

Full Length Research Paper

The role of leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour in efficient management

Ahmet AVCI

Department of Education Sciences, Lifelong Learning Center & Career Center Director, Fatih Sultan Mehmet Vakıf University, Turkey.

Received 20 July, 2015; Accepted 28 September, 2015

Currently, leadership and organizational citizenship behaviours are the most significant actors in management of organizations. Leadership ensures management of human factor within organizations while orientation and control of human factor is provided by organizational citizenship behaviour. Managers' leadership characteristics have a direct and highly important impact on primarily employees and organizational citizenship sensed as well as organizational culture, climate and success. Managers' personal and professional characteristics and their communication and management styles are essential determinants for formation and shaping of organizational citizenship. Organizational citizenship behaviours are the most significant factors for high performance working, increasing efficiency, showing extra effort beyond the expectations, forming the culture of "big family" among employees, establishing efficient management dedicated to organizational vision, mission, core values and goals. Starting from these considerations, the main purpose of this essay is to define the role of leadership and organizational citizenship behaviours in establishment and maintaining of efficient management and also to make inferences and suggestions in order to enable organizations to gain sustainable achievements. With reference to the purpose of the research, documentary model was used as the research design.

Key words: Efficient management, leadership, organizational citizenship.

INTRODUCTION

The competition conditions experienced currently have rendered efficient management much more important in any field. Leadership and organizational citizenship behaviours play a critical role in establishment of efficient management. The rapid developments experienced in the internal and external environments of organizations require practising more efficient and effective leadership styles in organizations with the aim of achieving organizational success (Burns, 1978: 3; Bass, 2008: 7; Yukl, 2008: 93; Drucker, 1988: 45; Kotter, 2001: 85).

Organizational citizenship behaviour is the leading topic considered important and researched in relation to ensuring high performance working, increasing efficiency, showing extra effort beyond the expectations, forming the culture of "big family" among employees, establishing efficient management dedicated to organizational vision, mission, core values and goals (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Graham, 1991; DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran, 2001; DiPaola and Hoy, 2005; Bogler and Somech, 2005).

*Corresponding author. E-mail: ahmetavci7@gmail.com

Authors agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Based on these determinations, the main purpose of the article is to indicate the role of leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors in provision and maintenance of effective management and also to make some inferences and suggestions which enable organizations to gain sustainable successes.

METHODOLOGY

Research design/strategy

This research is of qualitative and survey model while in terms of data collection techniques, it is a documentary survey and descriptive research. Descriptive researches try to search, define and explain incidents, facts and relations as they are (Karasar, 2007:77). Qualitative researches are fundamentally based on an "interpretive" perspective since they deal with how the incidents, facts and relations emerge, they are understood and interpreted. In qualitative research, researcher uses the flexible data collecting, examining, analyzing and interpreting methods suitable for the research context (Bakioğlu and Kurnaz, 2011:54). Survey models are the research methods aiming to describe a past or existing fact as it is (Karasar, 2007:77). In survey model, researcher tries to describe an existing situation or fact carefully and make important analyses in this respect. Document survey model encompasses finding, examining, analysing and interpreting the resources for a certain purpose. In document survey models, the data is obtained from the existing records, documents and research results (Karasar, 2007:183). The researches in the document survey model are divided into two groups as general survey and content analysis (Karasar, 2007:184). In this study, the general survey model known as literature survey was used and descriptive analyses were made. The basic condition of a successful document survey is the capability to make the necessary arrangements to find the related documents, examine them and have a synthesis (Karasar, 2007:189). Detailed literature survey was made, hence primary data and resources were obtained in this research. The necessary examinations, analyses and discussions were made on the collected data and the part of results was written and the practical suggestions were put forward.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Management

According to different perspectives, management has been defined and described variously. Generally, management is defined as getting the works performed by persons (Hodgetts, 1997: 317). In a broader sense, management is a process during which sources are organized to reach the predefined goals and results are assessed to determine future activities (Hodgetts, 1997: 317). Maxwell (2012: 36) defines management as prompting and governing the persons managed with the aim of ensuring their happiness. Owen et al. (2011: 66) defines it as a way to introduce order and audit to hierarchal organizations. According to Robbins; Judge (2012: 376), management is the art of coping with chaos. From a different perspective, Drucker (2012: 43) defines management as the most important innovation of the twenty first century that has a direct impact on the educated persons and the young who attend higher-education schools and universities to be "intellectual workers" of tomorrow as well as future managers in managed organizations. Drucker's perspective describes the role played by management in drawing the road map and course of a country beyond that of individual, society, organization and companies.

Eren's definition of management (2013: 3) covers the processes and variables involved in the concept of management. According to Eren (2013: 4), management is combination of the processes of taking and implementing the decisions on harmonic, efficient and effective use of financial sources, equipment, assets, raw materials, auxiliary materials and time. Robbins; Decenzo; Coulter (2013: 6) defines management as the process of getting some works done with and by others efficiently and productively. In this definition, productivity means carrying out a work properly and obtaining maximum productivity with maximum sources while efficiency refers to completion of actions and performance of proper works in order to achieve the organizational goals (Robbins et al., 2013: 6).

Leadership

Many authors having studied leadership have made various definitions based on their study fields and focuses (Burns, 1978: 1; Yukl, 2008: 20; Lunenburg and Ornstein, 2013: 100). In this respect, Stodgil found out after long-term studies that leadership has as many definitions as the number of persons who attempted to define it (Yukl, 2008: 20). Even if there are some conceptual conflicts, leadership is defined by most specialists as the process during which an individual affects other group members with the purpose of achieving the defined success or organizational goals (Lunenburg and Ornstein, 2013: 100). Following their researches, Burns and Bass put forward that it would be more appropriate to consider the concept of leadership under two basic titles including transformational and transactional leadership (Yukl, 1989: 269; Avolio, Bass and Jung, 1999: 441; Bass, 1997: 130).

Structure and definition of transformational and transactional leadership styles

Burns and Bass consider the concept of leadership under two main titles, transactional and transformational leadership. Based on more traditional styles, transactional leadership acts under the principle of awarding and involves mutual exchange between leader and followers (Yukl, 1989: 271; Bass et al., 2003: 208). In transformational leadership, leader establishes a link between himself/herself and followers/employees, affects them, becomes a role-model for them, encourages them to work willingly beyond their performance, acts under team spirit, pays effort to realize the organizational goals in unity, follows constantly innovations, changes and developments, keeps the organization full and alive under fierce competition and enables the organization to get closer to success (Yukl, 1989: 272; Bass, 1997: 131; MacKenzie et al., 2001: 116; Avolio et al., 1999: 460).

Sub-dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership

The sub-dimensions of transformational leadership are generally considered under the following titles: 1) *Idealized influence-charisma*: Leader is a person admired, trusted and respected. 2) *Inspirational motivation*: Leader motivates and encourages the followers in line with the organizational goals and objectives. 3) *Intellectual stimulation*: Leader encourages his/her followers to have a new/different perspective towards experienced incidents, situations and problems. 4) *Individualised consideration*: Leader takes care of his/her employees' personal differences and needs, pays required importance to them and detects their different possibilities and capabilities and sets for them the objectives that they can achieve (Bass, 1997: 133; Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999: 187; Bass, Avolio et al., 2003: 208). The sub-dimensions of transactional leadership can be addressed under the following

titles: 1) *Conditional award*: Leader informs the followers clearly about the expectations of organization and about the fact that they will be awarded if they satisfy these expectations. 2) *Management by exceptions*: It is divided into two categories as active and passive: a) *Active management by exceptions*: Leader observes his/her employees and their performance. In the event of a divergence from standards and rules, leader intervenes in and remedies the mistake. b) *Passive management by exceptions*: Leader does not intervene in the system until the problems become serious. When the disruptions experienced become serious, it attracts everyone's attention and hence leader takes an action and intervenes in the situation. 3) *Leadership recognising full freedom*: Leader does not take action and he is indecisive and reluctant. He/she avoids undertaking responsibility, leaves his/her employees and system alone and he is absent within the system and management when he is needed (MacKenzie et al., 2001: 116; Bass, 1997: 133; Bass et al., 2003: 208).

Organizational citizenship behaviour

Making use of Katz's (1964) definition of extra role behaviour, Organ et al. described, for the first time, the concept of "organizational citizenship behaviour" (Bateman and Organ, 1983: 588; Graham, 1991: 249) which has a critical role in the organizational success and development and which is expressed as the behaviours involving extra effort on a volunteer basis beyond the defined role-task expectations (Bateman and Organ, 1983: 589). The theory and dimensions of this concept were put forward by Organ (1989). Later, this behaviour was defined as pro-social behaviour, good soldier syndrome, organizational volunteerism and extra role-task behaviour (Graham, 1991: 250; Podsakoff et al., 2000: 513-515; Motowidlo, 2000: 117).

Structure and definition of organizational citizenship behaviour

Organizational citizenship behaviour is defined as discretionary extra-role behaviour which is not directly involved or defined in the formal reward system, and which in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Bateman and Organ, 1983: 588). Unlike formal organizational behaviours, organizational citizenship behaviour is on volunteer basis (Organ and Konovsky, 1988: 157), goes beyond the routine work behaviours (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter, 1990: 115), isn't based on explicit orders and instructions (Graham, 1991: 253), contributes to organizational success in short, medium and long term (Williams and Anderson, 1991: 602). Those non-formal behaviours that go beyond formal and written work and task behaviours are generally called as organizational citizenship behaviour (Farh, Podsakoff and Organ, 1990: 706; Moorman, 1991: 846; Moorman, Neihoff and Organ, 1993: 210).

Starting from the definitions of organizational citizenship behaviour and their scope, such behaviours involve the following three basic aspects (Bateman and Organ, 1983: 588; Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1997: 135; Wagner and Rush, 2000: 380): 1) Being discretionary and volunteer, 2) Involving extra behaviour not included in terms of reference, 3) Contributing to organizational effectiveness and success. Examining the structure of organizational citizenship behaviours, it is seen that such behaviours can be assessed under the following two groups (Organ and Konovsky, 1988: 157; Farh et al., 1990: 706; Moorman, 1991: 846; Organ and Ryan, 1995: 777): 1) Behaviours for providing active participation and contribution to the organization and 2) Behaviours avoiding any behaviours that may damage the organization and prevent them within organization. General characteristics of the first-type behaviours are individuals' active contribution to the organization and efficient participation in the

organizational structure and their contribution to the organization by working and sacrifice. As general characteristics, the second-type behaviours contribute to the organization by avoiding and preventing the behaviours that may damage the organization. Although there are some basic differences between these two types of behaviours, the underlying aspect for both of them is to grow the organizational success and efficiency (Podsakoff et al., 1996: 263; Motowidlo, 2000: 116).

Sub-dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour

Regarding sub-dimensions of the concept of organizational citizenship behaviour, Organ's definition including five dimensions (1988) are taken as basis and various inferences are made accordingly (Podsakoff et al., 2000: 516; DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran, 2001: 431; DiPaola and Hoy, 2005: 36). Nonetheless, it can not be stated that there is complete compromise in this respect. Starting from Bernard (1938), Katz (1964), Katz and Kahn's (1960) studies and by synthesizing them with Bateman and Organ's (1983) studies which use the concept of organizational citizenship behaviour under its current concept, Organ (1986) considered the sub-dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour under the following five titles (Podsakoff et al., 1990: 115-116; Podsakoff et al., 1996: 279-280; Podsakoff et al., 2000: 516-517; DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran, 2001: 431-432): 1) *Altruism*: It implies that an individual helps voluntarily and willingly his/her colleagues and those newly starting working and plays an active role in solution of work-related problems within the organization and assists other persons gratuitously. 2) *Courtesy*: It refers to preventing potential problems by informing, reminding and transferring useful information and to fulfilling the tasks more effectively by efficient use of time and possibilities. 3) *Conscientiousness*: It implies that an individual fulfils his/her tasks voluntarily beyond the minimum expected role behaviours. Arriving the work place on time, using the working time efficiently and respecting the rules defined in the working place voluntarily can be considered under this title. 4) *Sportsmanship*: It refers to performing the tasks willingly without complaining in the event of problems and disruptions experienced in the organization. Sportsmanship denotes not complaining when disturbed by others or when the conditions are not as desired and it also denotes not refusing colleagues' wishes. 5) *Civic virtue*: It means active and volunteer participation in the organizational activities and life by keeping the organizational interest at the highest level.

Role of leadership and organizational behaviour in establishment of efficient management

Together with organizational citizenship, transformational and transactional leadership have significant effects on the corporate success and other corporate factors. Also, compared to transactional leadership, transformational leadership provides more contribution to achievement of the organizational success and goals and affects organizational citizenship more positively in almost all studies (Yukl, 1989: 272; Bass, 1997: 130; MacKenzie et al., 2001: 118; Geijssels et al., 2003: 230). Transactional leaders do not intervene in previous functioning system of the organization (Bass, 1997: 134); they motivate their employees by awarding them, promise position, status and money for their success (Howell and Avolio, 1993: 891); they also do not pay attention to employees' personal traits, entrepreneur and innovative characteristics (Deluga, 1990: 192) and hence the activities are performed in this way under the framework of the basic mission and vision of the organization (MacKenzie et al., 2001: 118; Bass et al., 2003: 208). This leadership style is beneficial for managing the organization under the framework of the organizational mission, vision and core values

and guiding and governing the system (Bass, 1997: 134). However, this leadership is not sufficient in terms of re-organizing the organization and structure for innovation, entrepreneurship, reform and needs, all of which have become a must in current competitive environment, and also in terms of acting together with the employees and producing the outputs beyond expectation under team spirit (Yukl, 1989: 271; MacKenzie et al., 2001: 118). Transformational leaders establish a strong link between themselves and their employees (Bass, 1997: 130); they guide their employees in line with the organizational interests (Deluga, 1990: 193); they affect them in a way that they go away from their personal interests and work more and sacrifice for the sake of organizational success (Leithwood, 1992: 9); they become a guide for them by being a role-model in this respect and ensure their commitment for the organization (Koh et al., 1995: 320); they analyse and know their employees' beliefs, values and needs well and hence motivate them and encourage them to show a performance beyond expectations by considering their personal differences (Leithwood et al., 1996: 203); they assign them with the tasks which are suitable for their possibilities and capabilities and allow them to experience the sense of success and gain more self-confidence (Hipp, 1997: 4). Transformational leaders are also engaged in personal and corporate development (Bogler, 2001: 663); they go after innovation by ever-lasting energy and desire and they are entrepreneur and innovative (Bess and Goldman, 2001: 434); they have a different perspective towards events and problems and hence they derive different inference and produce flexible solutions (Barnett et al., 1999: 42); they fulfil the changes required in the organizational mission, vision, core values and strategic planning in accordance with the necessities of the time and competitive environment (Geijsel et al., 2003: 230). This leadership style is closer to success (Yukl, 1989: 272) in the present conditions in which change is experienced stunningly (Howell and Avolio, 1993: 891), science and technology develops and spreads rapidly (Leithwood and Jantazi, 2007: 204), competition is highly fierce, organizations produce rapid and flexible solutions (Howell and Avolio, 1993: 892), management is restructured according to personal traits, works turn out to be successful under team spirit (MacKenzie et al., 2001: 118) in order that organizations become successful domestically and globally and survive by overcoming problems and adapt to changing conditions rapidly.

Organizational citizenship behaviours have a quite critical role, serious significance and extensive benefit for efficiency and success of organizations (Bateman and Organ, 1983: 587). Such behaviours contribute considerably to organizational success and achievement of organizational goals (Podsakoff et al., 1990: 109; Farh et al., 1990: 707) by protecting the organization against destructive and undesired actions (Organ and Konovsky, 1988: 157), improving employees' capabilities and skills, forming an efficient and productive working atmosphere (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter, 1990: 109; Farh, Podsakoff and Organ, 1990: 707). The fact that organization, while fulfilling its objectives, enables individuals to reach their goals and those individuals, while realizing their aims, enable organization to reach its goals are the fundamental needs of organizational life. From this perspective, organizational citizenship behaviour plays a balancing role for achievement of personal and organizational goals (Organ and Ryan, 1995: 776; Podsakoff, MacKenzie and Bommer, 1996: 278). According to the research outputs, organizational citizenship behaviour supports the organizational structure at the following three points within the organization for establishing efficient and productive working environment (Motowidlo, 2000: 116; Borman, 2004: 239; Purnova et al., 2006: 4): 1) It grows solidarity and cooperation among employees, 2) It improves employees' responsibility against their organization and colleagues, 3) It enables employees to develop positive attitude towards their organization and colleagues.

DISCUSSION

The fact that leadership is a very important factor in achieving success in the management and in having institutions achieved their objectives is a result that occurs in almost all researches (Burns, 1978; Drucker, 1988; Bass, 1997; Avolio et al., 1999; Kotter, 2001; MacKenzie et al., 2001; Bass et al., 2003; Bass, 2008; Yukl, 2008). Regardless of the type of sector and the line of business difference, and with reference to research findings, it can be commented that the degree of effectiveness and success of leadership in institutions are the most important determinants of institutional outcomes and success. However, the transformational and transactional leadership have effects on institutional structure and culture of an institution, separately (Tahaoğlu and Gedikoğlu, 2009:293; Şahin, 2005:46). The organizational trust, commitment (Buluç, 2009: 26), organizational citizenship behavior (Oğuz, 2011: 395), job satisfaction (Yılmaz and Ceylan, 2011: 291) exhibited by employees and the positive and healthy organizational structure and climate (Şahin, 2011: 1919; Korkmaz, 2005:412; Cemaloğlu, 2007a:83; Koşar and Çalık, 2011:596), organizational learning and continuous self-improvement features (Arslan and Uslu, 2014:351; Korkmaz, 2008: 91) and the organization's performance and success index (Korkmaz, 2006: 520) are high to the extent that transformational leadership characteristics of managers are high.

However, the major issue here is the lack of studies carried out on how leadership which is really important will be established in institutions and how will leaders who could shape the future of the institution be educated. In fact, the most important point is here. Because when the literature is analyzed, in studies carried out from the first use of the leadership concept until today; the importance of leadership has always been emphasized (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1997, 2008; Yukl, 2008), general suggestions have been given regarding the educating of leaders, however, studies about shaping the factor which is so important for institutions according to institutional structure and about presenting models for different sectors have been insufficient. Yes, the general characteristics of leadership are certain, and there is a system in establishing these characteristics in the general sense, however, it seems impossible that this general leadership structure could be applied to each sector. This is because of the structure differentiated on sectoral basis, of the sector-specific different characteristics that employees have, of the differences in business processes, and of different inputs (the presence constituting the basis of production) and outputs (products). In the following example, this will be understood more clearly; heavy industry sector and education sector are completely different from each other, and also tourism sector and military sector are completely different from each other. Therefore, in the general sense, the implementation of the same leadership practices in these

sectors which are different from each other will not be a healthy method. Moreover, the establishment of leadership in these sectors and the education of leaders will also be different from each other. In this case, there appear two major issues concerning the leadership. The first of these is the development of leadership models unique to different sectors and the second one is the preparation of the necessary infrastructure and environment in the work environments for the education of leaders in sectors which are different from each other. The theoretical and empirical studies to be carried out on these two major issues will fill a crucial gap for the development of leadership which has vital importance for the institutions.

Regarding the organizational citizenship behaviors and the connection of these behaviors with organizational variables, while there is a positive outlook in general, there are also some studies that approach the issue in a critical manner. Şeşen (2008) examines this issue in detail in his study called "A critical analysis of studies on organizational citizenship behaviors: Theological and epistemological concerns". According to Şeşen (2008), the issue of organizational citizenship behaviors attracted the interest of many researchers especially in the last fifteen to twenty years, and many researches have been carried out on the premises and results of this issue. However, when the research results was analyzed according to Şeşen (2008), it is seen that the concept of organizational citizenship behavior was based on some universal consents and that it was not discussed on the basis of theoretical, conceptual or philosophical. Also, when the domestic and foreign sources related to organizational citizenship behaviors was analyzed, it is seen that it is not much possible to agree with the opinion of Şeşen (2008). Because there are many domestic and foreign researches concerning the premises and especially the results of organizational citizenship behaviors, and these researches reveal the positive effects of organizational citizenship behaviors for the institutions on the basis of scientific data (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Graham, 1991; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Motowidlo, 2000; DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran, 2001; DiPaola and Hoy, 2005; Bogler and Somech, 2005; Özdevecioğlu, 2003; Sezgin, 2005; Polat and Celep, 2008; Buluç, 2008; Oğuz, 2011). Thus, it is possible to observe that the critical importance and value revealed by organizational citizenship behaviors for the institutions are based on scientific data rather than some universal consents, as Şeşen (2008) stated.

And also, the relationship of organizational citizenship behaviors with internal variables is significant and positive. According to the research of Oğuz (2011), there is a moderate, positive and significant relationship between the leadership styles of managers and OCB; according to the research of Yılmaz and Çokluk-Bokeoğlu (2008), there is a moderate, positive and significant relationship between OCB and organizational commitment;

according to the research of Polat and Celep' (2008), there is a moderate, positive and significant relationship between the perception of organizational justice and OCB, and there is a moderate, positive and significant relationship between the perception of organizational trust and OCB; according to the research of Polat (2007), there is a moderate, positive and significant relationship between the perception of organizational justice and OCB, and there is a moderate, positive and significant relationship between the perception of organizational trust and OCB.

These results show that the organizational citizenship behaviors exhibited in institutions have positive effects on healthy operation and success of institutions. This situation is especially valid for the educational institutions that have the most important role in a country's development. When considered from this point of view, it appears that the promotion and the enhancement of organizational citizenship behaviors also in educational institutions is important and essential for more efficient education system of our country, improving the quality of education and the establishment of quality and success-oriented school culture (Çetin et al., 2003; Özdevecioğlu, 2003; Sezgin, 2005; Polat and Celep, 2008; Buluç, 2008; Yılmaz and Taşdan, 2009; Titrek et al., 2009; Yılmaz, 2009).

However, with all these, it should not be forgotten that leadership is very important in the establishment of a healthy climate in the institution and institutional success. Because, leaders are the key determinants in the establishment and maintenance of organizational citizenship and positive organizational culture in institutions (Oğuz, 2011). The establishment of organizational citizenship behaviors in institutions is not that easy if there is not an effective leadership in institutions, and in the same way, the maintenance of the established organizational citizenship behaviors seems impossible. When considered from this point of view, effective leadership becomes the locomotive, guide, leader and shaper of organizational citizenship behaviors (Arslantaş and Pekdemir, 2007; Bolat et al., 2009; Aslan, 2009; Oğuz, 2011). The job satisfaction, leader support, organizational justice, organizational trust, organizational commitment, positive organizational culture and positive organizational communication in institutions make significant contributions to the establishment and maintenance of organizational citizenship behaviors (Smith et al., 1983; Organ and Ryan, 1995; Konovsky and Organ, 1996; Netemeyer et al., 1997; MacKenzie et al., 1998). These data show us that all institutions should understand and recognize better the organizational citizenship behaviors and the premises and the results of these behaviors. Also, these data reveal that the critical role of organizational citizenship behaviors in the success of institutions should be noticed and that organizational citizenship behaviors play a key role in achieving institutional objectives. With all these, the main point to

be emphasized about the organizational citizenship behaviors is that efficient and effective leadership styles should be ensured to be established and maintained in institutions.

CONCLUSION

The changes experienced in business and human factor within organizations and the current rapid innovations have rendered the concept of leadership considerably important and increased the need for managers featuring leadership. Organizational citizenship behaviour which denotes high performance working, increasing efficiency, running towards the organizational goals under the unity of healthy, entrepreneur, innovative employees, giving particular importance to personal and corporate development in line with the organizational interests, showing extra effort beyond the expectations, forming the culture of "big family" among employees, establishing efficient management dedicated to organizational vision, mission, core values and goals constitutes the most significant building stone of organizational behaviour and culture structure. Currently, leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour are the most important actors for organizational management. Leadership ensures management of human factor within organizations while orientation and control of human factor is provided by organizational citizenship behaviour.

Managers' leadership characteristics have a direct and highly important impact on primarily employees and organizational citizenship sensed as well as organizational culture, climate and success. Managers' personal and professional characteristics and their communication and management styles are essential determinants for formation and shaping of organizational citizenship. Such characteristics as "having positive personal traits, setting objectives, being innovative and entrepreneur, working efficiently and having working culture, establishing effective communication, paying importance to individuals, motivating, considering team work, solving problems" are required to be featured by a leader in order to allow an organization to be shaped positively and successfully. None can deny the important role that positive or negative characteristics play on employees' psychology and working desire and on how much value they will attach to their profession or not. Managers' leadership characteristics should get all material and mental elements of an organization together like cement and form a coherent integrity between them.

Similarly, such characteristics as "corporate identification, task and responsibility sense, helpfulness, administrative contribution, sacrifice, being understanding and well-adjusted, acting under team spirit, positive communication and interaction, personal and corporate development" addressed under the framework of behaviours are the most significant factors which

determine the current and future position of an organization. Therefore, the fact that these factors are positive will support employees' happiness and success, increase their motivation, contribute to ensure that they love and embrace their job and most importantly grow their corporate commitment and sense of belonging. Definitely, the positive energy employees will obtain from these positive organizational citizenship factors will directly be reflected on their work and contribute to more organizational success.

SUGGESTIONS

Suggestions for Implementers

In organizations, such events as leadership trainings, conferences, seminars, panels and internal trainings that will improve managers' leadership characteristics and contribute to establishment of positive organizational culture and citizenship behaviour should be organized for efficient management and organization. Nevertheless, leadership models unique to different sectors should be developed and the necessary infrastructure and environment should be prepared for the education of leaders in different sectors.

With the aim of forming strong and healthy organizational citizenship behaviours, managers should stand with justice and objectivity for all decisions to be taken regarding employees, show a fair management style in relation to fulfilment of their commitments, promotion, performance assessment and also they should allow all employees to feel they are all equal and important for them and organization on every occasion.

For establishing strong organizational citizenship behaviours in organization, the studies, aiming to create a working environment where all employees' ideas and suggestions are considered, are involved in decision-making process, and a policy open to innovation, development and change should be conducted.

By applying such techniques as SWOT periodically, managers should determine employees' perception level of organizational citizenship within organization and accordingly take the necessary measures. More attention should be focused on social and cultural events that will increase positive organizational culture and citizenship behaviour in working environment.

Suggestions for Researchers

Undergraduate and postgraduate studies can concentrate on formation of leadership skills and organizational citizenship behaviours as well as establishment of efficient management and organization. The related publications in our country and abroad can be followed, contemporary and new models can be developed and hence a

contribution can be made to improvement of management sciences in our country.

The studies analysing such variables as leadership, organizational citizenship behaviour and corporate culture, organizational success levels, managers' and employees' moral and job satisfaction comparatively can be conducted. In the light of contemporary and new developments, leadership models specific to our country can be studied for rendering the organizations in our country more efficient and productive.

Conflict of Interests

The author have not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- Arslan H, Uslu B (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının öğrenme stilleri ile liderlik yönelimleri arasındaki ilişki. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 39(173):341-355.
- Arslantaş CC, Pekdemir I (2007). Dönüşümcü liderlik, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ve örgütsel adalet arasındaki ilişkileri belirlemeye yönelik görgül bir araştırma. *Anadolu Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 7(1):261-286.
- Aslan Ş (2009). Karizmatik liderlik ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ilişkisi: "Kurumda çalışma yılı" ve "ücret" değişkenlerinin rolü. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi* 6(1):256-275.
- Avolio BJ, Bass BM, Jung DI (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *J.Occupat. Organ. Psychol.* 72:441-462.
- Bakioğlu A, Kurnaz Ö (2011). *Araştırmada Kalite*. İstanbul:Nobel Yayınları.
- Barnett K, McCormick J, Conners R (1999). Transformational leadership in schools – Panacea, placebo or problem? *J. Educ. Admin.* 39(1):24-46.
- Bass BM (1997a). Does the transactional – transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *Am. Psychol.* 52(2):130-139.
- Bass BM (1997b). Personal selling and transactional/transformational leadership. *J. Pers. Sell. Sales Manage.* 17(3):19-28.
- Bass BM (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *Euro.J. Work, Organ. Psychol.* 8(1):9-32.
- Bass BM (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership, theory, research, and managerial applications*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass BM, Avolio BJ (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Adm. Quart.* 17:112-121.
- Bass BM, Steidlmeier P.(1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadersh. Quart.*10(2):181-217.
- Bass BM, Jung DI, Avolio BJ, Berson Y (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *J. Appl. Psychol.*88(2):207-218.
- Bateman TS, Organ DW (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". *Acad. Manage. J.* 26(4):587-595.
- Bess JL, Goldman P (2001). Leadership ambiguity in universities and K-12 schools and the limits of contemporary leadership theory. *Leadersh. Quart.* 12:419-450.
- Bogler R (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(5), 662-683.
- Bogler R, Somech A (2005). Organizational citizenship behavior in school: How does it relate to participation in decision making? *J. Educ. Adm.* 43(5):420-438.
- Bolat Ö, Bolat T, Seymen OA (2009). Güçlendirici lider davranışları ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı arasındaki ilişkinin sosyal mübadele kuramından hareketle incelenmesi. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 12(21):215-239.
- Borman WC (2004). The concept of organizational citizenship. *Am. Psychol. Soc.* 13(6):238-241.
- Buluç B (2008). Ortaöğretim okullarında örgütsel sağlık ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi* 6(4):571-602.
- Buluç. B. (2009). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin algılarına göre okul müdürlerinin liderlik stilleri ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi (Edu. Adm. Theory Pract.* 15(57):5-34.
- Burns JM (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Cemaloğlu, N. (2007). Okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stilleri ile yıldırma arasındaki ilişki. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. J. Educ.* 33:77-87.
- Çetin M, Yeşilbağ Y, Akdağ B (2003). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı. *M. Ü. Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi* 17:39-54.
- Deluga RJ (1990). The effects of transformational, transactional and Laissez Faire leadership characteristics on subordinate influencing behavior. *Basic, Appl.Soc. Psychol.*11(2):191-203.
- DiPaola MF, Hoy WK (2005). Organizational citizenship of faculty and achievement of high school students. *High School J.* 88(3):35-44.
- DiPaola M, Tschannen-Moran M (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. *J. School Leadersh.* 11(5):424-447.
- Drucker PF (2012). *Kendini yönetmek (Çev. İnan, M.). Esaslar: Harvard Business Review'den en kalıcı yönetim fikirleri*. İstanbul:Optimist Yayınları.
- Drucker PF, (1988). *The coming of the new organization*. Harvard Bus. Rev. 28:45-53.
- Eren E (2012). *Örgütsel davranış ve yönetim psikolojisi*. İstanbul:Beta Yayınları, 14. Basım.
- Farh JL, Podsakoff PM, Organ DW (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *J. Manage.*16(4):705-721.
- Geijsel F, Sleegers P, Leithwood K, Jantzi D (2003). Transformational leadership effects on teachers' commitment and effort toward school reform. *J. Educ. Adm.* 41(3):228-256.
- Graham JW (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities Rights J.* 4(4):249-270.
- Hipp KA (1997). Documenting the effects of transformational leadership behavior on teacher efficacy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 2-34.
- Hodgetts RM (1997). *Yönetim: Teori, süreç ve uygulama (Çev. Çetin, C.; Can Mutlu, E.)*. İstanbul:Der Yayınları.
- Howell JM, Avolio BJ (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 78(6):891-902.
- Karasar N (2007). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. İstanbul:Nobel Yay., 17. Basım.
- Koh WL, Steers RM, Terborg JR (1995). The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore. *J. Organizat. Behav.*16(4):319-333.
- Konovsky MA, Organ DW (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *J.Organ. Behav.* 17:253-266.
- Korkmaz M (2005). Duyguların ve liderlik stillerinin öğretmenlerin performansı üzerinde etkisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi [Educational Administration: Theory and Practice]*, 43:401-422.
- Korkmaz M (2006). Liderlik uygulamalarının içsel okul değişkenleri ile öğrenci çıktı değişkenlerine etkisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi [Educational Administration: Theory and Practice]*, 48:503-529.
- Korkmaz M (2008). Okul müdürlerinin liderlik stilleri ile öğrenen örgüt özellikleri arasındaki ilişki üzerine nicel bir araştırma. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi [Educational Administration: Theory Pract.* 53:75-98.
- Koşar S, Çalık T (2011). Okul yöneticilerinin yönetimde gücü kullanma stilleri ile örgüt kültürü arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi* 4:581-603.
- Kotter JP (2001). What leaders really do? *Harvard Bus. Rev.* 79(11):85-96.

- Leithwood K, Jantzi D (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness School Improvement* 17(2):201-227.
- Leithwood KA (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educ. Leadersh.* 49(5):8-12.
- Leithwood K, Menzies T, Jantzi D, Leithwood J (1996). School restructuring, transformational leadership and the amelioration of teacher burnout. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping: Int. J.* 9(3):199-215.
- Lunenburg FC, Ornstein AC (2013). Eğitim yönetimi (Çev. Arastaman, G.). Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.
- MacKeinzce BS, Podsakoff MP, Ahearne M (1998). Some possible antecedents and consequences of in-role and extra-role salesperson performance. *J. Market.* 62:87-98.
- MacKenzie SB, Podsakoff PM, Rich GA (2001). Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance. *J. Acad. Market. Sci.* 29(2):115-134.
- Maxwell JC (2012). Liderlik nitelikleri (Çev. Pınarbaşı, A.). İstanbul: Beyaz Yayınları.
- Moorman RH (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *J. Appl. Psychol.* 76(6):845-855.
- Moorman RH, Niehoff BP, Organ DW (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities Rights J.* 6(3):209-225.
- Motowidlo SJ (2000). Some basic issues related to contextual performance and organizational citizenship behavior in human resource management. *Hum. Resourc. Manage. Rev.* 10(1):115-126.
- Netemeyer GR, Boles SJ, McKee OD, McMurrian R (1997). An investigation into the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors in a personnel selling context. *J. Market.* 61:85-98.
- Oğuz E (2011). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları ile yöneticilerin liderlik stilleri arasındaki ilişki. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi (Educational Administration: Theory and Practice), 17(3):377-403.
- Organ DW, Konovsky M (1988). Cognitive Versus Affective Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior.
- Organ DW, Ryan K (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Pers. Psychol.* 48:775-802.
- Organ DW, Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB (2006). Organizational citizenship behavior. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Owen H, Hodgson V, Gazzard N (2011). Liderlik elkitabı (Çev. Çelik, M.). İstanbul: Optimist Yayınları.
- Özdevecioğlu M (2003). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ile üniversite öğrencilerinin bazı demografik özellikleri ve akademik başarıları arasındaki ilişkilerin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* 20:117-135.
- Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Hum. Perform.* 10(2):133-151.
- Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Paine JB, Bachrach DG (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *J. Manage.* 26(3):513-563.
- Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Bommer WH (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *J. Manage.* 22(2):259-298.
- Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Moorman RH, Fetter R (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadersh. Quart.* 1(2):107-142.
- Polat İ (2007). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet algıları, örgütsel güven düzeyleri ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. Doktora tezi, Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.
- Polat C, Celep C (2008). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel güven, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına ilişkin algıları. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi (Educational Administration: Theory and Practice) 54:307-331.
- Purvanova RK, Bono JE, Dzieweczynski J (2006). Transformational leadership, job characteristics, and organizational citizenship performance. *Hum. Performance* 19(1):1-22.
- Robbins SP, Decenzo DA, Coulter M (2013). Yönetimin esasları (Çev. Öğüt, A.) Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.
- Robbins SP, Judge TA (2012). Örgütsel davranış (Çev. Erdem, İ.). Ankara: Nobel Yayınları, 14. Basım.
- Sezgin F (2005). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları: "Kavramsal bir çözümleme ve okul açısından bazı çıkarımlar. G. Ü, Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi 25(1):317-339.
- Smith AC, Organ WD, Near PJ (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 68:653-663.
- Şahin S (2005). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin dönüşümcü ve sürdürümcü liderlik stilleri (İzmir İli Örneği). *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 30(135):39-49.
- Şahin S (2011). Öğretimsel liderlik ve okul kültürü arasındaki ilişki (İzmir ili örneği). Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri (Educational Sciences: Theory, Practice) 11(4):1909-1928.
- Şeşen H (2008). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı çalışmaları üzerine eleştirel bir çözümleme: Teolojik ve epistemolojik kaygılar. *Savunma Bilimleri Dergisi/ Kara Harp Okulu*, 7(2):57-86.
- Tahaoglu F, Gedikoğlu T (2009). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin liderlik rolleri. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi [Educational Administration: Theory and Practice] 15(58):274-298.
- Titrek O, Bayrakçı M, Zafer D (2009). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına ilişkin görüşleri. *Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler E-Dergisi* 17:1-28.
- Wagner SL, Rush MC (2000). Altruistic organizational citizenship behavior: Context, disposition, and age. *J. Soc. Psychol.* 140(3):379-391.
- Williams LJ, Anderson SE (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *J. Manage.* 17(3):601-617.
- Yılmaz A, Ceylan ÇB (2011). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin liderlik davranış düzeyleri ile öğretmenlerin iş doyumunu ilişkisi. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi [Educational Administration: Theory, Practice], 17(2):277-394.
- Yılmaz K (2009). Özel dersane öğretmenlerinin örgütsel güven düzeyleri ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi (Educational Administration: Theory, Practice), 15(59):471-490.
- Yılmaz K, Çokluk-Bokeoğlu O (2008). Organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment in Turkish primary schools. *World Appl. Sci. J.* 3(5):775-780.
- Yılmaz K, Taşdan M (2009). Organizational citizenship and organizational justice in Turkish primary schools. *J. Educ. Admin.* 47(1):108-126.
- Yukl G (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *J. Manage.* 15(2):251-289.
- Yukl G (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadersh. Quart.* 10(2):285-305.
- Yukl G (2008). Leadership in organizations. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.