

The relationship between moral, supportive and oppressive leadership styles, with the psychological capital

P. Rahiminejad*, Department of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, School of Psychology, Islamic Azad University, 1477893855, Tehran, Iran.

Gh. Golshani, General Psychology, School of Psychology, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, 1477893855, Tehran, Iran.

Maliheh Arshi, Assistance Professor, Department of Social work, University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Sciences, 1987513834, Tehran, Iran.

Suggested Citation:

Rahiminejad, P., Golshani, Gh. & Arshi, M. (2018). The relationship between moral, supportive and oppressive leadership styles, with the psychological capital. *Global Journal of Guidance and Counseling in Schools*, 8(2), 67-76.

Received from July 10, 2017; revised from December 05, 2017; accepted from June, 27, 2018.

Selection and peer review under responsibility of Prof. Dr. Kobus Maree, University of Pretoria South Africa

©2018 SciencePark Research, Organization & Counseling. All rights reserved.

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the relationship between moral, supportive and oppressive leadership styles, with the psychological capital. For this study, 400 samples were considered. After distributing and collecting questionnaires, 20 valid questionnaires for analysis were diagnosed, so research sample group was reduced to 380 persons. The sample randomly sampled based on a list of employees. To collect log data, organisational effectiveness, leadership oppressive questionnaire, a questionnaire on ethical leadership and supportive leadership questionnaire were used. Data analysis in two levels of descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation) and inferential statistics (Pearson correlation, multiple regression and ANOVA (analysis of variance, a statistical method in which the variation in a set of observations is divided into distinct components)) was performed using SPSS software. According to the result of the relationship between leadership styles with dimensions of psychological capital, there is a significant relationship.

Keywords: Leadership styles, moral leadership, supportive leadership, oppressive leadership, psychological capital.

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: **P. Rahiminejad**, Department of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, School of Psychology, Islamic Azad University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.

E-mail address: p.rahiminejad@gmail.com / Tel. : +98 31 3535 4001

1. Introduction

Due to the ever-increasing development of the economics and given the transformations in the global market, organisations make some changes within them for their survival and progress and guide them towards flourishing. The staff in these organisations should learn to make new paths and strategies in order to reach their goals. They should trust their successes and abilities (effectiveness) besides having the power in order that they are not failed as a result of the barriers to which they encounter. In addition, it seems that in order to succeed, the staff should have motivation. They should substitute new ways to the pre-determined ones when encountering problems and give optimistic documents when something works badly. They should also have a positive prospect in the future (Luthans, Avey, Avolio, Norman & Combs, 2006).

The results of various works performed on the optimistic behaviour and the optimistic psychology indicate that psychological capacities, including hope, resiliency, optimism and self-efficacy make altogether a factor called psychological capital. In other words, the above-mentioned four factors make a new hidden resource or factor altogether which is apparent in each of these variables (Avey, Patera & West, 2006).

Self-efficacy is defined as below: when one believes in his/her abilities in organising and performing a series of activities required for managing different conditions and statuses (Luthans et al., 2006).

Those who believe that positive consequences would definitely occur are called optimists, while those who believe that their personal abilities would lead to success are called self-efficient optimists. Optimists expect positive consequences for them regardless of their personal abilities (quoted from Avey et al. (2008)).

Resiliency is defined as a type of developable state in a person based on which he/she is able to continue more attempts in encountering failures, afflictions and conflicts of life and even positive events as well as to reach more success (Luthans et al., 2006).

Conceptually, Schneider, Irving and Anderson (1991) have defined 'hope' as below: hope is a positive motivational state that appears as a result of the following two components: (a) will-power (goal-oriented energy) and (b) way-power design even when encountering barriers and planning for reaching the goal (quoted from Luthans, Youssef & Avolio (2007)).

Optimistic psychological capital has the ability to effectively develop the staff's positive points, potentials and talents and help the organisation so that it would have a safe margin and a long-term competition (Toor & Ofori, 2010).

In addition to its traditional usage in economics and business, the term 'capital' is used to indicate the value of human resources (human capital) like other concepts such as intellectual capital, social capital and cultural capital. Optimistic psychology uses the term 'psychological capital' to show the individual's motivational tendency that appears through such positive psychological structures as efficiency, optimism, hope and resiliency.

Bronz described 'leadership' as a process rather than a set of separate activities. Leadership is a process in which as time passes, leaders and followers affect each other simultaneously with the evolution of the existing relationship among them (Yulk, 2006).

Ethical leadership has been considered seriously by the scholars and thinkers of industrial/organisational psychology and the organisational behaviour management in recent years. On the basis of the reviews conducted by Golparvar and Padash (1389a, 1389b), by bearing on features such as reliability, fairness in different fields, using integrity, encouraging the staff towards growth and developing their abilities and skills, especially making the reward and punishment regimes for unethical behaviours, ethical leadership provides the necessary background for the abilities and feeling of energy of its underneath staff.

Resick, Hanges and Dickson (2006) presented six main features in order to describe ethical leadership as below:

Character and integrity: Character refers to the pattern of goals, tendencies and virtues that make the foundation of ethical leadership.

Ethical awareness: It is the ability to understand and being sensitive to the ethical-related issues. It has to be considered in selections with a considerable influence on others.

Community/People–orientation: Ethical leaders emphasise on the proverb ‘worship is not something other than serving people’ that leads to people orientation, knowledge of how their actions influence other people and using the social power to serve the group benefits rather than personal ones (Trevino, Brown & Hartman, 2003).

Motivating: Ethical leaders encourage the staff to prefer the group’s benefits to their own ones (Trevino et al., 2003).

Encouraging and empowering: Ethical leaders encourage and empower the staff such that they could acquire a sense of personal deserve.

Managing ethical accountability: In their study on ethical leadership, Trevino et al. (2003) found that an ethical leader makes some expectations and measure of the ethical behaviour. Then, he maintains the commitment to these measures by using the available award and punishment regimes (Resik et al., 2006).

Respect: Ethical leaders to respect others. It is the duty of everyone to be respectful with others and them only for their own sake, not for the purpose other respects (Northouse, 2004).

Servicing: Ethical leaders serve others. The ethical principle of serving others is indeed the same as altruism (Northouse, 2004).

Justice: Ethical leaders are righteous and are different from the fairness and justice affairs are concerned (Northouse, 2004).

Honesty: Ethical leaders are honest. No honest or not honest is a form of lying and project a false image of reality. Lack of honesty has obvious negative consequences. The first one is the lack of trust (Northouse, 2004).

Participation: Ethical leaders are collectivist. Every society is like an organisation with a specific system. For this reason, for societies, certain goals are set according to their texture and prospect which are usually known as common values. To obtain common values requires that the leader and the followers follow the path set by the group and agree on it (Northouse, 2004).

2. Supportive leadership

Leader’s behaviour makes the subordinates satisfied and meets their needs and preferences. Supportive leaders care about their staff’s welfare (House & Michell, 1974). This behaviour is especially required in situations where conducting duties or relationships are required, which are bothering in physical or spiritual terms (House, 1996).

3. Tyrannical leadership

Howell and Avolio (1990) described tyrannical leadership based on the personal benefit and misusing of others. These leaders use their power to their own benefit. They are indifferent to their subordinates’ needs and pay the least attention to the constructive social behaviour. Tyrannical leadership is defined based on the individual dominance and autocratic behaviour and

authoritarianism, i.e., tyrannical leaders follow their own benefits rather than the collection's ones. Megalomania and misusing others are their features.

The theoretical foundation of the link of behavioural leadership and tyrannical one with psychological capital and its components are rooted in social influence and penetration processes from administrators and managers on the staff (Luthans et al., 2007). Based on the research report by Golparvar and Padash (1389a, 1389b), behaviour-based leaders are naturally enabling, reinforcing and guidance for the staff (Padash, 1389). The necessary research support of this theory is provided by De Hoogh and Den Hartog (2008) in which it is indicated that the behavioural leadership makes optimism and positivism about the future. In contrast, tyrannical leadership has a negative relationship by positivism and workgroup effectiveness.

Based on what was introduced in the introduction, in a final conclusion of the theoretical and research basics reviewed, it must be declared that ethical leadership through an affecting sense of empowerment and energy sector strengthen and the subsequent organisational effectiveness provides and the leadership of the oppressive pointing confidence, efficiency and control over the conditions of the workers, field weakened sense of self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience, and subsequently provide organisational effectiveness.

Ethical leadership has also a positive correlation with trusting in the leader and a negative correlation with the extreme administration, while it has no correlation with demographic features. Perhaps, the most important point is that the staff's realisation of ethical leadership is the sense of satisfaction of the leader's observed efficiency, tendency to dedicate more attempts to perform the job and reporting problems to the management.

Based on what Parvar and Vaseqi (1389) reported, ethical leadership reinforces the psychological capital, while tyrannical leadership weakens it.

Based on what was presented in theory and research project, the relationship between ethical leadership, support and oppression with psychological capital in the workplace is reasonable.

4. Method

The method used in this research was descriptive–correlation is.

4.1. Sample

This paper was considered based on the conformity of the sample's size to the statistical sample's size in order to increase the statistical power of the results of 400 individual. After the distribution and collection of the questionnaires, 20 questionnaires were detected invalid for analysis. Therefore, the research sample group was reduced to 380 individuals. The sample was also randomly sampled based on the staff's names list. The educational range of the sample members was from high-school to B.S. degree, their age range was 21–46, their job history was between 3 months and 19 years and the range of job history in a private company was between 3 months and 11 years.

4.2. Research tools

Psychological capital questionnaire: in order to measure the psychological capital, a 20-item questionnaire was used introduced by Luthans et al. (2006). It measures self-efficiency (four items), resourcefulness (four items), positivism (three items) and resiliency (nine items), respectively. In this paper, stochastic factor analysis gave four factors with Chronbach's alpha as 0.79, 0.78, 0.7 and 0.85.

Tyrannical leadership questionnaire: in order to measure tyrannical leadership, six questions set by De Hoogh and Den Hartog (2008) were used which are answered based on a 7° scale (never = 1 to always = 7). It measures tyrannical, destructive and mood-braking behaviours for staff. They examined

its validity and reported the Chronbach's alpha as 0.82. this questionnaire's validity in this paper was examined by the stochastic factor analysis to obtain the Chronbach's alpha as 0.87.

Ethical leadership questionnaire: in order to measure the ethical leadership, 17 questions set by De Hoogh and Den Hartog (2008) were used which are answered based on a 7° scale (never = 1 to always = 7). It measures three domains, i.e. being ethical and just (six items), role clarity (five items) and power division (six items) for the ethical leadership. They examined its validity and reported Chronbach's alpha over 0.8. This questionnaire's validity in this paper was examined by the stochastic factor analysis to obtain Chronbach's alpha over 0.8 (De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2008).

Supportive leadership questionnaire: in order to measure the supportive leadership, nine questions set by Banai and Riesel (2007) were used which are answered based on a 7° Lickert's scale (strongly disagree = 1 to strongly agree = 7). They examined its validity in samples from Cuba, Germany, Poland, Russia and the U.S. and reported Chronbach's alpha over 0.8 for this questionnaire.

4.3. Data analysis

Finally, in order to test the research hypotheses, the collected questionnaires data were analysed by SPSS and appropriate statistical methods in both descriptive and conclusive forms. The description of the frequency and frequency percentage with descriptive indicators (mean, standard deviation and standard error) was used, and inferential statistics from the Pearson test and the test which is meaningful to investigate the relationship between leadership styles (ethical, oppressive and protection) and aspects of organisational effectiveness (the effectiveness of individual results, effectiveness and overall effectiveness of organisational structures and systems) was used.

5. Findings

First hypothesis: There is a meaningful correlation between leadership styles (ethical, tyrannical and supportive) and the psychological capital dimensions (self-efficiency, resourcefulness, optimism and resiliency).

As observed in Table 1, being ethical and just (ethical leadership) has a positive meaningful correlation with self-efficiency ($P < 0.01$), resourcefulness ($P < 0.01$) and resiliency ($P < 0.05$), while it has no meaningful correlation with self-efficiency ($P < 0.01$). Role clarity has a positive meaningful correlation with self-efficiency ($P < 0.01$), resourcefulness ($P < 0.01$), optimism ($P < 0.01$) and resiliency ($P < 0.01$). Power division has a positive meaningful correlation with self-efficiency ($P < 0.01$), resourcefulness ($P < 0.05$) and resiliency ($P < 0.05$), while it has no meaningful correlation with optimism ($P > 0.05$). Tyrannical leadership has a negative meaningful correlation with self-efficiency ($P < 0.05$) and resourcefulness ($P < 0.05$), while it has no meaningful correlation with self-efficiency and resiliency ($P > 0.05$). Supportive leadership has a positive meaningful correlation with self-efficiency ($P < 0.01$), resourcefulness ($P < 0.01$), optimism ($P < 0.01$) and resiliency ($P < 0.01$).

The first hypothesis is therefore confirmed such that there is a meaningful correlation between being ethical and just (ethical leadership) and self-efficiency, between resourcefulness and resiliency, between role clarity and self-efficiency, between resourcefulness and optimism and resiliency and between power division and self-efficiency, between resourcefulness and resiliency, between tyrannical leadership and self-efficiency and resourcefulness and finally between supportive leadership and self-efficiency, resourcefulness, optimism and resiliency.

Table 1. Correlations between the leadership styles and the psychological capital dimensions (self-efficiency, resourcefulness, optimism and resiliency)

Row	Variables	Self-efficiency		Resourcefulness ability		Optimism resiliency		Resourcefulness ability	
		<i>r</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>P</i>
1	Being ethical and just (ethical leadership)	0.18	0.001	0.14	0.007	0.04	0.38	0.1	0.04
2	Role clarity (ethical leadership)	0.26	0.000	0.19	0.000	0.15	0.003	0.24	0.000
3	Power division (ethical leadership)	0.2	0.000	0.12	0.02	0.05	0.35	0.1	0.04
4	Tyrannical leadership	-0.11	0.03	-0.12	0.02	-0.09	0.07	-0.005	0.93
5	Supportive leadership	0.34	0.000	0.18	0.001	0.2	0.000	0.18	0.000

Second hypothesis: There is a combinational linear (meaningful) correlation between leadership styles (ethical and just, role clarity, power division, tyrannical and supportive leadership) and self-efficiency.

According to Table 2 of the leadership styles, role clarity and supportive leadership, with a standard beta index of 0.17 and 0.28, respectively, determine 13.7% of the self-efficiency variance. Therefore, hypothesis 7 is supported such that role clarity and supportive leadership have a combinational linear correlation with self-efficiency. The equation of prediction of self-efficiency via the meaningful dimensions of leadership styles is presented below:

$$(\text{Supportive leadership}) 0.29 + (\text{role clarity}) 0.19 + 3.22 = \text{self-efficiency.}$$

Table 2. Simultaneous regression analysis results for the prediction of self-efficiency via leadership styles

Row	Constant value and predicted value	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>F</i>	<i>b</i>	SE	β	<i>T</i>	<i>P</i>
1	Constant value	0.37	0.137	11.86**	3.22	0.32	-	10.11	0.000
2	Being ethical and just (ethical leadership)				-0.01	0.08	-0.01	-0.18	0.85
3	Role clarity (ethical leadership)				0.19	0.07	0.17	2.7	0.007
4	Power division (ethical leadership)				0.02	0.08	0.01	0.22	0.83
5	Tyrannical leadership				-0.05	0.06	-0.05	-0.74	0.45
6	Supportive leadership				0.29	0.06	0.28	5.22	0.000

P* < 0.05, *P* < 0.01

Third hypothesis: There is a combinational linear (meaningful) correlation between leadership styles (ethical and just, role clarity, power division, tyrannical and supportive leadership) and resourcefulness.

According to Table 3, of the leadership styles, role clarity and supportive leadership, with a standard beta index of 0.15 and 0.12, respectively, determine 5% of the resourcefulness variance. Therefore, hypothesis 8 is supported such that role clarity and supportive leadership have a combinational linear correlation with resourcefulness. The equation of prediction of resourcefulness via the meaningful dimensions of leadership styles is presented below:

$$(\text{Supportive leadership}) 0.1 + (\text{role clarity}) 0.13 + 4.68 = \text{resourcefulness}$$

Table 3. Simultaneous regression analysis results for the prediction of resourcefulness via leadership styles

Row	Constant value and predicted value	R	R ²	F	b	SE	β	T	P
1	Constant value	0.225	0.05	3.98**	4.68	0.26	–	17.8	0.000
2	Being ethical and just (ethical leadership)				0.001	0.06	0.001	0.01	0.99
3	Role clarity (ethical leadership)				0.13	0.06	0.15	2.2	0.02
4	Power division (ethical leadership)				-0.04	0.07	0.04	-0.54	0.59
5	Tyrannical leadership				-0.03	0.05	-0.04	-0.55	0.58
6	Supportive leadership				0.1	0.05	0.12	2.14	0.03

* $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$

Fourth hypothesis: There is a combinational linear (meaningful) correlation between leadership styles (ethical and just, role clarity, power division, tyrannical and supportive leadership) and optimism.

According to Table 4, of the leadership styles, role clarity and supportive leadership, with a standard beta index of 0.17 and 0.21, respectively, determine 6.7% of the optimism variance. Therefore, hypothesis 9 is supported such that role clarity and supportive leadership have a combinational linear correlation with optimism. The equation of the prediction of optimism via the meaningful dimensions of leadership styles is presented below:

$$(\text{Supportive leadership}) 0.18 + (\text{role clarity}) 0.15 + 5.01 = \text{optimism.}$$

Table 4. Simultaneous regression analysis results for the prediction of optimism via leadership styles

Row	Constant value and predicted value	R	R ²	F	b	SE	β	T	P
1	Constant value	0.258	0.067	5.35**	5.01	0.28	–	17.98	0.000
2	Being ethical and just (ethical leadership)				-0.11	0.07	-0.13	-1.7	0.08
3	Role clarity (ethical leadership)				0.15	0.06	0.17	2.54	0.01
4	Power division (ethical leadership)				0.11	0.07	0.11	-1.57	0.12
5	Tyrannical leadership				-0.08	0.05	-0.11	-1.57	0.11
6	Supportive leadership				0.18	0.05	0.21	3.63	0.000

* $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$

Fifth hypothesis: There is a combinational linear (meaningful) correlation between leadership styles (ethical and just, role clarity, power division, tyrannical and supportive leadership) and resiliency.

According to Table 5, of the leadership styles, role clarity, tyrannical leadership and supportive leadership, with a standard beta index of 0.26, -0.14 and 0.12, respectively, determine 8.1% of the resiliency variance. Therefore, hypothesis 10 is supported such that role clarity, tyrannical leadership and supportive leadership have a combinational linear correlation with resiliency. The equation of the prediction of resiliency via the meaningful dimensions of leadership styles is presented below:

$$(\text{Supportive leadership}) 0.11 + (\text{tyrannical leadership}) 0.12 - (\text{role clarity}) 0.24 + 3.95 = \text{resiliency.}$$

Table 5. Simultaneous regression analysis results for the prediction of resiliency via leadership styles

Row	Constant value and predicted value	R	R ²	F	b	SE	β	T	P
1	Constant value	0.285	0.081	6.62**	3.95	0.28	–	13.85	0.000
2	Being ethical and just (ethical leadership)				0.01	0.07	0.01	0.17	0.86
3	Role clarity (ethical leadership)				0.24	0.06	0.26	3.91	0.000
4	Power division (ethical leadership)				-0.03	0.07	-0.03	-0.36	0.72
5	Tyrannical leadership				-0.12	0.05	-0.14	-2.11	0.03
6	Supportive leadership				0.11	0.05	0.12	2.25	0.02

* $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$

6. Discussion and conclusion

First hypothesis: There is a meaningful correlation between leadership styles (ethical, tyrannical and supportive) and the psychological capital dimensions (self-efficacy, resourcefulness, optimism and resiliency) (Table 2). This hypothesis was confirmed between ethics and fairness (moral leadership) with self-efficacy, the ability resourcefulness and resiliency, the sharing of power with efficient, resourceful and resiliency, the leadership oppressive with efficient and resourceful and supportive leadership and finally, the correlation with efficacy and resourceful with optimism and resiliency, there is a significant relationship.

Existence of ethical leaders causes that staff to seek a relaxing atmosphere in an ethical value-based space through which they may affect the psychological capital dimensions. It causes that staff seek to grow the psychological capital dimensions.

The supportive leadership as leadership that concerns the welfare of their employees has certainly increased levels of self-efficacy, resourcefulness, optimism and resiliency of staff will help to gather. Tyrannical leadership has a negative meaningful correlation with resiliency and self-efficiency.

In other words, despite the oppressive leadership to reduce their sense of efficacy and resourceful in people. As is now well represented, with multiple mechanisms of moral leadership in the field of behavioural and mental health of their employees are affected. Indeed an ethical leader shows the staff via ethical just encounters as well as role clarity on the one hand that he values them.

On the other hand, he shows that ethical and human principles such as justice are important in practice rather than speech. For this reason, the foundation for enabling the social penetration processes of these administrators on the subordinates is provided (Brown, Trevino & Harrison, 2005). On this basis, in this study, relationships between morality and fairness and clarity of the role of the psychological capital component of such resilience, self-efficacy and optimism are obtained.

Another part of the findings shows that supportive leadership has similar functions in the field of its relationship with the psychological capital components. Similar functions mean that when the staff supervisor is supportive in the organisation, the staff would naturally in different time, especially at the times of need, trust that they could rely on their supervisor's support. Based on the findings, such support may lead to the increased self-efficiency, resourcefulness, optimism and resiliency.

In contrast, in agreement with De Hoogh and Den Hartog (2008), tyrannical leaders destruct the individuals' values, trust and efficiency via their behaviours and weaken their self-efficiency and resourcefulness in the field of psychological capital.

There is a combinational linear (meaningful) correlation between leadership styles (ethical and just, role clarity, power division, tyrannical and supportive leadership) and self-efficiency (Table 3).

This hypothesis is confirmed such that the leader's role clarity and supportive leadership have a combinational linear correlation with self-efficiency. Step-by-step regression analysis results in this research show that between the leadership styles (ethical, supportive and tyrannical) and self-efficiency, just the ethical and supportive leader's role clarity make a combinational linear correlation with self-efficiency. This finding agrees with Avey et al. (2006) and Luthans, Norman, Avolio and Avey (2008).

There is a combinational linear (meaningful) correlation between leadership styles (ethical and just, role clarity, power division, tyrannical and supportive leadership) and resourcefulness (Table 4).

This hypothesis is confirmed such that the leader's role clarity and supportive leadership have a combinational linear correlation with resourcefulness. Step-by-step regression analysis results in this research show that between the leadership styles (ethical, supportive and tyrannical) and self-efficiency, just the ethical and supportive leader's role clarity make a combinational linear correlation with resourcefulness (hope).

This finding agrees with Toor and Ofori (2008). They suggested that the leader is good who stimulates his followers to set their goals on their own and encourages them to reach their potential. In explaining this theory, the definition of the role will be for employees who are looking determination and design of routes necessary even when faced with obstacles (employees hope), they are planning to reach the target and are as an encouragement be a facilitator and suppliers. As part of the resolution makes employees more energy to achieve your goals hope.

There is a combinational linear (meaningful) correlation between leadership styles (ethical and just, role clarity, power division, tyrannical and supportive leadership) and optimism (Table 5).

This hypothesis is confirmed such that the leader's role clarity and supportive leadership have a combinational linear correlation with optimism. Step-by-step regression analysis results in this research show that between the leadership styles (ethical, supportive and tyrannical) and optimism, just the ethical and supportive leader's role clarity make a combinational linear correlation with optimism.

For the combinational linear correlation between role clarity and supportive leadership and resiliency, there were no data from other authors.

This finding theoretically shows that role clarity, i.e., to decrease ambiguity in work with a supportive leader, the existence of a friendly atmosphere is necessary to increase the staff's optimism. Optimism is a declaration style that people make based on their lives and documents. It seems that optimism is closely related to the supportive leadership since supportive leaders try to make the staff optimistic by spiritual facilitation and making a secure low-stress atmosphere and help people to choose positive healthy declaration styles. It is important to mention that that optimism means the reality-based optimism. In addition, role clarity, lack of ambiguity, and sense of harmony in the dedicated duties increases optimism.

There is a combinational linear (meaningful) correlation between leadership styles (ethical and just, role clarity, power division, tyrannical and supportive leadership) and resiliency (Table 6).

This hypothesis is confirmed such that the leader's role clarity and supportive leadership have a (negative) combinational linear correlation with resiliency. Step-by-step regression analysis results in this research show that between the leadership styles (ethical, supportive and tyrannical) and resiliency, just the ethical and supportive leader's role clarity make a combinational linear correlation with optimism.

For the correlation between role clarity, tyrannical leadership and supportive leadership and resiliency, there were no data from other authors. In the clarification of this hypothesis, it is important to mention that the lack of role ambiguity as well as the supportive environment cause that the

individuals have positive and more successful performances in solving difficulties, doubt, failure or even positive changes.

The negative role of tyrannical leadership with resiliency shows that this leadership style causes that people make no attempt to conform them positively to challenging situations and move rapidly toward failure. In other words, tyrannical leadership is opposed to the positive effects of role clarity and supportive leadership to resiliency. In this case, the foundation is provided for weakening resiliency. It seems that tyrannical leaders influence the resistance of people to follow working goals by weakening their self-esteem and self-efficiency.

References

- گل پرور، محسن، پاداش، فریبا و آتش پور، حمید. (a1389). مدل تقویت احساس انرژی، توانمندی و خلاقیت کارکنان از طریق رهبری اخلاقی. سلامت کار ایران، 7(3)، 4-11.
- گل پرور، محسن، واثقی، زهرا. (b1389). نگاهی نوین به سبک های دلبستگی در محیط های سازمانی و کاری: مطالعه موردی پیوند بین رهبری اخلاقی و ستمگرانه با سرمایه روانی. دومین کنگره دوسالانه روان شناسی صنعتی و سازمانی ایران. ۱۳۸۹؛ دانشگاه آزاد اسلامی خوراسگان
- Avey, J. B., Patera, J. L., & West, B. J. (2006). The implications of positive psychological capital on employee absenteeism. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 13, 42-60.
- Banai, M. & Reisel, W. D. (2007). The influence of supportive leadership and job characteristics on work alienation: a six country investigation. *Journal of World Business*, 42, 463-476.
- Brown, M. E., Trevino, L. K. & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: a social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Journal of Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97, 117-134.
- De Hoogh, A. H. B. & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationship with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: a multi-method study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 197-134.
- House, R. J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 323-352.
- House, R. J. & Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Contemporary Business*, 3(Fall), 81-98.
- Howell, J. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1990). Transformational leadership, transactional.
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M. & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Psychological Press.
- Luthans, F., Norman, S. M., Avolio, B. J. & Avey, J. B. (2008). The mediating role organization psychological capital in the supportive organization climate—employee psychological performance relationship. *Journal of Organization Behavior*, 29, 21-238.
- Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., Norman, S. M. & Combs, G. M. (2006). Psychological capital development: toward a micro-intervention. *Journal of Organization Behavior*, 27, 387-393.
- Northouse, P. (2004). *Leadership: theory and practice* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.
- Peterson, S. J. (2011). *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 427-445. Wiley Periodicals.
- Resick, C. J., Hanges, P. J. & Dickson, M. W. (2006). A cross-cultural examination of the endorsement of ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 63, 345-359.
- Toor, S. R. & Ofori, G. (2010). Positive psychological capital as a source of source of sustainable competitive advantage of organization. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 136(3), 341-352.

Rahiminejad, P., Golshani, Gh. & Arshi, M. (2018). The relationship between moral, supportive and oppressive leadership styles, with the psychological capital. *Global Journal of Guidance and Counseling in Schools*, 8(2), 67-76.

Trevino, L. K., Brown, M. & Hartman, L. P. (2003). A qualitative investigation of perceived executive ethical leadership: Perceptions from inside and outside the executive suite. *Human Relations*, 55, 5–37.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organization*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.