocate with appropriate work attitudes, performance (Chullen et al., 2010) and voice behavior (Premeaux and Bedeian, 2003).

In today's workforce, employees with the best access to critical information are the most likely to succeed (Eisenberg and Goodall, 2004). Clearly, employees with higher quality relationships with their supervisor have the best access to quality information. This likely increases their commitment to the organization and satisfaction with their job and promotes voice behavior. All in all, as Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995:232) explain, "For those dyadic members who make it to the mature 'partnership' [high quality] stage, the payoffs can be tremendous".

In a similar vein, results of this study have organization-level implications. As Wheatley (2001) notes, quality relationships and quality information sharing which are the main characteristics of servant leadership are crucial to overall organizational functioning. Practitioners in troubled organizations (e.g., those with high levels of workplace deviance, turnover, low levels of performance, morale and voice behavior) might examine the quality of the supervisor-subordinate relationships in their organizations to determine how that might be detracting from the dispersion of quality information throughout the organization. Although research consistently demonstrates the differentiated nature of leader-member relationships, scholars argue that such dynamics could exist in a more equitable fashion. As Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995:233) explain, "since [high quality] relationships are beneficial for dyadic members and organizations, managers should be encouraged and trained to make the offer of high quality relationship (partnership) building to *all* of their subordinates". The present findings suggest that this would mean managers should be encouraged to learn how to become a servant leader. Managers need also pay attention to employees' personality traits to improve the quality of the communication environment between management and employees, to stimulate employees' voice behaviors and to improve organizational effectiveness.

The main strength of this study was its multilevel research design which 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 servant leadership. In fact, measuring servant leadership from a secondary source would have allowed minimizing same-source bias. This would have happened that authors of this study used faculty deans' reports of servant leadership. Third, the use of a Turkish sample added to the growing literature examining job stress in non-Western settings.

This study has potential limitations as well. First, it is important to recognize limits to generalizability. This study was conducted on a sample of faculty members from state universities. Whether universities had private or state funding may have affected their leadership styles, organizational culture or management-employees relationships, which, in turn, could influence faculty members' voice behavior levels. It is also important to recognize that universities in the sample were all subject to regulations of the Turkish Higher Education Council, potentially limiting variability in some university-level practices. Therefore, the generalizability of study results to different branches of a single organization might be questioned. To provide evidence of generalizability, future related researches shall need to support study findings within other industries and occupational settings. Second, faculty members in the sample were not relatively young with an average age of 29 years old. Evidence suggests that older employees are more likely to engage in voice behaviors (Chullen et al. 2010). In this regard, study hypotheses could better be tested in settings in which faculty members are not only relatively new to the organization but also are engaged in the process of developing relationships. Third, because our study is cross-sectional by design, we cannot infer causality. Indeed, it is possible that, for example, psychological empowerment could drive perceptions of servant leadership as opposed to the causal order we predicted. Additionally, employing an experimental research design to address causality issues would be useful. For example, a lab study could aid in making causal claims for each of the specific mediators investigated in the present study. Finally, we did not control for other forms of related leadership theories. Future research could overcome this limitation by controlling for other styles of leadership that have been found to positively relate to servant leadership such as transformational leadership (Bass and Avolio 1994) or authentic leadership (Luthans and Avolio, 2003) to examine whether servant leadership explains additional unique variance.

In summary, despite the importance of servant leadership and its outcomes in organizations, research investigating the potential mechanisms through which servant leadership affects voice behavior has been lacking. This study makes an important contribution by examining how and why servant leadership is more effective in promoting employee voice behavior by highlighting the importance of psychological safety and empowerment. Thus, we provide a more complete picture on how to translate servant leader behavior into follower action such as increased voice behavior. We hope the present findings will stimulate further investigations into the underlying mechanisms and the conditions under which servant leadership relates to various individual and group outcomes.

5. REFERENCES

- Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management, 31*, 300-326.
- 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*(6), 1173-1182.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., & Quinn, R. E. (2003). *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chullen, C., Benjamin, D., Angermeier, B., Ingo, B., Wayne, B., & Alan, D. (2010). Minimizing deviant behavior in healthcare organizations: the effects of supportive leadership and job design. *Journal of Healthcare Management, 55*(6), 381-397.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review, 13*, 471-482.

- Detert, J., & Burris, E. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 869–884.
- Dirks, K. T. (2000). Trust in leadership and team performance: Evidence from NCAA basketball. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 1004–1012.
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 611–628.
- Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 350-383.
- Edmondson, A. C. (2004). Psychological safety, trust, and learning in organizations: a group-level lens. In R. M. Kramer & K. S. Cook (Eds.), *Trust and Distrust in Organizations: Dilemmas and Approaches* (pp. 239–272). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 61-94.
- Eisenberg, E., & Goodall, H. (2004). *Organizational communication: Balancing creativity and constraint*. Boston, MA: Bedford/ St. Martin's.
- Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2005). From ideal to real: A longitudinal study of the role of implicit leadership theories on leader member exchanges and employee outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4), 659-676.
- Errol, E. J., & Bruce, E. W. (2005). A correlation of servant leadership, leader trust, and organizational trust. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 26(1), 6-22.
- Frazier, M. L., & Fainshmidt, S. (2012). Voice climate, work outcomes, and the mediating role of psychological empowerment: A multi-level examination. *Group and Organization Management*, 37, 691-715.
- George, W. (2003). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Graen, G., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multilevel multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Graham, J. W. (1991). Servant-leadership in organizations: Inspirational and moral. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2, 105-119.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Higher Education Council of Turkey (10 June 2013). *Üniversitelerimiz*. [Available online at: <http://www.yok.gov.tr/web/guest/universitelerimiz>], Retrieved on 10 June 2013.
- Hunter, E. M., Neubert, M. J., Perry, S. J., Witt, L. A., Penney, L. M., & Weinberger, E. (2013). Servant leaders inspire servant followers: Antecedents and outcomes for employees and the organization. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 316-331.
- James, L. A., & James, L. R. (1989). Integrating work environment perceptions: Explorations into the measurement of meaning. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 739–751.
- James, L. R., & Sells, S. B. (1981). Psychological climate: Theoretical perspectives and empirical research. In D. Magnusson (Ed.), *Toward a psychology of situations: An interactional perspective* (pp. 275-295). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Janssen, O., & Gao, L. (2013). Supervisory responsiveness and employee self-perceived status and voice behavior. *Journal of Management*, 17, 6-22.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 692-724.
- Kim, T., Bateman, T. S., Gilbreath, B., & Andersson, L. M. (2009). Top management credibility and employee cynicism: A comprehensive model. *Human Relations*, 62, 1435–1458.
- Liden, R., Wayne, S., & Stilwell, D. (1993). A longitudinal study on the early development of leader-member exchanges. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 662-674.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Sparrowe, R. T. (2000). An examination of the mediating role of psychological empowerment on the relations between job, interpersonal relationships, and work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 407–416.

- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 161–177.
- Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., & Freiberg, S. J. (1999). Understanding the dynamics of leadership: The role of follower self-concepts in the leader/ follower relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 78, 167–203.
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. (2003). Authentic leadership: A positive development approach. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 241–258). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- 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.
- May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 11–37.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, D. F. (1995). An integrative view of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709–734.
- Premeaux, S. F., & Bedeian, A. G. (2003). Breaking the silence: the moderating effects of self-monitoring in predicting speaking up in the workplace. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1537–1562.
- Russell, R., & Stone, G. A. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23, 145–157.
- Schoorman, F. D., Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (2007). An integrative model of organizational trust: Past, present and future. *Academy of management Review*, 32, 344–354.
- Searle, T. P., & Barbuto, J. E. (2011). Servant leadership, hope, and organizational virtuousness: a framework exploring positive micro and macro behaviors and performance impact. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 18(1), 107–117.
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 1442–1465.
- Spreitzer, G. M., Kizilos, M. A., & Nason, S. W. (1997). A dimensional analysis of the relationship between psychological empowerment and effectiveness, satisfaction, and strain. *Journal of Management*, 23(5), 679–704.
- Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An “interpretive” model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(4), 666–681.
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228–1261.
- Van Dierendonck, D., Nuijten, I., & Heeren, I. (2009). Servant leadership, key to follower well-being. In D. Tjosvold & B. Wisse (Eds.), *Power and interdependence in organizations* (pp. 319–337). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 108–119.
- Wat, D., & Shaffer, M. A. (2005). Equity and relationship quality influences on organizational citizenship behaviors. *Personnel Review*, 34(4), 406–422.
- Wheatley, M. J. (2001). *Leadership and the new science: Discovering order in a chaotic world*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishing.
- Zhao, B., & Olivera, F. (2006). Error reporting in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 1012–1030.

Uzun Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı psikolojik güvenlik ve psikolojik güçlendirme kavramlarının hizmetkâr liderlik ve dile getirme davranışı arasındaki ilişkideki aracı rollerini araştırmaktır. Bu amaç için şu sorulara yanıtlar aranmıştır: 1. Fakültede Dekanın hizmetkâr liderlik düzeyi ile öğretim üyelerinin dile getirme davranışları arasında bir ilişki var mıdır? 2. Dekanın hizmetkâr liderliği ile öğretim üyelerinin dile getirme davranışları

arasındaki ilişkide öğretim üyelerinin psikolojik güvenlik ve psikolojik güçlendirme düzeylerinin aracılık rolleri bulunmakta mıdır?

Bu çalışmanın kavramlarından birisi olan hizmetkâr liderlik kavramının özünde öncelikle, hizmet etme isteğinin olması yatmaktadır (Greenleaf, 1997). Bu konuda Bass (2000), hizmetkâr liderlerin hizmet etme isteği açısından “doğal” bir duyguya sahip olduklarına, liderlik yapmayı ise “bilinçli” olarak seçtiklerine değinmiştir. Greenleaf’a (1977) göre hizmetkâr liderler, önce liderlik yapan sonrasında hizmet eden liderlere oranla başkalarının öncelikli ihtiyaçlarını daha fazla tanımlamakta ve bunları karşılamak için daha fazla çaba göstermektedirler. Hizmetkâr lider, güvene ve ahlaki ilkelere bağlı, kendi çıkarlarından ziyade tüm ortakların (paydaşların) çıkarlarına hizmet etmeye odaklı, örgüte ve çalışanlarına uzun dönemli bağlılık duyan, alıcı değil verici olan bir davranış sergiler. Hizmet etme bilinci örgütün sınırlarını da aşmış, toplumsal anlamda ve tüm paydaşları da kapsayan bir kültür yaratma şekline dönüşür. Başka bir deyişle hizmetkâr liderler topluma fayda sağlama ve değer katma bilincini örgüt içerisinde yayarak, örgütün müşterileri ve diğer paydaşları da içine alan bir hizmet etme kültürü yaratmayı hedeflerler. Hizmetkâr liderlerin bütüncül bir dünya görüşüne sahip oldukları, örgütte amaca ulaşma yolunda çalışanlara odaklanarak onların gelişimlerine katkıda bulunmak için onlara sürekli ilham verdikleri görülmektedir. Hizmetkâr liderler çalışanlarının gelişimlerini güçlendirirken hem onların bağlılıklarını artırır hem de performansın yükselmesine neden olurlar (Dinçer ve Bitirim, 2007: 61). Çalışmanın diğer kavramı olan çalışanların dile getirme davranışı ise istek, ihtiyaç, beklenti, sorun, düşünce ve duyguların iş çevresi ile paylaşımı olarak tanımlanabilir.

Bu çalışmanın örneklemini 2012-2013 bahar döneminde İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Kayseri, Konya, Bursa, Samsun ve Gaziantep’te rastlantısal metotla seçilen 10 devlet üniversitesindeki 793 öğretim üyesi ve onların dekanları oluşturmaktadır. Çalışma Nisan-Mayıs 2013 tarihleri arasında tamamlanmıştır. Katılımcılara, çalışmanın yüksek eğitim işgücü içerisinde öğretim üyelerinin kendilerini ifade etme davranışları ve dekanlarının hizmetkâr liderlik düzeyleri konularında bilgi toplamak için tasarlandığı bildirilmiştir. Katılımın gönüllü olduğu ifade edilmiştir. Anketler hemen toplanılmıştır. Çalışmada toplam 922 öğretim üyesine psikolojik güvenlik, psikolojik güçlendirme ve dile getirme davranış anketleri verilmiş olup bunlardan 793 kişinin anketleri kullanabilecek durumda geri alınmıştır. Hizmetkâr liderlik anketi ise aynı deneklerinin tüm anketleri doldurdıkları zaman oluşabilecek ön yargıları engellemek için psikolojik güvenlik, psikolojik güçlendirme ve dile getirme davranış anketlerini dolduran öğretim üyelerinin bağlı bulunduğu fakülte dekanlarına doldurtulmuştur. Çalışmadaki öğretim üyelerinin %53’ü kadın olup yaş ortalaması 29.33 yıldır. Ayrıca dekanların %69’u erkek olup yaş ortalaması 53.13 yıldır. Anketlerin geri dönüş oranı %86’dır.

Bu çalışmada dört farklı anket kullanılmıştır. Öğretim üyelerinin psikolojik güçlendirme düzeyleri Spreitzer (1995) tarafından geliştirilmiş bulunan ve 12 maddeden oluşan psikolojik güçlendirme ölçeği kullanılarak ölçülmüştür. Ankette yer alan örnek maddeler “İşteki etkinliklerim kişisel olarak bana anlamlı gelir.”, “Görevlerimi tamamlamak için kendi kararlarımı veririm.” biçimindedir. Ankete verilen yanıtlar 1 (asla) ile 7 (her zaman) arasında değişmektedir. Anketin güvenilirlik katsayısı .90’dır. Öğretim üyelerinin psikolojik güvenlik düzeyini ölçmek için Edmondson (1999) tarafından geliştirilmiş olan psikolojik güvenlik anketi kullanılmıştır. Anket 5 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Bu maddeler çalışanların iş ortamında kendilerini rahat hissedip hissetmediklerini ve fikirlerini yöneticiden gelen bir tehdit olmadan söyleyip söyleyemeyeceklerini değerlendirmektedir. Anketin güvenilirlik katsayısı .83’dür. Dekanın hizmetkâr liderlik düzeyinin ölçümü için Ehrhart (2004) tarafından geliştirilmiş bulunan hizmetkâr liderlik ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Ölçek 14 maddeden oluşmakta olup: “Öğretim üyelerinin kişisel gelişimine öncelik tanırım.” örnek bir madde olarak verilebilir. Anket soruları 1 (kesinlikle katılmıyorum) ile 7 (tamamen katılıyorum) arasında bir ölçekte değerlendirilmiştir. Anketin güvenilirlik katsayısı .91’tür. Çalışmada kullanılan son anket van Dyne ve LePine (1998) tarafından geliştirilmiş bulunan ve 6 maddeden oluşan dile getirme davranış ölçeğidir. Ankette yer alan örnek maddeler “Çalışma grubunu etkileyen konularda öneriler yaparım.”, “Diğerlerinden farklı olsa bile iş ile ilgili konularda kendi fikirlerimi ifade ederim.” biçimindedir. Ankete verilen yanıtlar 1 (asla) ile 7 (her zaman) arasında değişmektedir. Anketin güvenilirlik katsayısı .86’dır.

Bu çalışmada, aracılık rollerinin test edilmesinde MacKinnon (2000) tarafından detayları açıklanan yöntem izlenilmiştir. Çalışmanın sonuçları, dekanların hizmetkâr liderlik düzeyleri ile öğretim üyelerinin

kendilerini ifade etme davranışları arasında olumlu bir ilişkinin varlığını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Ayrıca öğretim üyelerinin psikolojik güvenlik ve psikolojik güçlendirme düzeyleri, hizmetkâr liderlik ve dile getirme davranışı arasındaki olumlu ilişkide aracı rolleri göstermişlerdir.

Takipçilerin lidere güven duymasında liderlik tarzının ve lider davranışlarının önemi büyüktür. Liderlerin davranışları takipçilerin güven düzeyini belirler (Joseph ve Winston, 2005). Hizmetkâr liderlik ile ilgili tanımlarda da belirtildiği gibi “güven” hizmetkâr liderliğin merkezinde yer alan bir kavramdır. Hizmetkâr lider, meşruluğunu takipçilerin kendisine duyduğu güven ile kazanır. Hizmetkâr 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 (Liden ve diğerleri, 2008). Her bir çalışanın kendisine has (özgü) karakteristikleri ve ihtiyaçlarını anlayan hizmetkâr liderler, daha sonra çalışanlarına kendi potansiyellerini açığa çıkarmaları ve geliştirmeleri için destek verirler (Lord, Brown ve Freiberg, 1999). Kişisel potansiyelin ortaya çıkarılması, çalışanların kendine olan güvenlerinin ve benlik değerlerinin inşa edilmesi ile gerçekleşir.

Hizmetkâr liderler, kendileri de bir rol model olarak, kendileri ve çalışanları arasında bilgi, kaynak ve geribildirim akışını hızlandırarak karşılıklı güveni pekiştirirler. Yardımseverlik, destek ve kişisel ilgi hizmetkâr liderliğin en önemli unsurlarındandır ve liderin bu yardımsever davranışları lidere duyulan güveni pekiştirir. Ayrıca hizmetkar liderler, takipçilerini önceden bilgilendiren, onları kararlara katan ve inisiyatif veren, başka bir deyişle takipçilerini güçlendiren liderlerdir. Hizmetkâr liderlerin kişisel düzeyde astları ile ilgilenmeleri ve onların mesleki ve kişisel anlamda gelişimlerini takip etmeleri, etik değerlere uygun davranmaları ve dürüst olmaları da bire bir güven ile ilişkili unsurlar olarak çalışanların kendilerini herhangi bir endişe duymaksızın rahat bir biçimde ifade etmelerine yol açmaktadır.

Çalışmanın aracı rollerinden olan psikolojik güvenlik “bireylerin kendilerini rahat hissetmeleri ve herhangi bir korku veya tehdit olmaksızın kendilerini ifade edebilmeleri” (Edmondson, 1999; Kahn, 1990), psikolojik güçlendirme ise “dört algısal boyuttan oluşan (anlam, yetkinlik, özerklik ve etki) psikolojik bir durum” (Spreitzer, 1995) olarak kavramsallaştırılabilir. Buna göre; üstlenilen işin gerekleri ile çalışanın değerlerinin uyumlu olması (anlam), işin gereklerini yerine getirebilmek için çalışanın yeteneklerine inanç duyması (yetkinlik), işin yapılışında çalışanın inisiyatif kullanabilmesi (özerklik) ve yapılan işin örgütsel düzeydeki sonuçları etkileyebilme gücü (etki), çalışanlarda yüksek görev motivasyonu yaratmaktadır. Hizmetkâr liderler çalışanların kendilerini daha güvenli bir yönetim altında çalıştıklarını hissetmelerine ve kendilerini yaptıkları iş ile ilgili konularda kontrol ve karar verme inisiyatifine sahip olduklarını algılamalarına yol açıp bu durum çalışanların kendilerini herhangi bir korku ve endişe duymaksızın ifade etmelerine yol açacaktır.

Citation Information

Erkutlu, H., & Chafra, J. (2015). Servant leadership and voice behavior in higher education. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education [Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi]*, 30(4), 29-41.