Reassessing Innovative Work Behaviors during COVID-19 Pandemic: The Impacts of Workplace Spirituality and Psychological Safety Perception

Seçil TAŞTAN
Marmara Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi İşletme (İng) Bölümü
seciltastan@marmara.edu.tr

Serin İŞİAÇIK
FMV İskik Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Psikoloji Bölümü
serin.isiacik@isikun.edu.tr

ABSTRACT
Recent literature has shown the contributions of positivity in organizations, but less is known about the impact of spirituality and safety feelings as an extension of positive psychology on individuals' innovative work behaviors. Considering the COVID-19 pandemic outbreak, it is suggested that the conditions encouraging employees' perceptions and attitudes as well as their innovative work behaviors (IWBs) have been changed. Based on the positive psychology approach, workplace spirituality and psychological safety are seen as important factors on employees' IWBs. Therefore, this study aimed to examine the relationships among perceived workplace spirituality, psychological safety, and employees' IWBs within the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Employees working in different private sectors in Istanbul (N= 251) participated in the current research. The statistical analyses revealed that workplace spirituality contributed to employees' innovative behaviors, and psychological safety fully mediated this relationship. Based on the findings, practical and conceptual implications of this study are discussed and future directions are presented.
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Introduction
Within the last decades, organizations have faced the challenges of globalization, competition, changing structures, and the diversified workforce that lead them to act innovatively and differently. Together with a variety of challenging and fluctuating socioeconomic environmental factors, at the beginning of 2020, the whole world has encountered an unexpected situation. The outbreak of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) has been demanding for the world and organizations have to behave differently compared to the past. COVID-19 pandemic has created serious harms to the economics,
organizations, and society. Particularly, psychological problems of individuals, such as panic disorder, anxiety, and depression can be triggered due to the outbreak. Also, there have been discussions about public health systems and economies, after the expansion (McKibbin and Fernando, 2020; Qiu, Shen, Zhao, Wang, Xie, and Xu, 2020). It has been suggested that innovations with several new management practices can meet the rapidly changing demands of the environment (Fernando, Jabour, and Wah, 2019). For example, employees have been allowed to work in the home office and they have to find new methods to be able to work from home. Healthcare workers are expected to behave innovatively to find quick life-saving solutions in intense and challenging working conditions of the pandemic outbreak. In this context, employees’ innovative work behavior (IWB) and its prerequisites have gained more importance. Psychology and organizational behavior studies are valuable to understand innovative behaviors since the significance of individuals’ morale, health, and motivation was found to be related to positive organizational outcomes. In this respect, retaining creative individuals might be strategically advantageous for organizations (Riggio, 2012; Robbins and Judge, 2012). In addition to retaining qualified employees, forming a work atmosphere that leads employees to behave innovatively might be critical. Likewise, scholars provided the relationship between IWB and employee level variables (King and Anderson, 2002). It has also been argued that fostering IWB among employees depends on effective human resource management (HRM) practices (Newman, Donohue, and Eva, 2017). In this regard, IWB can be followed by successful implementations of HRM, new management perspectives, and employees’ positive effects (Seligman and Csikzentmihalyi, 2014). More specifically, positive psychology and positive organizational behavior approach (Luthans, 2002b) is in the scope of the current study to understand the psychological background of IWB.

As such, evaluating employees as human beings with their physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual needs is crucial in today’s management perspective. Past studies have confirmed that individuals who have experienced public health emergencies as the COVID-19 outbreak still have stress disorders, even if after the event is over (Low and Wilder-Smith, 2005). Therefore, psychological interventions in such crises are continuously considered by scholars and authorities. With this regard, workplace spirituality refers to the recognition of individuals’ inner life that is nourished by meaningful work with a feeling of community, and the social bond can play a preventive mechanism for employees’ stress and related negative emotions at least during work. This may lead to employees’ innovative behaviors which they would be able to find solutions to work problems that are directly or indirectly caused by such environmental issues. Previous studies also concluded that workplace spirituality increase employee engagement, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Saks, 2011), and creativity (Shinde and Fleck, 2015). In addition to the proposed findings from the past research, Pandey, Gupta and Gupta (2019) addressed the need for more empirical evidence regarding the relationship between workplace spirituality and organizational outcomes. Hence, the present study aims to find the relationship between workplace spirituality and IWB. As workplace spirituality may have important implications, another variable that is studied concerning IWB is employees’ psychological safety. For being one of the antecedents of employees’ psychological contract and organizational trust, psychological safety is a kind of interpersonal safety perception in the organizational context. Psychological safety perception may influence individuals to engage in typical discretionary behaviors, such as IWB. It is suggested that the higher the individuals perceive psychological safety, the higher the discretionary behaviors. In particular, psychological safety perception is regarded as a mediator variable between the organizational characteristics and employee outcomes (e.g., employee attitudes, motivation, performance) (Edmondson and Lei, 2014). From this point of view, the mediating role of psychological safety on the relationship between workplace spirituality and innovative work behaviors will be examined. A detailed review of the literature will be presented based on the previous assumptions.

**Literature Review and Conceptual Framework**

The remainder of the paper is organized by initially reviewing the foundation literature for the study and then providing the conceptual and empirical evidence supporting the relationships among the study variables leading to the proposition of hypotheses.
Innovative Work Behaviors and Workplace Spirituality

In today’s rapidly changing environment the ability of businesses to adopt the changes and to survive is partly dependent on their capability of innovation. In order to be innovative, employees’ IWB is crucial because employees carry out innovations during uncertain times where change, novelty, and challenge are needed (e.g., pandemic business context) (Çetinkaya and Gülbaşar, 2019). Within this respect, West and Farr (1990) described IWB as employees’ intentional and voluntary introduction and/or application of new ideas, products, processes, and procedures to the organizations and they initially stated two stages for IWB: “idea generation” and “idea implementation”. Further studies indicated four stages for IWB (De Jong and Den Hartog, 2008) as “idea generation” (developing new ideas and offering solutions for the problems), “idea promotion” (includes voice and share ideas to other people), “opportunity exploration” (an awareness of the opportunities in organizations), and “idea implementation” (utilizing new ideas in organizations).

It is generally assumed that employees need to have freedom and autonomy for being innovative. Creating such an environment in organizations would contribute to individuals IWB (De Jong and De Hartog, 2010). Especially, the presence of workplace spirituality can be a part of a positive work atmosphere. Thus, a few research has revealed the relationship between workplace spirituality and IWB recently (Pandey et al., 2019), since the concept of spirituality and its relations with workplace issues have received attention in the literature. Before that, classical management theories (e.g., Taylor’s scientific management) have been criticized for being against human nature by focusing on productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness in organizations, and the subsequent studies have stated that employees should be evaluated differently than the assumptions of the classical theory of management. However, the idea of focusing on employees’ psychology has been expanded among organizational scholars and practitioners (Tasselli, Kilduff, and Landis, 2018), and mental health discourses (e.g., ensuring the positivity to create a psychologically healthy workplace) have been the mostly studied areas in organizational psychology. According to this perspective, individuals bring their whole self to the organization, where they work for. This wholeness includes their personal beliefs, values, and strengths. Further, as an extension to those arguments, there have been researches and some implementations that showed employees’ wellness and positivity are related to the positive organizational outcomes (Alex Linley, Joseph, Harrington, and Wood, 2006; Taştan, 2016). In particular, positive psychology is a related concept for its focus on positivity and it is defined as “at the individual level it is about positive individual traits: The capacity for love and vocation, courage, interpersonal skill, aesthetic sensibility, perseverance, forgiveness, originality, future mindedness, spirituality, high talent, and wisdom.” (Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi, 2000, p. 5). As it can be seen in the definition, spirituality might be a part of the positivity in organizations. Thus, spirituality studies and applications are expected to provide new insights to organizations in a pandemic environment. The practices of workplace spirituality may contribute to employees’ positive emotions and can play as a preventive mechanism against stress in environmental crises. For example, some global organizations have started to apply meditation training and some spirituality-related practices (Gupta, Kumar, and Singh, 2014). The concept of ‘spirit’ comes from the word ‘soul’. Spirit is described as the basic feeling of being connected with one's complete self, others, and the entire universe (Howard and Welbourn, 2004). Individuals feel interconnected to other people and have a purpose when they feel spiritual (Mitroff and Denton, 1999, p. 83). Therefore, spiritual knowledge introduces individuals to their inner self, a quest for meaning and purpose in life (Seyyar and Evkaya, 2015). In the current study, workplace spirituality is defined based on Kinjerski and Skrypnek’s (2004) conceptualization. Accordingly, “spirit at work is a holistic experience where individuals share a sense of interconnectedness and common purpose, authenticity, alignment between their values and actions, feel good about what they do, are aware of a spiritual presence, a sense that they are contributing a to the common good and enjoy mystical moments” (Kinjerski and Skrypnek, 2004, p. 39). Furthermore, the sub-dimensions of the construct of workplace spirituality are indicated as “engaging work” (meaningful work), “mystical experience”, “sense of community”, and “spiritual connection”.

Particular perceptions and feelings that are related to workplace spirituality may have impacts on IWB, such as meaningful work, sense of community, and alignment with organizational values.
According to Gupta and colleagues (2014), organizations that have spirituality are differed from other organizations, because they are characterized by several positive qualities, such as self-transcendence and a sense of community. Similarly, the positive association between the spiritual characteristics of an organization and team-level innovative behavior was revealed in the literature (Pandey et al., 2019). The theoretical background of the relationship between workplace spirituality and IWB can be explained by the Social Exchange Theory (SET) framework. According to Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, and Dunham (1989), if employees feel worthwhile, important, and meaningful for their organizations, they are likely to engage in discretionary workplace behaviors as reciprocity. More specifically, individuals tend to evaluate their worth in a particular context or a specific relationship (Blau, 1964) and they feel that they get some benefits from their organizations through workplace spirituality, this enhances the positive attitudes and behaviors. Employees may also feel a sense of obligation to the organization (Rego and Cunha, 2008) and as an effect of obligation, employees sense an urge to benefit the organization through displaying IWB. Hence, according to the SET framework, if individuals' values are respected, individuals tend to develop positive work attitudes and behaviors (Afsar and Badir, 2017). Based on the SET (Blau, 1964) and the previous researches, the first hypothesis of the study is proposed as follows.

**H1**: Perceived workplace spirituality has a positive effect on the employees’ innovative work behaviors.

**The Mediating Role of Psychological Safety**

Organizational learning, adaptation, and innovation are more critical and complex processes enabling a system to adapt to environmental uncertainty and to develop a competitive advantage. Taken together, organizational survival and sustainability depend on how the organization learns, adapts, and responds to uncontrollable contingents in the environment. With that respect, employees are expected to be more flexible, adaptive, and open to learning and innovation, since the innovativeness and growth capacity of the organizations depend on how much their members are involved in decision-making, creative and innovative thinking, team learning, and collaboration. Fundamentally, employees’ involvement in joint decision-making, teamwork, collaborative works, and expression of different ideas stem from their psychological comfort and belief in being safe regarding the consequences of exposing self opinions. As Kahn (1990) described, psychological safety is the feeling of being able to show and employ one’s self without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status, or career. Thus, psychological safety perception lies behind an individual’s risk-taking behavior, engagement to changing work patterns, and expression of self opinions, whereas it reduces uncertainty avoidance and fear of rejection or criticism. The extensive literature provides...
conceptual and empirical links of the concept with employee attitudes and behaviors and organizational outcomes (e.g., Carmeli, Brueller and Dutton, 2009; Edmondson, 2018; Vandekerkhof, Steijvers, Hendriks and Voordeckers, 2018; Kanbur and Ay, 2020). The common argument of the previous works is that psychological safety is a psychological resource and it enhances individuals’ coping with uncertain conditions, responding to workplace changes, and joining in problem-solving and collaborative processes.

Turning back to the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, employees’ mental health and psychology should be discussed more than before. Individuals’ psychological states are realized as an important condition for both their positive affection as well as positive employee attitudes and behaviors in work. Taking into account its role in reducing stress and fear of self-presentation in knowledge sharing and participation in cooperative works, psychological safety perception is considerably needed in such kind of uncertain times. Likewise, the previous literature puts forward that psychological safety has an intervening role on the relationship between the employee antecedents and organizational level outcomes of information sharing, innovation, and performance (e.g., Carmeli, Sheaffer, Binyamin, Reiter-Palmon and Shimoni, 2014; Hirak, Peng, Carmeli, and Schaubroeck, 2012; Kostopoulos and Bozionelos, 2011; Newman et al., 2017; Siemsen, Roth, Balasubramanian and Anand, 2009; Walumbwa and Schaubroeck, 2009). Even though there is a gap in the organizational studies about the role of psychological safety on the relationship between workplace spirituality and IWB, some studies and theoretical frameworks might be used to explain this model. For instance, the sense of community as a dimension of workplace spirituality may affect individuals’ freedom of expression through the feeling of psychological safety. In other words, the interpersonal relations and the feeling of community reduce ineffective workplace conflicts, increases trust and psychological safety that leads to creativity (Deci, Connell and Ryan, 1989; Oldham and Cummings, 1996) and innovative behaviors (Carmeli, Gelbard and Gefen, 2010). Moreover, researchers indicated that individuals in high-performing work teams have the feeling of community and psychological safety, and individuals in these teams have a high work engagement (Delizonna, 2017). In line with these arguments, Chen and colleagues (2019) unveiled the role of psychological safety on the relationship between spiritual leadership and proactive workplace behavior. Furthermore, Hackman and Oldham’s (1976) theory can explain the role of psychological safety on the relationship between workplace spirituality and IWB. Based on the Job Characteristics Model (Hackman and Oldham, 1976), work characteristics affect employees’ organizational behaviors through their psychological states. Thus, work characteristics are evaluated as workplace spirituality, whereas employees’ psychological states can be psychological safety perceptions and IWB is one of the work outcomes that is affected by workplace spirituality and psychological safety perception. Accordingly, the following hypotheses of the study are suggested as follows.

H2: Perceived psychological safety has a positive effect on the employees’ innovative work behaviors.

H3: Perceived psychological safety has a significant mediating role in the relationship between perceived workplace spirituality and employees’ innovative work behaviors.

Based on the rationale above, the conceptual framework, presented in Figure 1, displays the suggested relationships.

![Figure 1. Suggested Conceptual Framework](image-url)
Methodology

In the following part of the study, the research method is described. First, the sampling method and the participants are displayed, then the measures utilized to assess the study variables are explained.

Participants and Procedure

The convenience sampling method was used in this research. 251 employees who were working in different private sectors in Istanbul, such as technology, Research, and Development (R&D), Telecommunications, Education, Bank-Finance, and Marketing participated in this research. The questionnaire survey has been performed via an online database between March 2020 and April 2020. The sample was composed of 139 (55.4%) females and 112 (44.6 %) males with an age of 29.11 (M), while 177 (70.5%) participants were single and 74 (29.5%) of them were married. A multi-item questionnaire on a six-point interval scale was used in this research and questionnaires were distributed through online forms. The participants initially completed the demographic questions that included their age, gender, industry, work experience, and educational background. The questionnaire continued with three scales to measure the main variables of this study: workplace spirituality, psychological safety, and innovative work behaviors (IWB). The items were rated on a 6-point interval scale ranging from “totally disagree” (1), to “totally agree” (6).

Measures

In this part, the measures are described by giving information about their sources and the sample items used in the current research context.

**Innovative Work Behaviors (IWBs):** IWBs were measured by 14 items that were developed by De Jong and Den Hartog (2010) and Scott and Bruce (1994) to analyze employees’ innovative behaviors in more detail. De Jong and Den Hartog’s (2010) scale was adapted to the Turkish language by Çimen and Yücel (2017), Scott and Bruce’s scale was translated to the Turkish by Çalışkan, Akkoç, and Turunç (2011). De Jong and Den Hartog’s (2010) scale measures four dimensions, including “problem recognition”, “idea generation”, “supporting ideas” and “idea implementation”, whereas all the items are collected under one factor in Scott and Bruce (1994)’s IWB scale. The internal consistency of De Jong and Den Hartog’s (2010) scale was found to be higher than .70 in their study. The previous studies indicated the reliability of the scale as .86 (Taştan and Davoudi, 2015). In addition, the internal consistency of Scott and Bruce’s (1994) scale was found as .89, while other studies revealed the Cronbach alpha of the scale as .87 (Taştan, 2013). An example of items from the scale was: “I pay attention to issues that are not part of your daily work and I wonder how things can be improved.”

**Workplace Spirituality:** The Workplace Spirituality Scale was developed by Kinjerski and Skrypnik (2006) and consists of 18 items. The scale has four dimensions that are “engaging work”, “sense of community”, “spiritual connection” and “mystical experience”. An item example from the scale was “I experience a real sense of trust and a personal connection with my coworkers.” The internal reliability of the scale was found as .93 in the original study. The Turkish translation of the scale was done by Ünal and Turgut (2015) and they found the internal consistency of the scale as .93.

**Psychological Safety:** Edmondson’s (1999) “Psychological Safety Scale” was utilized to assess individuals’ psychological safety. The scale has 7 items and the Turkish adaptation of the scale was done by both Üçok and Torun (2016) and Yener (2015). The Cronbach alpha value of the scale was found as .79 in Edmondson’s (1999) original study, also it was found as .93 in Üçok and Torun’s (2016) study. An example item from the scale was “It is difficult to ask other members of my organization for help.”
Findings

In this part, the research results are presented. First, the reliability and validity analyses outcomes are explained. Then, the reports of the correlation and regression analyses are displayed and statistical findings are highlighted by acknowledging the interpretations for the hypotheses.

Reliability and Validity Analyses

Initially, skewness and kurtosis values for each item of the scale were evaluated to check out the normality and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed for evaluating the construct validity of the scales (e.g. Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994; Şimşek, 2007). Cronbach's alpha was used for reliability assessment and the reliability of all the scales were more than 0.7, which indicated that all the scales demonstrated good reliability. The following Table 1 shows the factor analysis results of workplace spirituality scale. The below Table 1 presents the fitness indices of the study variables based on the CFA.

| Fitness indices | Innovative Work Behaviors | Workplace Spirituality | Psychological Safety | Principle |
|-----------------|---------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-----------|
| Chi-square/df   | 2.3774                    | 2.4155                 | 2.3362               | < 3       |
| p-value         | 0.00                      | 0.00                   | 0.00                 | < 0.05    |
| RMSEA           | 0.065                     | 0.062                  | 0.068                | < 0.10    |
| GFI             | 0.93                      | 0.92                   | 0.92                 | > 0.9     |
| AGFI            | 0.90                      | 0.91                   | 0.92                 | > 0.9     |

Note: IWB (χ²/df=2.37, sd=140, RMSEA=0.065, GFI=.93, AGFI=.90); Workplace Spirituality (χ²/df=2.41, sd=143, RMSEA=0.062, GFI=.92, AGFI=.91); Psychological Safety (χ²/df=2.33 , sd=142, RMSEA=0.068, GFI=.92, AGFI=.92).

It has been indicated that goodness-of fit indexes are expected to be equal to or greater than 0.90 to confirm the model and RMSEA is expected to be less than or equal or 0.05 to state that there is a good model fit. Lastly, when RMSEA is less than or equal to 0.08, an adequate fit is found (Schumacker and Lomax, 2004). The 14 items IWB scale was averaged for an overall score. Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was yielded as 0.96 in the research setting. The results of CFA showed that the fit index of the scale was acceptable (x2/df = 2.37, RMSA = .065, GFI = .93, AGFI = .90) (Çokluk, Şekerlioglu and Büyüköztürk, 2010). The reliability of the workplace spirituality scale was α = 0.93. The results of the CFA showed that the fit index of the scale was acceptable (x2/df = 2.41, RMSA= .062, GFI = .92, AGFI = .91). Moreover, the 7 items scale of psychological safety showed Cronbach’s Alpha as 0.96 and the CFA results revealed that the fit index of the scale was acceptable (x2/df = 2.33, RMSA = .068, GFI = .92, AGFI = .92). Thus, as can be seen in Table 1, the findings of the CFA of the variables demonstrated that all the mentioned criteria were measured with the scales. The results of CFA showed good fitness of the models, indicating that the selected indicators are good representatives for each component of the variables of the study.

Results of Correlation and Regression Analyses

Before regression analyses, the correlations among the research variables were assessed and the findings showed that workplace spirituality, psychological safety and IWB were statistically significantly and positively correlated with each other (p< .001). Descriptive statistics including means and standard deviations and correlations among the main variables are presented in Table 2.

|   | M  | SD  | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   |
|---|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Gender | 1  | .058** | -.077 | .101** | .133** | .095** |
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Reassessing innovative work behaviors during COVID-19 Pandemic: The impacts of workplace spirituality and psychological safety during COVID-19 pandemic: The impact of workplace spirituality and psychological safety on IWBs. Workplace spirituality items served as independent variables and the psychological safety measures were the intervening variables in the model. IWB items were used as the dependent variable. The results of regression analysis are reported in below Table 3.

Table 3
The Contribution of Workplace Spirituality on IWB and Psychological Safety

| Variable                     | \( \beta \) | Std. Error | t     | p     |
|------------------------------|-------------|------------|-------|-------|
| (Constant)                   | 3.100       | .203       | 15.281| .000***|
| Workplace Spirituality       | .360        | .049       | 7.282 | .000***|

\( R^2 = .176; F = 53.031; p < .001 \)

*\( p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 \) Dependent Variable: IWB

| Variable                     | \( \beta \) | Std. Error | t     | p     |
|------------------------------|-------------|------------|-------|-------|
| (Constant)                   | 2.388       | .251       | 9.512 | .000***|
| Workplace Spirituality       | .452        | .061       | 7.386 | .000***|

\( R^2 = .180; F = 54.553; p < .001 \)

*\( p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 \) Dependent Variable: Psychological Safety

As it is seen in Table 2, workplace spirituality is significantly and positively correlated with psychological safety (\( r = .424 \)) as well as IWB (\( r = .419; p = .01 \)) in a moderate magnitude. In addition, it is determined that psychological safety is positively related to individuals’ IWBs (\( r = .278; p = .01 \)). Furthermore, multiple regression analysis was used to determine the effects of workplace spirituality and psychological safety on IWBs. Workplace spirituality items served as independent variables and the psychological safety measures were the intervening variables in the model. IWB items were used as the dependent variable. The results of regression analysis are reported in below Table 3.

Table 3
The Contribution of Workplace Spirituality on IWB and Psychological Safety

| Variable                     | \( \beta \) | Std. Error | t     | p     |
|------------------------------|-------------|------------|-------|-------|
| (Constant)                   | 3.100       | .203       | 15.281| .000***|
| Workplace Spirituality       | .360        | .049       | 7.282 | .000***|

\( R^2 = .176; F = 53.031; p < .001 \)

*\( p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 \) Dependent Variable: IWB

| Variable                     | \( \beta \) | Std. Error | t     | p     |
|------------------------------|-------------|------------|-------|-------|
| (Constant)                   | 2.388       | .251       | 9.512 | .000***|
| Workplace Spirituality       | .452        | .061       | 7.386 | .000***|

\( R^2 = .180; F = 54.553; p < .001 \)

*\( p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 \) Dependent Variable: Psychological Safety

Table 3 shows that workplace spirituality significantly contributed to IWB by showing that IWB can be predicted by perceptions of workplace spirituality (\( \beta = .360, p < .01 \)). Moreover, as Table 3 illustrates, workplace spirituality significantly contributed to psychological safety (mediating variable; \( \beta = .452, p < .01 \)). Thus, the regression analysis results in a significant p-value by showing that workplace spirituality contributed to psychological safety. Subsequently, the regression analyses supported H1 and H2.

Further, the mediation model of psychological safety was tested with the bootstrap-based Hayes’ PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2012)- a well-established statistical resampling technique that estimates the parameters of the model and their standard errors strictly from the sample (Hayes, Montoya and Rockwood, 2017). When compared with the causal steps model of Baron and Kenny (1986), Hayes’ method calculates precise and correct confidence intervals of indirect effects. In sum, the inferred two steps have been applied to obtain adequate results regarding the research model. By that, insignificant results from small-size data sets are prevented and it provides healthy results (Arslan and Yener 2015, p. 297).

The findings of PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2012) with bootstrapping of 5000 are illustrated in Table 4. The total effect of workplace spirituality on IWB was 0.279, and the indirect effect of workplace spirituality on psychological safety is \( b = 0.121 \) (\( p < 0.01 \)). The bootstrapped confidence interval bias had corrected 95%, and it did not show an interval straddling a 0; thus, H3 is confirmed. According to the results, “psychological safety” fully mediated the relationship between “workplace spirituality” and “IWB”.

Table 4
The Mediating Role of Psychological Safety

| The Mediation Effect of | Total Effect | Direct Effect | Indirect Effect | \( P \) Value of Bootstrap Significance Interval of Sobel Test | The Type of Mediation |
|-------------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Age                     | 29.11        | 1.03          | .488**          | .205** .368** .355** |                      |
| Work Experience         | 14.25        | 0.96          | .239**          | .277** .289** |                      |
| Workplace Spirituality  | 3.95         | 1.08          | .424**          | .419** |                      |
| Psychological Safety    | 4.17         | 1.16          | .278**          |                  |                      |
| IWB                     | 4.52         | .93           |                 |                  |                      |

Note. *** \( p < .001 \).
Psychological Safety | Direct Effect | Indirect Effect |
|---------------------|--------------|----------------|
| WS→ IWB             | .279         | -.1582         |
|                      |              | .121           |
|                      |              | .1106          |
|                      |              | -.2483/-.0393  |
|                      | .0423        | -.2.8723       |
|                      | .0041        | Full           |

WA: Perceived Workplace Spirituality
IWB: Innovative Work Behaviors

On the other side, even though the primary aim of this study was to understand the contributions of workplace spirituality and psychological safety on IWBs, multiple regression analyses were applied with the sub-dimensions of the workplace spirituality for a detailed understanding on how each dimension explains IWBs. Since workplace spirituality was composed of three factors and were named as “feeling of engagement and community”, “spiritual connection”, and “engagement to work” in the current research, these three factors were examined as the antecedents of individuals’ IWB. As such, for assessing the contributions of the independent variables of workplace spirituality dimensions on IWBs, multiple regression analysis was performed.

The below Table 5 and Table 6 present the model summary results of the multiple regression analysis.

Table 5

Model Summary of Regression Analysis

| Model | $R$ | $R^2$ | Adj. $R^2$ | Std. Error of the Est. |
|-------|-----|-------|------------|------------------------|
| 1     | .435| .189  | .179       | .847                   |

Note: Predictors: (Constant), Feelings of engagement and community, Engagement to work

Table 5 indicates that the overall $R^2$ was revealed as .189 suggesting that feelings of engagement and community and engagement to work combine to explain approximately 19% of the variance in perceived IWBs among the sample group.

Table 6

Summary Results of Coefficients of Regression Analysis

| Independent Variables | $\beta$ | $t$ Value | $p$ Value |
|-----------------------|--------|----------|-----------|
| Constant              | 3.058  | 14.990   | .000      |
| Feelings of engagement and community | .244 | 3.688 | .000 |
| Engagement to work    | .121   | 2.206    | .028      |
| Spiritual connection  | .012   | .271     | .787      |

In the above Table 6, it is reported that the effects of “feelings of engagement and community” ($\beta = .244, p < .01$) and the “engagement to work” ($\beta = .121, p < .05$) on IWB were found as significant and positive. However, “spiritual connection” did not have a significant effect on IWB ($p = .787$). Table 5 and Table 6 present the overall model and the findings ($F = 19.72, p < .05$).

Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendations

COVID-19 pandemic has been spreading around the world, its psychological effect might be hard to predict from now. However, as the first patients were observed in China, scholars from China have been studying the possible impact of the COVID-19 epidemic in their country since then. Notably, researchers (Cao, Fang, Hou, Han, Xu, Dong and Zheng, 2020) have found that the reflection of highly spreading coronavirus in individuals’ daily life (e.g., delays in academic activities and social life) were positively related with college students’ anxiety symptoms. Additionally, psychological interventions have been discussed among scholars (Duan and Zhu, 2020). For this respect, rethinking...
the contributions of positive psychology (e.g., psychological safety) and the effects of workplace spirituality on organizational life is beneficial for ensuring the morale of employees and the benefits of organizations. More specifically, employees usually carry out innovations with their behaviors against situations where novelty or quick solutions are needed. Based on this, it is important to understand the relationship between workplace spirituality and IWB variables, including perceived psychological safety. The purpose of the present study was to investigate the relationship between workplace spirituality and IWBs with the mediating role of psychological safety. Following the recent empirical evidence about positive organizational behavior and spiritualism (Alex Linley et al., 2006, Donaldson and Ko, 2010; Kumar, 2016), it was hypothesized that there is a relationship between workplace spirituality and IWBs. Along with the first hypothesis, extant literature has been reviewed to unveil the evidence for potential contingent and intervening variables on this relationship. Subsequently, psychological safety has been discussed as mediating variable that refers to interpersonal perception and psycho-social resource in work (Agarwal and Farndale, 2017; İşiaçık, 2019; Newman et al., 2017).

Even there were relatively scarce empirical studies that examine psychological safety, workplace spirituality, and IWB together, hypotheses were logically formulated and the suggested relationships have been investigated through cross-sectional research in Turkey. Following the methodological approach, the findings of this research supported the assumptions. The statistical findings showed a positive relationship between workplace spirituality and IWB ($\beta = .360$, $p<.01$). This result was in line with some previous discussions in the literature. For instance, Turner (1999) argued that if employees bring their spiritual side to their workplace, they do not behave like a machine or in a routine way, rather they can engage in creative thoughts and behaviors. Kumar (2016) also stated a positive relationship between workplace spirituality and IWB. This finding is related to some theories and perspectives on organizational behavior. One of them SET (Blau, 1964), as mentioned previously. In other words, workplace spirituality refers to positivity, such as the feeling of community and meaningful work that may contribute to employees’ positive affections. Individuals behave innovatively to help the organization as a return for the benefits they sense workplace spirituality (e.g., positive emotions in the workplace). The positive relationship between workplace spirituality and IWB can also be explained with culture. According to Hofstede (1997, p. 5), culture is “the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another”. Given the logic that organizational culture is about both formal and informal work context, it guides individuals in their behaviors and can be defined as the shared basic assumptions that characterize the workplace setting. Consequently, workplace spirituality can be linked with organizational cultures. For example, individuals’ feeling of community can be a part of organizational culture (see Cameron and Quinn, 2011). In addition, the reflections of workplace spirituality in organizational cultures have been stated in the previous studies. If there is knowledge sharing and solidarity culture in an organization, these characteristics can be related to a spiritual workplace (Alas and Mousa, 2016). Hence, some benefits and characteristics of organizational culture might trigger employees’ IWB as well as creativity.

Further, psychological safety was included in the model because of the critical role of psychological safety on IWB (Pandey et al., 2019). The mediating role of psychological safety on the relationship between workplace spirituality and IWB was examined with several statistical analyses. The results indicated the fully mediating role of psychological safety between workplace spirituality and IWB. Workplace spirituality strengthens the psychological safety perception of the employees and they contribute to IWBs. The impact of workplace spirituality on individuals’ psychological safety perceptions and IWB was shown in the current research. According to Rego and Cunha (2008), human beings have a spiritual side and it can be crucial to understand the potential outcomes of workplace spirituality on positive work attitudes and/ or behaviors. In other words, for practical implementations, managers should understand the antecedents of workplace spirituality. Within this respect, understanding individuals’ values and goals is important, because the congruence between them and organizational values may be critical for creating a spiritual workplace. For example, employee selection and retention are important to ensure IWB in organizations (Riggio, 2012). If employees do not match their significant beliefs and thoughts with their workplace, they may not engage in
innovative behaviors and may not feel psychologically safe. Likewise, appropriate employee selection is essential for organizations’ survival and long-term benefits. After highlighting the importance of employee selection in organizations, HRM and its functions should be emphasized (e.g., Buller and McEvoy, 2012). HR employees play a vital role in all the selection and recruitment processes. Their congruence with the organization and their wisdom and the knowledge about their impact on the whole human process in the organization are significant. For example, as an applicator of workplace spirituality, the HR professional should find meaning in their work. In this case, their educational backgrounds (e.g., being an expert in social sciences), skills, and abilities are important rather than just job experiences in the HR field.

In particular, the influence of psychological safety on individuals’ IWB was demonstrated in the current study. In the detailed analyses, psychological safety was predicted by workplace spirituality ($\beta = .452, p=.01$), while it directly affected IWB ($r=.278; p=.01$). The role of psychological safety on the relationship between workplace spirituality and employees’ IWB might be explained through Affective Events Theory (AET; Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996). Psychological safety can be stated as an opposite term of negative emotions in the workplace, such as job stress (Yener, 2015). AET discusses that workplace characteristics influence employees’ affections and emotions in organizations. Workplace spirituality may wake individuals’ positive emotion-related behaviors and attitudes, such as psychological safety and innovative work behaviors. Delizonna (2017) stated a human evolution perspective of psychological safety and correlated the term with high-performing teams. Accordingly, it can be inferred that such kinds of mental activities encourage individuals’ psychological safety, innovative work behaviors, and even performance.

CFA was performed to examine the factorial structure of the scales. According to the findings of CFA, the selected indicators were good representatives for each component of the variables of the study. The results are consistent with previous analyses (İşiaçık, 2019) and the concept of workplace spirituality has three dimensions were confirmed. These dimensions are revealed as “feeling of engagement and community”, “spiritual connection”, and “engagement to work”. Moreover, upon the findings, it can be concluded that the definition of workplace spirituality combines employees’ feeling of engagement and community with feeling spiritual at work. In other words, if employees feel blissful and find meaning through the feeling of community, they are probably in a state that is called workplace spirituality. In line with Scott and Bruce’s (1994) arguments, the IWB measure has been found as a unidimensional construct in the present study. The IWB measurements can still open to more confirmatory analyses because of the inconsistent discussions and evidence.

In addition, the effects of feelings of engagement and community, engagement to work, and spiritual connection were examined for a detailed understanding. Interestingly, the spiritual connection did not predict IWB ($p>.05$), while both feelings of engagement and community and engagement to work positively contributed IWBs. It seems that individuals’ engagement and positive interpersonal relationships at work more effective on discretionary behaviors. Consistent with the previous studies (Fox, Webster, and Casper, 2018; Mónico, Mellão, Nobre-Lima, Parreira, and Carvalho, 2016), workplace spirituality contributed to individuals’ psychological safety in the present study. It is concluded that spirituality serves as a psychological resource for the individuals at the workplace and enhances IWB. In sum, positive employee behaviors and performance outcomes are associated with satisfying individuals’ psychological needs and this suggestion is more denotative especially within challenging environmental situations. Besides the practical implications, there are contributing conceptual implications of the current research. Firstly, the impact of individuals’ psychological factors and spirituality levels in their workplaces on employees’ behavioral outcomes has been underlined in the current study. As stated before, innovation is crucial to today’s rapidly changing environment. With this logic, psychological safety perception and the proceeds of workplace spirituality can be highly important to understand the success stories of organizations and may give inspirations to possible new management techniques.

The current research has some limitations because of the absence of the moderating variables. The reason for this can be the possible significant factors that strengthen and weaken the relationships
between the variables. As Taştan, Gücel and İşçi (2017) suggested employees’ assumptions about the world, as well as their autonomy perceptions, influence their positive workplace behaviors. From this point of view, it may also be beneficial to study the impacts of workplace spirituality on different positive workplace attitudes and behaviors, such as psychological safety and IWB on the side of individuals’ self-construals. Further, even though this study did not focus on a certain sector, studying a particular industry may be beneficial to understand workplace behaviors in more detail. As Gupta (2017) recommended a sector-specific study for workplace spirituality, the model of this research should be investigated in the critical sectors that are important in today’s business world. While we stated the impact of workplace spirituality on positive workplace attitudes and behaviors (psychological safety and IWB), different empirical studies are necessary to reveal the possible workplace spirituality implications and employee outcomes. Another limitation of this study can be self-report surveys. The data collection method may be extended for later studies. As Üçler and Taştan’s (2018) study, individuals’ in-role and extra-role performance behaviors were measured and rated by their supervisors and they suggested that multiple data collection methods may be useful to gain more valid data. Thus, individuals’ IWB can be rated by their supervisor and/or might be obtained from the performance evaluation results of the organizations in later researches. Such a method can lead to eliminating potential social desirability bias. Additionally, larger sample size is recommended for future studies to get more generalizable findings. Since this study was conducted in a limited sample group through a cross-sectional survey, a longitudinal study may be beneficial to understand the possible interactions and changes among the variables. Finally, even though there were two main hypotheses in the current paper to explore the relationships among the focal variables, future studies can be executed through the relevant hypotheses.
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Tüm dünyayı etkisi altında bırakıkan COVID-19 salgını ve beraberinde getirdiği psikoijik ve ekonomik zorluklar örgütler açısından dikkate alınması gereken önemli çevrevel faktörler içerisinde yer almaktadır. Bu salgın ortamında, örgütlerin rekabet güçlerini koruyabilme ve varlıkları sürdürdüğine için yenilgiçi olmaları gerektmektedir. Söz konusu yenilgiçi yaklaşımlar, örgütün sunduğu ürün ve hizmetler ile olabildiği gibi çalışanların yönelik örgüt içi uygulamaları da kapsamaktadır. Bu noktada birçok örgüt, gerek örgütün, gerek ürün ve hizmetlerinin verdiği ve sunulan biçimlerine olmak üzere gerçekle çalışanların salgından korunmak adına daha önce uygulamadığı çeşitli yönetim taktiklerini hayata geçirilmişlerdir. Örneğin pandemi sürecinde daha önce uzuakta çalışmaya gecekmemiş birçok kurum daha esnek bir çalışma tarzına geçmiştir. İleti, çalışanların da bu değişimlere uyum sağlayarak gerektiğinde yenilikçi davranışlara başvurabilme kapasitesine bu tür adımların önceligi vardır. Psikolojik güvenliğin, bireylerin psikolojik yaşamlarında önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Örneğin, psikolojik güvenlik, bireylerin psikolojik yaşamlarında önemlidir ve öncülük edici bir rol oynamaktadır. Öncelikle, psikolojik güvenlik, bireylerin psikolojik yaşamlarında önemlidir ve öncülük edici bir rol oynamaktadır. Özellikle, psikolojik güvenlik, bireylerin iç dünyalarının beslendiği, yüksek bir topluluk ve sosyal bağ duygusu ile işinde çalıştıkları alanlarda stres bozukluğu gibi kamu sağlığı açısından çok riskli olaylara maruz kalan bireylerin, olay bitmekten sonra bile hala stres bozukluklarına sahip olduklarını doğrulamıştır (Low ve Wilder, 2011). Bu bağlamda, bireylerin iç dünyalarının beslendiği, yüksek bir topluluk ve sosyal bağ duygusu ile işinde anılan bulma olarak tanımlanan işyeri maneviyatı, çalışanların stresinin yanı sıra iş esnasında yaşanan kötü duyular için önlenici bir mekanizada rol oynamaktadır. İşyerinde algılanan maneviyat, çalışanların, buna çözüm arayarak çalıştıkları alanlara girdikleri ve çalıştıkları alanlarda çalıştıkları alanlarla çalıştıkları alanlarda çalıştıkları alanlarda çalıştıkları alanlarda çalıştıkları alanlarda çalışanların psikolojik güvenlik algıları arasında bir bağ bulunmuştur (Edmondson ve Lei, 2014). Söz konusu kuramsal ve görgül katkılarının olabileceği düşünülmektedir. Öncelikle araştırmalarında, işyeri maneviyatının, çalışanları, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örgüt kültürünün, örg
tarafından Türkçe’ye uyarlanan ‘İşyeri Maneviyatı Ölçeği’ ile Edmondson (1999) tarafından geliştirilmiş Üçok ve Torun (2016) ve Yener (2015) tarafından Türkçe’ye adaptasyonu yapılan 7 maddelik “Psikolojik Güvenlik Ölçeği” kullanılmıştır.

Sonuç, Tartışma ve Öneriler

Bu çalışmada elde edilen sonuçlar ışığında, kriz durumlarında (COVID-19 salgını gibi), maneviyat, insanlık ve ilgili olumlu tutumlara çok daha fazla ihtiyaç duyulduğu söylenebilir. Öncesi araştırmalarla (Fox, Webster ve Casper, 2018; Mónico, Mellão, Nobre-Lima, Parreira ve Carvalho, 2016) tutarlı olarak, bu çalışmada da işyerinde maneviyat algısının bireylerin psikolojik güvenliğine katkıda bulunduğu gözlenmiştir. Dolayısıyla, işyerindeki maneviyatın çalışanların için bir tür psikolojik kaynak olarak hizmet ettiği ve algılanan psikolojik güvenliğin katkısıyla yenilikçi davranışların geliştirildiği sonucuna varılmıştır. Bu çalışmada çıkarılacak başka bir sonuç ise bireylerin kontrol edilemeyen dış koşullarla başa çıkmaları için işyeri maneviyatının potansiyel bir rolü olduğu ve bu iliski özellikle zorlu çevre koşullarında daha anlaşılmaktır. Gelecekteki araştırmalarda ise, benzer ilişkilerdeki olası şartlı değişikliklerin rolünün artırılması için de önerilmektedir. Taştan, Gücel ve İşçi (2017)’nin ifade ettiği gibi çalışanların dünya hakkındaki varsayımlarının yanı sıra özerklik algıları pozitif işçi davranışlarını etkilebilmektedir. Bu bakış açısından incelendiğinde, işçi maneviyatının, bireylerin benlik durumları açısından psikolojik güvenliğine ve YİD gibi pozitif işçi tutum ve davranışları üzerindeki etkilerini incelemek de yararlı olabilecektir. Bu çalışma için kısıt olarak da çalışanların kendilerini değerlendirdiği ölçüların kullanılmış olması ifade edilebilirdir. Tek kaynaklı veri toplama yönteminin ziyade çok sayıda kaynak yönteminin yararlanmak daha güvenilir sonuçlara ulaşılması bakımından yararlı olacaktır. Daha sonraki çalışmalar için veri toplama yönteminin ve örneklem grubunun genişletilmesi önerilmektedir. Böylece, daha genellenebilir sonuçların elde edilmesi mümkün olabilecektir.