The relationship between the leadership styles of the school administrators and the organizational citizenship behaviours of teachers

Ebru Öğuz a *

*Faculty of Education, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Samsun 55200, Turkey

Abstract

The aim of this study is to determine the relationship between the leadership styles of the school administrators and the organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers. The concept of organizational citizenship is not one of the task definitions of teachers but they are the actions which they perform with their free will. Besides, these actions increase job satisfaction and productivity of teachers in their working environment. The style of leadership of school administrators has a significant effect on the gaining process of organizational citizenship for teachers. The study group of this research model was formed with 204 volunteer primary school teachers who work in Samsun city center. The data of this research have been collected by looking into the “Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Scale” and “The Leadership Style Questionnaire”. Descriptive statistics, t test, Kruskal Wallis test have been used in the analysis of the data which have been collected. According to the findings which have been gathered, the participants have positive outlooks and opinions about the organizational citizenship behaviors in the schools they work in. However, participants’ opinions have had a significant diversity in terms of gender, branch, education level and variable seniority. There is a meaningful and positive relationship between the organizational behaviors of teachers and transactional and transformational leadership styles of school administrators. It cannot be denied that school administrators have an important role in making teachers feel that they are the part of the organization and in their working more efficiently. Consequently, it is important that school administrators are the people who should have clear objectives, be open to transformation, be able to give ethical decisions and respect and appraise teachers’ opinions.
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1. Introduction

In recent years, in the very essence of the followers’ making more useful practices for their organizations, voluntary and optional behaviours are claimed to have existed in the working group and thus more research have been done more frequently related to extra-role behaviours of the followers. In this sense, extra-role behaviours have become more important for organizations. These behaviours could also be defined as voluntary behaviours except for formal organizational requirements. Furthermore, extra-role behaviours can be expressed as organizational citizenship behaviours. Organizational citizenship behaviours are in an interaction with the
organizational structure, communication with the other followers and the leadership styles of the managers. Organizational citizenship behaviour and leadership style of the leader could affect the followers’ performance and the output.

2. Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) comprises extra-role behaviors that are not within role but nevertheless of great importance for efficient processes in organizations (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 1997). Literature discusses different conceptions of OCB (Podsakoff et al., 2000). In Deckop et al.’s study (Deckop, Mangel, & Cirka, 1999), OCB consists of the following three facets: (1) helping behavior, (2) sportsmanship, and (3) conscientiousness.

Helping behavior stimulates performance because new colleagues are easily integrated into the group. Therefore, the group can establish best practices, ease coordination, and thus variations of performance become less probable. Given high levels of sportsmanship, the group does not need to spend much energy and time on group maintenance functions.

Hence, sportsmanship may raise the attractiveness of group membership for high performers. With increasing follower conscientiousness, leaders may tend to empower their followers and, thus, raise their performance motivation. Accordingly, in a comprehensive literature review, Podsakoff et al. (2000) found OCB to predict followers’ performance.

3. Leadership Styles

Transformational leadership is based on increasing the level of consciousness of followers about the value of the output and upgrading their success. Transactional leadership, on the other hand, is based on the expected reward in return for the obedience of the followers with their effort, productivity and loyalty (Bass and Riggio, 2006).

One of the main differences between two leadership styles is: transformational leadership style is directed to future, innovation, change and reformation. On the contrary; transactional leadership style is based on past and traditions. Transformational leaders create their organizational culture with the existing rules, procedures and norms. The leaders who behave in the form of transactional leadership style use their authority in rewarding their followers by giving money and status so that the followers could make more effort whereas transformational leaders try to inspire their followers for a mission and orient them to a dream or a vision (Eren, 2001). Unlike transactional leaders, transformational leaders inspire their followers, give them intellectual stimulation and show concern for each individual. Transformational leaders are guiding their followers and they can compromise more easily (Bass, 1999).

Transformational leaders consider the leadership as a process that stimulates and inspires their followers and that also enhances their leadership capacities. Moreover, transformational leaders support their followers to gain problem-solving skills by coaching and mentoring as well as inspiring them (Bass and Riggio, 2006). Nevertheless, transactional leaders lead to social diversity. Transactional leaders focus on financial rewards or penalties to increase efficiency (Yammarino and Bass, 1990; Bass and Riggio, 2006). They are also focused on the variation among the followers and colleagues. This variation is based on the required circumstances in which the leader could debate with the other and it is also based on the award which can be obtained as a result of completed requirements (Bass, 1985; Akt.Hartog, House, Hangles and Quintanilla).

While defining the transformational leadership, Bass (1985-1996) is primarily focused on the impact that the leader has on the followers. Having trust, faith, respect and appreciation towards the leader can make followers become much more motivated than expected. The leader’s attitude may lead the followers consider the organization’s interest above their own interests. Transformational leadership bears some differences in terms of complying with the rules of the organization, fulfilling the demands of the leader, motivation of the followers and the change process when it is compared to the transactional leadership.
In fact, laissez-faire leadership is an ineffective kind of leadership. This kind of leader neither support followers nor try to lead them. They are reluctant to attract followers and they prefer not to deal with their needs and demands. They fail to make individual or group decisions and avoid responsibilities. They fail to be a part of anything and are not interested in ongoing actions or activities (Deluga, 1990; Kikbride, 2006). Laissez-faire leaders provide full freedom to followers. They avoid followers’ questions and they don’t evaluate them. Under the leadership of laissez-faire organizations, an organizational structure is hard to be formed and ineffective. Therefore, followers have rather low satisfaction. In this kind of leadership, the quality of work that is being done is very low.

Laissez-faire leadership can be considered as the least satisfactory and the most ineffective leadership style. Followers are quite isolated from the leader and they hardly ever participate in the process of taking decisions. Having freedom in organizations can cause lack of control and organizational sanctions. Individual goals are above organizational goals (Bass and Stodgill, 1990).

Laissez-faire leadership the extent to which leaders avoid responsibility, fail to make decisions, are absent when needed, or fail to follow up on requests (Bass, 1985; cited in Nguni, Sleegersb, Denessen, 2006).

4. The relationship between organizational leadership and leadership styles

Researchers have identified various factors that influence organizational citizenship behavior of which leadership is an important one. Empirical support for the relationship between supportive leadership style and organizational citizenship behavior can be found in various research studies mainly derived from noneducational context (Podsakoff et al., 1990; Smith et al., 1983; cited in Nguni, Sleegersb, Denessen, 2006).

For a long time, the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational performance has been analysed in literature (e.g., Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Howell & Avolio, 1993). However, little is still known about the mediating processes between transformational leadership and organizational success (Kark, Chen, & Shamir, 2003; Yukl, 1999).

The goal of our study is to help fill this gap by analyzing the mediating role of follower behavior. We argue that transformational leadership abets different follower behaviors that lead to follower performance and follower innovation, respectively. More precisely, we examine the mediating effects of two different follower behaviors: organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997) and controversial discussion (Simons, Pelled, & Smith, 1999). Organizational citizenship behavior is explicitly defined as “extra-role behavior” and has been shown to have a positive impact on follower performance (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Ahearne, 1998; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000), while debate is assumed to enhance follower innovation in particular (Gebert, Boerner, & Kearney, 2006).

Transformational leaders inspire followers to achieve extraordinary outcomes by providing both meaning and understanding. They align the objectives and goals of individual followers and the larger organization (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 3).

Transformational leaders are assumed to “stimulate followers to perform beyond the level of expectations” (Bass, 1985; cited in Boerner, Eisenbeiss, & Griesser, 2007). Therefore, it seems likely that transformational leaders, by stimulating followers’ organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff et al., 1990), enhance quality and quantity of follower performance. A transformational leader provides meaning, and thereby makes followers identify with the respective goals and problems (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993).

Prior research provided consistent support for a positive relationship between transformational leadership and OCB across different settings (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000).

5. The Method

The research has been done in screening procedure. The aim is to display primary school teachers’ organizational citizenship behaviours and their leaders’ opinions about leadership styles with their past and present references (Karasar, 1995).
5.1. The study group

The study group of the research has been formed with 204 teachers who work in schools in Samsun city centre and they have taken part in the research voluntarily. The participants have been selected randomly. 52.5% of the participants are female and 47.5% of them are male. 42.2% of the participants are class teachers and 57.8% of them are branch teachers. 25.5% of the teachers have bachelor’s degrees, 20.1% have graduated from educational institutes, 42.6% have graduated from faculty of educations, only 3.9% of them have master’s degrees and 7.8% of them do not belong to any of these categories. Seniority varies from 3 years to 40 years.

5.2. Surveying tools

The data of this study has been obtained by using “Organizational Citizenship Behaviours Scale” (DiPaola, Tarter & Hoy, 2005) and “The Leadership Style Questionnaire” (Oğuz, 2008). Institutional copy of Organizational Citizenship Behaviours Scale consists of 12 likert-type items. In calculating the total score, scale ranking of two items is made in reverse. The institutional copy of the scale is one-dimensional. Reliability quotient is $a = 86$. The high score that has been obtained from the scale indicates organizational citizenship behaviours (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005). The adaptation of the scale to Turkish has been done by Taşdan and Yılmaz (2008). The actual value of the factor is 5.48. Factor loading values of the items in the scale vary from 31 to 82. Variance that is explained by the scale itself is 45.66%. According to the results of reliability analysis of organizational citizenship behaviour scale, Cronbach Alpha reliability quotient is determined as $a = 87$ (Taşdan & Yılmaz, 2008). Scales have a quintet likert-type response scale which ranges from “I definitely agree” item to “I strongly disagree” item. The leadership Style Scale of school administrators is three-dimensional and consists of 49 items. The factor loading values of the items which exist in transformational leadership dimension of leadership style scale vary from 30 to 87. The result of reliability analysis indicates that Cronbach Alpha reliability quotient is $a = 95$. The variance which is determined by the items is 50%. The factor loading values of the items which are in the laissez-faire leadership style vary between .74 and 89. The result of reliability analysis indicates that Cronbach Alpha Reliability Quotient is $a = .85$. The variance which has been obtained from the items is 70%.

5.3. The analysis of the data

In this study, descriptive statistics have been used to designate personal information and to evaluate the response which has been obtained from the scale; on the other hand, $t$ test, Kruskal Wallis and correlation analysis have been used to compare different points of view.

6. Findings

The comparison of the participants’ opinions that are related to organizational citizenship and their leaders’ opinions about leadership styles according to sex and branch variations has been made by using $t$ test. Participants’ opinions regarding laissez-faire leadership style vary according to the sex variation [$t_{(202)} = 3.037; p < 0.05$]. Female teachers ($X = 45.62$) have more positive point of views about the organizational citizenship behaviours when it is compared to male teachers ($X = 43.39$). On the other hand, when branches are taken into consideration, the participants’ opinions relating to transformational leadership style vary according to sex [$t_{(202)} = 2.240; p < 0.05$] variation. Class teachers ($X = 96.59$) have more positive views compared to branch teachers ($X = 90.29$).

The participants’ perceptions relating to the transformational leadership dimension have varied in a meaningful way according to the level of education [$\chi^2 (4) = 12.471, p < .05$]. Considering the average ranking order, the highest average belongs to educational institute graduates, on the other hand, those who graduate without completing their bachelor’s degrees are identified to have the lowest average.
The teachers who have participated in the research have various perceptions about the laissez-faire leadership style, which have gone under a change according to their seniority \[\chi^2 (3) = 20.891, p < .05\]. When ranking order averages are taken into consideration, those who have over 30 years seniority have the highest average; on the other hand, the lowest average belongs to those who have seniority from 11 to 20 years. This finding can be interpreted that advancing in seniority can cause expected leadership behaviours to reduce.

There is a positive and meaningful relationship between administrators’ transformational leadership style and teachers’ organizational citizenship behaviours. \((r = .387, p < .005)\). When determination coefficient \((r^2 = 0.15)\) is considered, 10\% of total variance is due to transactional leadership style.

If we examine the relationship between the sub dimensions of two scales, there is a meaningful and positive correlation between transformational leadership dimension and transactional leadership dimension \((r = .799, p < .005)\). That we are not able to differentiate two different leadership styles precisely can explain this conclusion. Likewise, there is a meaningful and significant correlation between laissez-faire leadership style and transactional leadership style \((r = .346, p < .005)\).
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