

The Effect of Workplace Social Courage on Life Satisfaction: A Scale Adaptation

Ibrahim Sani MERT¹ , Kemal KÖKSAL² 

ABSTRACT

Although the concept of courage has a long history, it is a latterly popular topic in organizational behavior. It is also an essential attitude or behavior for employees in whistleblowing, voice, unethical pro-organizational behavior. A valid and reliable scale is needed to reveal the effect of courage in different cultures. The study aims to adapt the workplace social courage scale to Turkish and test the validity and reliability of the scale. In three studies, the authors tested the scale's linguistic equivalence first, then its structural validity, and finally its predictive power on life satisfaction. Correlation, internal consistency, and explanatory factor analysis (EFA) were conducted with SPSS 23.0, and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and structural model analysis were performed with AMOS 23.0. Study one sample consisted of 48 academicians with sufficient English and Turkish language. Study two sample involved 267 employees from the tourism and finance sector. Study three sample comprised 374 data obtained from industrial and textile manufacturing employees. Back and forth translation and test-retest analysis results show the Turkish form has linguistic equality. EFA results indicate the adapted scale has a one-dimensional factor like the original one. CFA results reveal the adapted form has the one-factor structure in a different sample. The structural model analysis showed workplace social courage has a significant and positive effect on life satisfaction. The adapted Turkish form of workplace social courage scale is valid and reliable.

Keywords: Workplace social courage, Scale adaptation, Life satisfaction, Turkish form of courage.

JEL Classification Codes: I31, J21, M10

INTRODUCTION

Courage is one of the fundamental values that have been talked about from past to present. However, there is no consensus on it as a concept. Authors working in different fields have made different definitions. Especially philosophers defined courage based on the heroism of soldiers on the battlefield. In this view, courage means that people face various dangers on the job, such as soldiers, police officers, firefighters, and doctors, to fulfill their duties against these dangers. However, it may require employees to make brave decisions in today's organizations in situations such as disclosing information, unethical behaviors for the organizations' benefit, and decision-making in ethical dilemmas (Howard et al., 2017).

Individuals' bravery in organizational life has significant effects on both employees and the organization in the long term (Kilmann et al., 2010). Having social courage in the workplace can be defined as voluntarily pursuing a socially worthwhile goal, despite the fear and risk of a challenging event (Detert & Bruno, 2017). To protect the

organization's interests or society, the employees must face formal or natural power people. Courage comes into play and can affect employees' behaviors or decisions in these situations (Hannah & Avolio, 2010; Koerner, 2014).

Studies show that workplace social courage has a relationship with various organizational outcomes, and it has positive effects on employee voice, organizational citizenship behavior, and life satisfaction. Employees with high social courage exhibit extra organizational citizenship behavior, share their ideas further and experience more life satisfaction. Also, social courage causes a decrease in stress, depression, and anxiety while also decreasing counterproductive work behaviors (Detert & Bruno, 2017; Howard & Alipour, 2014; Howard & Holmes, 2019; Magnano et al., 2017; Santisi et al., 2020).

Another aspect of courage is a contribution to the development of the organizational culture. The stories told about the courageous behavior of the employees become a part of the corporate culture and inform the employees about the desired or accepted behaviors (Detert & Bruno, 2017). Howard and Cogswell (2019)

¹ Prof.Dr., Antalya Bilim University, School of Business and Social Sciences, ibrahim.mert@antalya.edu.tr

² Assoc.Prof.Dr. Akdeniz University, Serik Business Faculty, kemalkoksal@akdeniz.edu.tr (Corresponding Author)

state that social courage antecedent is brave, resilience, initiative, tenacity, a proactive personality, social support, empowering leadership, power distance, and age.

The number of studies on social courage in Turkey is deficient, and these are generally qualitative and conceptual studies (Mert, 2007, 2010, 2021; Mert & Aydemir, 2019). Social courage needs to be accurately measured to understand its concept, increase empirical studies, and guide researchers and practitioners in Turkey. A valid scale is required to determine both predecessors and organizational consequences of social courage and is essential to quantitative studies. Howard et al. (Howard et al., 2017) developed the workplace social courage scale, and researchers conducted it in some studies (Ginevra et al., 2020; Howard, 2021; Howard & Fox, 2020; Howard & Holmes, 2019). The scale successfully measures individuals' perceptions of social courage (Howard et al., 2017).

There is a lack of empirical studies about workplace social courage in Turkish literature. At this point, the authors considered developing a scale for courage or adapting an existing one. Because courage has been a topic discussed in different cultures for centuries and interpreted in common across cultures (Zavaliy & Aristidou, 2014) and advantages of adapting a scale (e.g., fast, cheap, and more reliable), the authors decided to adapt to the workplace social courage scale developed by Howard et al. (2017), whose reliability and validity have been tested in different studies before (e.g., Howard, 2019; Howard & Fox, 2020; Howard & Murry, 2020). One of the biggest obstacles in courage studies is the lack of a valid and reliable scale in Turkish literature. The authors considered that this study is essential in filling this gap. Turkish adaptation of the scale is also critical for comparing the results in international literature and different cultures.

The study aims to adapt to the workplace social courage scale developed by Howard et al. (Howard et al., 2017) to Turkish. For this purpose, the authors conducted three different studies. The first study is for linguistic equivalence, the second is for explanatory factor analysis, and the third is for confirmatory factor analysis. In the third study, we also examined the effect of social courage on life satisfaction to test the predictive power of the translated scale with structural model analysis because studies show that individuals who attribute themselves as courageous see their behaviors positively and have a more positive perspective on their life (Hannah et al., 2007; Koerner, 2014; Magnano et al., 2021; Santisi et al., 2020).

SOCIAL COURAGE

Studies on courage date back 2500 years, and according to Plato, courage is one of the most important virtues, and it is not easy to demonstrate other virtuous behaviors without courage. Philosophers stated that courage is critical for wars and other civil life areas, but courage emerges as an essential issue in an organization. It is a virtue that may also be necessary for today's employees. Some situations may require courage for employees, such as speaking up against powerful people or opposing injustice (Detert & Bruno, 2017; Scarre, 2012). Management researchers also refer to managers should have courage as a trait or behavior for effective leadership (Detert & Burris, 2007; McMillan & Rachman, 1988). It is a guiding virtue in managers' and employees' decisions and whistleblowing, reducing counterproductive work behavior, conflict management, and moral behavior (Detert & Bruno, 2017; Howard, 2019; Kilmann et al., 2010).

There is no consensus on the definition of the concept of courage. Different disciplines define courage differently. Mert (2021) tried to reveal the components of courage in Turkish culture with a qualitative study. He defines courage as "the conscious and decisive use of the power (resources) by taking the fear under control to achieve a moral purpose, generously doing what is necessary, in difficult conditions that contain threats and risks.". The main concepts in the general definition of courage are good for others, and these values can be moral, reaching an important goal or result, taking risks, acting voluntarily (Kilmann et al., 2010; Rate et al., 2007).

Depending on the interaction in the organizational environment, three different courage are essential, moral, physical, and social courage (Howard et al., 2017; Woodard & Pury, 2007). Moral courage is especially evident in the violation of ethical norms. Few studies reveal the nature of moral courage. When evaluated from an organizational perspective, moral courage gains importance in whistleblowing, especially considering today's corporate scandals. Physical courage is a trait or behavior that an individual shows perform to duties that could be physically harmed. These two courage is not our concern in this study. The third courage type is social courage. Social courage can be expressed as behaviors that individuals perform voluntarily for the benefit of the organization by taking risks and gaining respect in the eyes of others (Howard & Holmes, 2019).

Antecedents and consequences of social courage

Researchers have taken courage as an attitude or behavior and examined the factors that cause this attitude or behavior. The personality traits of the individual are a priority of courage. Especially risk-taking and proactive personality has a positive relationship with courage. Apart from personality traits, the social support of individuals, job diversity, job significance, identity, complexity, and skill diversity has a positive relationship with courage. An ethical and empowering leadership style also positively impacts social courage. Demographic variables such as gender, age, and experience may affect courage (Howard, 2021; Howard & Cogswell, 2019; Koerner, 2014; Rate et al., 2007).

Studies show that courage predicts some organizational outcomes such as organizational citizenship behavior, silence, counterproductive work behavior, stress, depression, anxiety, life satisfaction, psychological capital, and career adaptation (Detert & Bruno, 2017; Howard, 2019; Howard & Holmes, 2019).

Social courage and life satisfaction relationship

Life satisfaction is the degree of general satisfaction individuals have with life (Haybron, 2007; Marques et al., 2007, 2013; Pavot & Diener, 1993). The studies conducted between life satisfaction and courage show that individuals who attribute themselves as courageous see their behaviors positively and have a more positive perspective (Hannah et al., 2007). Employees who display brave behavior perceive themselves more constructively, thus gaining a positive view of life (Koerner, 2014). Studies show that courage is positively associated with life satisfaction (Howard, 2019; Magnano et al., 2021; Santisi et al., 2020) Based on this, we hypothesize that:

H1: Workplace social courage has a positive and significant relationship with life satisfaction.

Social courage scales

Empirical studies need a valid scale. There are three commonly known scales used to measure courage. The first is the multidimensional courage scale, with 23 expressions developed by Woodard and Pury (2007). The uncertain dimensions of this scale (Howard & Alipour, 2014; Woodard & Pury, 2007) caused the scale not to be preferred much. The second one is the courage scale developed by Norton and Weiss (Norton & Weiss, 2009). Researchers used Norton and Weiss's courage scale in different studies. However, Norton and Weiss's

definition of courage on fear made the factor measured by the expressions in the scale controversial. It has been criticized primarily for shifting towards risk-taking (Howard & Alipour, 2014). The third scale is the social courage scale developed by Howard et al. (Howard et al., 2017). There are 11 statements of the original scale, and it consists of one dimension. Different studies showed the original version of the scale is valid and reliable (Howard, 2019; Howard & Fox, 2020; Howard & Murry, 2020).

METHODS

In the study, the authors conducted three investigations within the scope of adapting the workplace social courage scale into Turkish. Firstly, the authors performed back-and-forth translation and test-retest analysis for linguistic equivalence, factor analysis for construct validity, and confirmatory factor analysis to test the existing structure in different sample groups. They collect the data from three different samples by online surveys between April 2018 and September 2019. SPSS 23.0 and AMOS 23.0 programs were used to analyze the collected data.

Scales

Workplace social courage scale. Howard et al. (Howard et al., 2017) developed the workplace social courage scale. It has one dimension consisting of 11 expressions. Interviewees indicated their level of participation using 7-point Likert (1, strongly disagree and 7, strongly agree). High scores from the scale show that social courage is high in the workplace. Table 1 presents the expressions of the form in Turkish and English.

Life satisfaction scale. The authors measured life satisfaction using the scale developed by Diener et al. (1985) and adapted to Turkish by Bekmezci and Mert (2018). Participants assessed the expressions with 7-point Likert (1, strongly disagree and 7, strongly agree). High scores indicate high satisfaction, and low scores indicate low satisfaction. There are expressions such as "I have a life close to my ideals." and "I am satisfied with my life." in the life satisfaction scale.

Strategy of analysis

The authors followed the Hambleton and Patsula (1999) procedure in adapting the courage scale. First, it should be ensured that structure similarity exists in the language and cultural groups of interest. Second, it should be decided to adapt or develop a scale. The other steps in the procedure were translating the scale using

Table 1: Social Courage Scale Expressions in the Workplace

Sıra	Items (In Turkish)
C1	<i>"Although it may damage our friendship, I would tell my superior when a coworker is doing something incorrectly."</i> (Arkadaşlığımızı zedeleyecek olsa bile, çalışma arkadaşım yanlış bir şey yaparsa yöneticime söylerim.)
C2	<i>"Although my coworker may become offended, I would suggest to him/her better ways to do things."</i> (Çalışma arkadaşımın kırılacağını bilsem dahi, ona işlerin daha iyi yapılmasına yönelik önerilerde bulunurum.)
C3	<i>"If I thought a question was dumb, I would still ask it if I didn't understand something at work."</i> (Aptalca bir soru olarak algılanacağını bilsem dahi, işte anlamadığım bir şeyi sorarım.)
C4	<i>"Even if my coworkers could think less of me, I'd lead a project with a chance of failure."</i> (Çalışma arkadaşlarım hakkımda olumsuz düşünse dahi, başarısızlık ihtimali olan bir işi/projeyi yürütürüm.)
C5	<i>"I would not tolerate when a coworker is rude to someone, even if I make him/her upset."</i> (Çalışma arkadaşımın bozulacağını bilsem de onun başka birisine kaba davranmasına müsamaha etmem.)
C6	<i>"Despite my subordinate disliking me, I would tell him/her when they're doing something against company policy."</i> (Astlarım/çalışma arkadaşlarım hoşlanmasa dahi, şirket/kurum politikasına aykırı bir şey yaparlarsa ikaz ederim.)
C7	<i>"I would let my coworkers know when I am concerned about something, even if they'd think I am too negative."</i> (Çok negatif birisi olduğumu düşüneceklerini bilsem dahi, çalışma arkadaşlarımın işle ilgili bir şeyden endişe duyduğumu bilmelerini isterim.)
C8	<i>"Even if it may damage our relationship, I would confront a subordinate who had been disrupting their workgroup."</i> (İlişkimizi tamamen zedeleyecek olsa bile, bir astım/çalışma arkadaşım iş arkadaşlarıyla birlikte çalışırken ahengi bozuyorsa, onun üstüne giderim.)
C9	<i>"Although it makes me look incompetent, I would tell my coworkers when I've made a mistake."</i> (Beni beceriksiz, yetersiz gösterecek olsa bile, işle ilgili yanlış bir şey yaptığımda çalışma arkadaşlarıma söylerim.)
C10	<i>"Despite appearing dumb in front of an audience, I would volunteer to give a presentation at work."</i> (Dinleyicilerin gözünde yetersiz görüneceğimi bilsem dahi, iş yerinde bir sunum yapmak için gönüllü olurum.)
C11	<i>"Although it may completely ruin our friendship, I would give a coworker an honest performance appraisal."</i> (Arkadaşlığımızı tamamen zedeleyecek olsa bile, bir çalışma arkadaşımın iş performansı hakkında dürüst bir geri bildirim veririm.)

a forward and back translation method by well-qualified researchers, reviewing the adapted version, conducting a small test of the adapted scale, and performing a validation study as proper.

The authors decided to adapt the scale regarding cross-cultural courage meanings (Zavaliy & Aristidou, 2014) and designed the three different studies for reliability and validity. The first was for linguistic equivalence, the second was for explanatory factor analysis, and the third was for confirmatory factor analysis and causal relationship. These studies intended to show that the courage scale has linguistic equivalence, reliability, and validity.

Linguistic equivalence

The first study aimed to test the linguistic equivalence of the scale.

Sample. The first study population consisted of academicians who were sufficient in both languages and studied management science, especially knowledgeable

in courage. Seventy-six academicians fit these criteria in two universities and selected 48 of them as the sample by a convenience sample method. 45.8% of them were men, and 54.2% were women. 64.6% of them were single, and 35.4% were married. 68.8% of the participants were between the ages of 21-30, 20.8% between the ages of 31-40, and 10.4% between 41-50. 27.1% worked for less than one year, 37.5% for 1-3 years, 14.6% for 4-6 years, and 20.8% for six years or more.

The authors used the forward and backward translation method suggested by Hall et al. (2003) for linguistic equivalence. The scale was translated into Turkish by a researcher who has primarily studied courage and is proficient in both languages. Another researcher translated the original version of the scale into English without seeing it. The authors compared this translation with its original form and finalized the scale with the agreed-upon expressions (Table 1).

After the forward and backward translation method, the scale should be examined with a pretest. It could

Table 2: Test of Normality of Courage's Scales

Scale	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		Shapiro-Wilk		Skewness		Kurtosis		Cronbach
	Statistic	p	Statistic	p	Statistic	S.E.	Statistic	S.E.	
Turkish	0,131	0,037	0,963	0,134	-0,358	0,343	-0,498	0,674	0,732
English	0,133	0,033	0,956	0,072	-0,523	0,343	-0,380	0,674	0,759

be conducted one of three different methods for the pretest. The first method is to apply both the original and the translated scale to a sample group who speak both languages. The second method is to use the translated scale to a small group, receive verbal/written feedback, and finally, focus group work (Bayık & Gürbüz, 2016; Hambleton & Patsula, 1999; Van de Vijver & Hambleton, 1996). The authors applied the scale in both languages to 48 academicians proficient in Turkish and English one-week interval and received verbal feedback.

Normality was checked (Table 2) before the test and retest analysis. According to Shapiro-Wilk statistics and skewness and kurtosis values, Table 2 revealed that the courage's data had normality distribution (Sposito et al., 1983). The Cronbach alpha tested the scales' internal reliability and was considered sufficient for comparing the means and correlation (Hair et al., 2014).

Test and retest analysis showed that the original form and adaptation of the Turkish form have a significant and positive relationship. Courage's mean of the Turkish scale was 5,25 (sd=0,71), and the English one was 5,31 (sd=0,79). In both forms, the perception of courage's mean is above the median value of Likert (4). The correlation coefficient between classes was 0,887 ($p = 0.000$), indicating the scale's linguistic validity.

Reliability and explanatory factor analysis (EFA)

As a pilot study, the second study aims to reveal the factor structure and reliability of the Turkish scale.

Sample. For this purpose, the authors sent a questionnaire by a convenience sampling method from 450 private-sector employees through their human resources office. The institutions where the data were collected operated in the tourism (two hotels and one tour company) and finance sector (two insurance companies and one bank's employees) and had 676 employees working in six different Antalya companies. Participation is voluntary, and information has been provided on the purpose of the study. From 450 questionnaires, 267 of them were returned. The response rate was 59.4%, and the authors considered this rate sufficient for the aim of the second study, which was not a generalization of the

results. All returned questionnaires are suitable for EFA. The demographic characteristics of the participants are as follows: 42.7% of the participants work in the tourism sector and 57.3% in the finance sector. 47.9% are men, and 52.1% are women. 39.7% are married, and 60.3% are single. Most of the participants are between the ages of 21-30 (56.6%), followed by 31-40 (28.8%) years old, 41-50 (9.7%) years old, and 51 and over (4.9%), respectively. Many respondents are associate degrees and graduates (78,7%), followed by post-graduate (16,5%) and high school (4.9%) graduates.

Before the reliability and explanatory factor analysis, the authors tested the normality. While the Shapiro-Wilk statistic (0,985, $p < 0,05$) did not confirm the normality, the authors considered the data had normal distribution for the reliability and explanatory factor analysis according to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic (0,050, $p > 0,05$), skewness (-0,312 S.E.=0,149), and kurtosis (-0,261, S.E.=0,297) values (Kline, 2011; Sposito et al., 1983).

Reliability analysis

The scale's reliability should be investigated after the pretest in scale adaptation studies. Reliability analysis tests the consistency between scale items. There are different methods for reliability analysis, such as internal consistency, test-retest, parallel forms, and split-half reliability (DeVellis, 2016). The authors performed internal consistency between items with Cronbach alpha, a commonly used method (DeVellis, 2016; Salkind, 2007). Table 3 shows the Cronbach alpha coefficient and the corrected item-total correlations for reliability analysis results. The scale had a good Cronbach coefficient (0,822) for the Likert scale (Hair et al., 2014; Salkind, 2007). Eleven statements gave the best reliability for the scale.

Explanatory factor analysis

First, the authors conducted Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Barlett sphericity tests to check sampling adequacy (KMO:0.894, $p < 0.000$). Kaiser (1974) proposed that KMO within the 0.80s was meritorious. Measurement sample adequacy values ranged from 0.872 to 0.916 and were above the critical value (0.50). The results show that the data set was sufficient for factor analysis (Kaiser, 1970).

Table 3: Explanatory Factor Analysis Results

Expressions	Factor loadings of the adapted scale	Factor loadings of the original scale	Common Factor Variance	Corrected Item-To-tal Correlation
C1	0.482	0.48	0,233	0,383
C2	0.720	0.60	0.519	0,615
C3	0.609	0.52	0,371	0,499
C4	0.544	0.57	0,296	0,442
C5	0,633	0.57	0.401	0,516
C6	0.707	0.66	0.500	0,596
C7	0.516	0.72	0,266	0,400
C8	0.506	0.72	0,256	0,403
C9	0,621	0.58	0.386	0,520
C10	0,642	0.37	0.412	0,527
C11	0.743	0.72	0.552	0,642

KMO Barlett's Test of Sphericity	0.894
Chi-square	718,952
df	55
p	0,000
Cronbach	0,822

They secondly performed an EFA to reveal the factor structure of the Turkish form by the principal component analysis method with varimax rotation for the scale's validity. Table 3 gives EFA results of the adapted and original scales. Results confirmed the Turkish adaptation of workplace social courage also has a one-dimensional structure. There were no factor loadings below the 0.50 point except for the first item. The first item's value was very close to the critical value, and the sample size of the study ($n=267$) was sufficient for the least (0.48) factor load (Hair et al., 2014) so, the authors did not exclude the item from the scale. It was examined the communalities, and the lowest communalities were 0.233. There is no agreement on the threshold value for the communalities. Hair et al. (2014) stated that it should be above 0.50, while Osborne (2008) indicated that it should be above 0.40. Child (2006) stated that low communalities might occur due to the one-dimensional structure, and the variables below the 0.20 point communalities should be removed. Because of one factorial structure and acceptably factor loadings, the variables with low communalities were not excluded from the scale. As a result, EFA indicates the one-dimensional structure in the original scale is also valid in the Turkish form.

The mean of participants' perception of social courage was 5.16 (sd:0.95). It is higher than the midpoint (4).

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and structural model analysis

The third study aimed to test whether the Turkish form of the workplace social courage scale could measure the latent structure by confirmatory factor analysis and the social courages' predictive power with structural model analysis. The third study has three variables: demographics, workplace social courage, and life satisfaction.

Sample. The third study's population consisted of three companies operating in Ankara. Two of them were in industrial goods manufacturing, and one was in textile. The companies had 482 employees in total. The supervisors and the foremen of the industrial and textile manufacturing company sent the questionnaire link through communication groups to employees. In this way, the authors obtained 394 data. The responding rate was 81.7%. As a result of removing the twenty inappropriate questionnaires, 374 data remained sufficient for the given population. A population consisting of 482 employees requires at least 217 samples (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). 46.5% of the participants were men, 53.5% were women, 60.4% were single, and 39.6% were married. Many of the participants were aged between 21-30 (56.7%), followed by 31-40 years (28.9%), 41-50 (9.6%), 51 and above (3.7%), 20 and under (1.1%). Most of the employees in the

Table 4: Test of Normality of Courage and Life Satisfaction Scales in Study Three

Scale	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		Shapiro-Wilk		Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	p	Statistic	P	Statistic	S.E.	Statistic	S.E.
Life Satisfaction	0,043	0,090	0,989	0,006	-0,358	0,126	-0,498	0,252
Courage	0,046	0,053	0,984	0,000	-0,314	0,126	-0,460	0,252

Table 5: Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results

Workplace Social Courage			Life Satisfaction		
Items	Factor Loads		Items	Factor Loads	
C1	0.454	AVE: 0.38	LS1	0,739	AVE: 0.637
C2	0.727	CR: 0.867	LS2	0.798	CR: 0.897
C3	0.581	MSV: 0.05	LS3	0,869	MSV: 0,05
C4	0.524	Cronbach:0,861	LS4	0.795	Cronbach:0,895
C5	0.585		LS5	0.782	
C6	0.731				
C7	0.575				
C8	0.591				
C9	0,632				
C10	0.550				
C11	0.730				

CR: Construct Reliability, AVE: Average Variance Extracted, MSV: Maximum Shared Variance

sample were high school graduates (79.4%), followed by associate (14.4%), secondary (5.9%), and bachelor (0.3%), respectively. 42% of the participants worked in the textile sector, and 58% worked in industrial products.

Before the reliability and CFA analysis, normality was examined. Table 4 shows the normality tests of courage and life satisfaction. According to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic, it could be said that the variables had normality and skewness and kurtosis values were acceptable range (Kline, 2011; Sposito et al., 1983).

The authors performed CFA to determine whether the workplace social courage scale and the life satisfaction scale have the same latent structure in different samples. Table 5 shows the measurement model's factor loadings, average variance extracted (AVE), construct reliability (CR), and maximum shared variance (MSV). The workplace social courage scale has similar factor loadings to the EFA in study two. While the lowest factor loading belongs to the first statement, the highest factor loading belongs to the sixth statement. Except for the first statement, factor loadings are higher than the critical value (0.50). Still, they remain below the desired

point (0.70), except for the second, sixth, and eleventh-factor loadings (Hair et al., 2010).

The reliability of the scales was tested internal and construct reliability. The internal reliability of the social courage scale was 0.861, and life satisfaction was 0.895. Courage scales' CR was 0.867, and life satisfaction was 0.897. According to these results, the authors considered the measured variables were reliable and successful in representing the latent construct (Hair et al., 2014).

The courage's AVE score (0.38) was less than the critical value (0.50) but, all items' factor loadings (except item one) were above the point of 0,50, and MSV was so low (0.05). For this reason, the authors considered that the social courage scale could measure successfully and separately. The outcome variable of the study is life satisfaction. The factor loadings of all items are above the point of 0.70, and AVE is 0.63. The life satisfaction scale is also successful in measuring its latent structure.

The CFA results of the measurement model confirm that the scales had acceptable and good fit values (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Table 6 represents CFA model fit values.

Table 6: Fit Values of the Measurement Model

	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	RMSEA	CFI	GFI	NFI	SRMR
Measurement Model	212,258	103	2,061	0.053	0.954	0.933	0.915	0.053

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	S.E	1
1-Courage	3.53	0.803	-
2-Life satisfaction	3.34	1.092	0.269*

* $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed)

Table 7 shows descriptive statistics and correlation for variables in study three. Participants' courage perception mean was 3.53 (sd:0.80), and life satisfaction perception was 3.34 (sd:1.09). These values are below the average value of four. There is a positive and significant low-level correlation between these variables ($r = 0.269$, $p < 0.01$).

Structural model analysis results show the effect of employees' workplace social courage perceptions on life satisfaction. According to the results, workplace social courage's perception predicts the life satisfaction of employees in a positive and significant way. Standardized regression coefficient is 0.243 ($p < 0.01$). In other words, courage can explain some changes in life satisfaction. If courage increased one point, life satisfaction would enhance 0.243 points. This result supported Hypothesis 1.

DISCUSSIONS

With conducted three studies, the authors aim to make the validity and reliability of the Turkish form of the workplace social courage scale developed by Howard et al. (2017). We tested linguistic and construct validity and the effect of social courage on life satisfaction with an adapted scale, respectively.

First, the authors translated the scale into Turkish for linguistic validity using the back-forward translation method. The test-retest correlation results showed the Turkish form has linguistic validity by applying the translated and the original document to academicians fluent in both languages at one-week intervals. Second, EFA performed on samples involving 267 data revealed the Turkish form also has a one-dimensional structure. Finally, CFA conducted on the sample consisting of 374 data confirmed the latent structure of courage previously shown by explanatory factor analysis.

As a result of the three studies, we found the observed variables of the courage scale had sufficient power to represent the latent structure but were below the desired level. The first item of the courage scale remained below the critical value in EFA and CFA. The statement is, "Although it may damage our friendship, I would tell my superior when a coworker is doing something incorrectly." The statement means telling the mistake made by his coworker to the upper level. This action is close to the espionage behavior that the group members do not welcome in Turkish collectivist culture. Therefore, the contribution levels of the participants in this statement differed from other expressions. Removing the first item could increase the structural validity of the scale.

The psychometric properties of the adapted scale were similar to the original one. The factor loadings of the Turkish version's scale were akin to the Howard et al. (2017) scale. In their study, Howard et al. (2017) found that the item loadings ranged from 0.37 to 0.72 (Table 3) and retained the minor factor load (0.37) in sample 5 due to the initial samples factor loads. Cronbach's alpha of the original scale ranged from 0.78 to 0.85 in six different studies. Howard (2021) found that workplace social courage was significantly related to personality, and Cronbach was 0.85. Howard and Fox (2020) examined the relationship between social courage, gender, and masculinity-femininity. They found Cronbach 0.83, and there was no significant correlation between courage and gender. Howard and Cogswell (2019) explored the antecedent of social courage and found Cronbach was 0.87, personality and some job characteristics were significantly related to social courage. The Cronbach's alpha of the Turkish version was 0.89.

The structural model also tested the predictive power of the workplace social courages' effect on life satisfaction. Findings show that workplace social courage has a significant and positive impact on life satisfaction. This result is compatible with the other studies' results (Howard and Cogswell, 2019; Santisi et al., 2020; Magnano et al., 2021). The authors considered that the positive feelings and thoughts created by the employees' perception of their brave behaviors positively affect their satisfaction with life.

The Turkish adaptation of the workplace social courage scale successfully measures individuals' perceptions of courage and predicts other variables. The social courages' first item with low factor loads in EFA and CFA could be removed from the scale for cultural reasons. Researchers also might consider removing the items with the low factor loadings from the adapted scale and check the validity and reliability of the short version of the social courage scale because they welcome short scales.

Consequently, workplace social courage is an emerging issue related to organizational variables. Courage is the dedication to achieve individual and organizational aims by voluntarily seeing the risks, logically evaluating the challenging work situations they face, and continuing their mindful behaviors despite danger and fear. Situational and dispositional factors are significant in courage (Kilmann et al., 2010). In fearful and stressful situations, the courage of the individual is decisive on behavior. Thus, studies on courage might contribute to understanding employee attitudes and behaviors in conditions involving stress and fear. The authors scanned the Turkish literature and found conceptual and qualitative studies on courage (Mert, 2007, 2021; Mert & Aydemir, 2019; Mert et al., 2021). Researchers can provide empirical results to practitioners and researchers in future studies by conducting quantitative studies on the predecessors and consequences of courage using the adapted Turkish courage scale.

REFERENCES

- Bayık, M. E., & Gürbüz, S. (2016). Ölçek Uyarlamada Metodoloji Sorunu: Yönetim ve Örgüt Alanında Uyarlanan Ölçekler Üzerinden Bir Araştırma. *İş ve İnsan Dergisi*, 3(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.18394/iid.15648>
- Bekmezci, M., & Mert, İ. S. (2018). Yaşam Tatmini Ölçeğinin Türkçe Geçerlilik Ve Güvenirlilik Çalışması. *Toros Üniversitesi İİSBF Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(8), 166–177.
- Child, D. (2006). *Essentials of factor analysis* (3rd ed.). Continuum.
- Detert, J. R., & Bruno, E. A. (2017). Workplace courage: Review, synthesis, and future agenda for a complex construct. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 11(2), 593–639. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0155>
- Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 869–884. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2007.26279183>
- DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale Development Theory and Applications* (Fourth, Vol. 4). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. In *Journal of Personality Assessment* (Vol. 49, Issue 1, pp. 71–75). Lawrence Erlbaum. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
- Ginevra, M. C., Santilli, S., Camussi, E., Magnano, P., Capozza, D., & Nota, L. (2020). The Italian adaptation of courage measure. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 20(3), 457–475. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10775-019-09412-4>
- Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2014). *Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective* (7th ed., Vol. 7th). Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hall, E. O. C., Wilson, M. E., & Frankenfield, J. A. (2003). Translation and restandardization of an instrument: the Early Infant Temperament Questionnaire. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 42(2), 159–168. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2003.02599.x>
- Hambleton, R. K., & Patsula, L. (1999). Increasing the Validity of Adapted Tests: Myths to be Avoided and Guidelines for Improving Test Adaptation Practices. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 44(8), 1–12.
- Hannah, S. T., & Avolio, B. J. (2010). Moral potency: Building the capacity for character-based leadership. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(4), 291–310. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022283>
- Hannah, S. T., Sweeney, P. J., & Lester, P. B. (2007). Toward a courageous mindset: The subjective act and experience of courage. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 2(2), 129–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760701228854>
- Haybron, D. (2007). Life satisfaction, ethical reflection, and the science of happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 8(1), 99–138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9006-5>
- Howard, M. C. (2019). Applying the approach/avoidance framework to understand the relationships between social courage, workplace outcomes, and well-being outcomes. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 14(6), 734–748. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2018.1545043>
- Howard, M. C. (2021). Identifying social courage antecedents and mediating effects: Applying the HEXACO and approach/avoidance frameworks. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 173, 110637. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110637>
- Howard, M. C., & Alipour, K. K. (2014). Does the courage measure really measure courage? A theoretical and empirical evaluation. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 9(5), 449–459. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2014.910828>
- Howard, M. C., & Cogswell, J. E. (2019). The left side of courage: Three exploratory studies on the antecedents of social courage. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 14(3), 324–340. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2018.1426780>
- Howard, M. C., Farr, J. L., Grandey, A. A., & Gutworth, M. B. (2017). The Creation of the Workplace Social Courage Scale (WSCS): An Investigation of Internal Consistency, Psychometric Properties, Validity, and Utility. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 32(6), 673–690. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-016-9463-8>
- Howard, M. C., & Fox, F. R. (2020). Does gender have a significant relationship with social courage? Test of dual sequentially mediated pathways. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 159(February), 109904. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.109904>
- Howard, M. C., & Holmes, P. E. (2019). Social courage fosters both voice and silence in the workplace: A study on multidimensional voice and silence with boundary conditions. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness*, 7(1), 53–73. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-04-2019-0034>
- Howard, M. C., & Murry, A. S. (2020). Does the courage measure (CM) measure persistence despite fear? *TPM - Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 27(2), 271–277. <https://doi.org/10.4473/TPM27.2.7>

- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- Kaiser, H. F. (1970). A second generation little jiffy. *Psychometrika*, 35(4), 401–415. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291817>
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31–36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291575>
- Kilmann, R. H., O'Hara, L. A., & Strauss, J. P. (2010). Developing and Validating a Quantitative Measure of Organizational Courage. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(1), 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9125-1>
- Kline, R. B. (2011). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling, 3rd ed. In *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling, 3rd ed.* Guilford Press.
- Koerner, M. M. (2014). Courage as Identity Work: Accounts of Workplace Courage. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(1), 63–93. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0641>
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>
- Magnano, P., Lodi, E., Zammitti, A., & Patrizi, P. (2021). Courage, career adaptability and readiness as resources to improve well-being during the university-to-work transition in Italy. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(6), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18062919>
- Magnano, P., Paolillo, A., Platania, S., & Santisi, G. (2017). Courage as a potential mediator between personality and coping. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 111, 13–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.01.047>
- Marques, S. C., Lopez, S. J., & Mitchell, J. (2013). The Role of Hope, Spirituality and Religious Practice in Adolescents' Life Satisfaction: Longitudinal Findings. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 14(1), 251–261. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-012-9329-3>
- Marques, S. C., Pais-Ribeiro, J. L., & Lopez, S. J. (2007). Validation of a Portuguese Version of the Students' Life Satisfaction Scale. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 2(2), 83–94. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-007-9031-5>
- McMillan, T. M., & Rachman, S. J. (1988). Fearlessness and courage in paratroopers undergoing training. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 9(2), 373–378. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(88\)90100-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(88)90100-6)
- Mert, İ. S. (2007). *Cesaret Yönetimi*. Hayat Yayınları.
- Mert, İ. S. (2010). Terör Yönetimi Kuramı ve Cesaret: Kavramsal Bir Tartışma. *Güvenlik Stratejileri Dergisi*, 06(12), 57–81. <https://doi.org/10.17752/gsd.26874>
- Mert, İ. S. (2021). Cesaret ve bileşenlerinin keşfine ilişkin nitel bir araştırma: Eski bir erdemden yeniden keşfi. *İş ve İnsan Dergisi*, 8(April), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.18394/iid.729238>
- Mert, İ. S., & Aydemir, M. (2019). Yönetimsel Cesaretin Tarihi Kaynakları Üzerine Bir İnceleme: Eski Türk Yazıtlarında Cesaret. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(6), 331–340. <https://doi.org/10.18506/anemon.523718>
- Mert, İ. S., Sen, C., & Alzghoul, A. (2021). Organizational justice, life satisfaction, and happiness: the mediating role of workplace social courage. *Kybernetes, ahead-of-p*(ahead-of-print). <https://doi.org/10.1108/K-02-2021-0116>
- Norton, P. J., & Weiss, B. J. (2009). The role of courage on behavioral approach in a fear-eliciting situation: A proof-of-concept pilot study. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 23(2), 212–217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2008.07.002>
- Osborne, J. (2008). *Best Practices in Quantitative Methods*. SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412995627>
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (1993). Review of the Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 5(2), 164–172. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.5.2.164>
- Rate, C. R., Clarke, J. A., Lindsay, D. R., & Sternberg, R. J. (2007). Implicit theories of courage. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 2(2), 80–98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760701228755>
- Salkind, N. (2007). Encyclopedia of Measurement and Statistics. In *Neurogastroenterology and Motility* (Vol. 23, Issue 8). Sage Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412952644>
- Santisi, G., Lodi, E., Magnano, P., Zarbo, R., & Zammitti, A. (2020). Relationship between Psychological Capital and Quality of Life: The Role of Courage. *Sustainability*, 12(13), 5238. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12135238>
- Scarre, G. (2012). *On Courage* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203851982>
- Sposito, V. A., Hand, M. L., & Skarpness, B. (1983). On the efficiency of using the sample kurtosis in selecting optimal lpestimators. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation*, 12(3), 265–272. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610918308812318>

- Van de Vijver, F., & Hambleton, R. K. (1996). Translating Tests. *European Psychologist*, 1(2), 89–99. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.1.2.89>
- Woodard, C. R., & Pury, C. L. S. (2007). The construct of courage: Categorization and measurement. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 59(2), 135–147. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1065-9293.59.2.135>
- Zavaliy, A. G., & Aristidou, M. (2014). Courage: A Modern Look at an Ancient Virtue. *Journal of Military Ethics*, 13(2), 174–189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15027570.2014.943037>