The Relationship Between School Administrators' Supportive Leadership Behaviors and Organizational Citizenship According to Teacher Perceptions

Ramazan ERTÜRK[1]

To cite this article:

---

[1] Dr. Ramazan ERTÜRK, Ministry of National Education, koroglu522@hotmail.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8140-0895

The Relationship Between School Administrators' Supportive Leadership Behaviors and Organizational Citizenship According to Teacher Perceptions

Ramazan Ertürk[1]

ABSTRACT

The research, which aims to determine the relationship between the supportive leadership behaviors of school administrators and organizational citizenship according to teacher perceptions, was designed in the relational survey model, which is one of the quantitative research methods. The study population of the research consisted of 465 teachers working in primary schools in the city center of Bolu in the 2021-2022 academic year, and valid data were obtained from 306 teachers. Supportive leadership scale and organizational citizenship scales were used to collect data in the research. Parametric tests were used because the research data showed normal distribution. According to the results of the research, teachers' perceptions of school administrators' supportive leadership behaviors and organizational citizenship perceptions are high. According to another result of the study, there is a moderately positive and significant relationship between the supportive leadership behaviors of school administrators and organizational citizenship. Supportive leadership is a significant predictor of organizational citizenship. School administrators, as supportive leaders, can help teachers with their problems related to their lessons, make an effort to create a quality and peaceful working environment for teachers, make constructive criticism and create a fair working environment at school, be open to teachers' opinions and suggestions, appreciate their success, and enable their organizational citizenship behaviors to emerge. In order to ensure continuity in the supportive leadership behaviors of school administrators, it will be good to ensure continuity in their professional development. In this regard, they can participate in in-service trainings, workshops, panels and symposiums and congresses related to their fields.

Keywords: Leadership, Organizational Citizenship, Supportive Leadership, Teacher

INTRODUCTION

In the 21st century, there is constant change and innovation in the world. In addition to their legal duties and responsibilities, it is very important for schools to achieve their goals by integrating these innovations and changes into educational practices, and to make extra efforts in presenting educational activities to students in a qualified way. The quality of education will increase if teachers help students during rest times, take care of the classes of absent teachers, bring them to class on time and use the time effectively, organize extra-curricular activities and take part in the activities. Because it can be said that school administrators are very important for teachers to fulfill these behaviors. Because school administrators can lead, encourage and guide all school stakeholders in cultural, economic and social sense. As a matter of fact, in schools where there is a school principal who focuses on solving teachers' problems, makes constructive criticism, listens to teachers, appreciates their success, strives to provide them with a good working environment, and acts fairly and equally, teachers are expected to display extra-role behaviors outside of their legal duties. Therefore, it is thought that there is a relationship between the supportive behaviors of school administrators and organizational citizenship.

The foundation of supportive leadership is based on the path-goal theory, which is one of the ideas about leadership put forward by House and Mitchell (1974). This theory is based on four basic leadership styles. These, they are directive leadership, participatory leadership, success-oriented leadership and supportive leadership styles. Since supportive leadership involves paying attention to employees and responding to their personal needs (Rafferty & Griffin, 2004), it is similar to individualized attention, which is a sub-dimension of transformational leadership. In addition, supportive leadership refers to individual evaluation, career advice, career monitoring and contribution to development, and orientation to education (Bass, 1985). Supportive leadership is a behavior that addresses the needs and preferences of employees, is concerned about their well-being, and fosters an organizational environment of pleasant and friendly relations (House & Mitchell, 1974), a behavior that focuses on meeting the needs and well- being of employees and creating a comfortable organizational climate for interaction leadership style (Shin et al., 2016). Needs, well-being and climate are geared towards social and emotional support, which manifests itself mostly in leader behavior. The behavior of the leader is sympathy, caring, listening, etc. may be in the form of (Dyananti et al., 2022). Supportive leadership refers to the extent to which leaders support their followers through active participation in solving difficult situations, being open, honest, and fair in their interactions (Schmidt et al., 2014).

Supportive leaders are aware of their duties and responsibilities and can encourage their subordinates; they create a favorable working environment to encourage respect, trust, cooperation and emotional support (Daft, 2005; Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 2000). Supportive leaders, who try to create a friendly climate in a sensitive organization, reward the achievements of their subordinates, respect them, treat everyone equally, are friendly and approachable (House, 1971; Leana, 2013; Northouse, 2010) they improve job performance while preventing them from rising (Rowold & Schlotz, 2009). Supportive leaders, while meeting the needs of employees, also aim to develop a positive attitude towards them and gain confidence (Yu, 2017). Supportive leaders, who take into account the rewards and emotional states of employees (Lin & Lin, 2021), are friendly towards their employees and provide psychological support, information and material support (Yelamanchili, 2019). Supportive leaders care about the welfare and human needs of their subordinates and strive to make the job more enjoyable for their subordinates (Jones & George, 2011; Northouse, 2010). It can be said that when employees see a supportive attitude from their leaders, they will work more selflessly. It can be stated that the supportive behaviors of the administrators in schools will enable teachers to exhibit behaviors that will contribute to the success of the students and the school, as well as their official duties. This situation emphasizes

organizational citizenship.

Organizational citizenship, one of the basic characteristics of which is behavior that is not formally rewarded by the organization, was used for the first time in the literature by Bateman and Organ (1983) (Dipaola & Neves, 2009). Organizational citizenship behavior increases organizational functionality, is not explained in the official job and job description, is a volunteer who directly or indirectly makes positive contributions to the employee and the organization, whose boundaries are not clearly defined and does not require any sanction when not fulfilled, and employees exhibit more than what is expected from them (Aytürk, 2019; Çelik, 2007), which is very important in terms of organizational success and progress, is expressed as behaviors that occur voluntarily and consist of extra efforts rather than defined tasks and expectations (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). All situations in which the employee strives beyond the expectations of the employer can be considered as organizational citizenship behavior (Kumari & Thapliyal, 2017). The focus of these behaviors is the behaviors exhibited by the employee voluntarily and in order to contribute to the social and psychological environment of the organization (Lievens & Anseel, 2004).

The dimensions of organizational citizenship, which aims to have an effective process to achieve organizational goals, also provide organizational solidarity and integrity (Titrek, Bayrakçı, & Zafer, 2009). It has been examined in five dimensions by organizational citizenship dimensions. These; altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy and courtesy. Altruism is the behavior of helping other employees voluntarily and preventing organizational problems. Civic virtue is the behavior of participating voluntarily in organizational decision-making processes, educational activities, social activities, boards and commissions, and participating in activities that will contribute to the benefit and image of the organization. Conscientiousness is the behavior that increases the effectiveness of both the individual and the group he/she is in, with behaviors such as going beyond what is expected by everyone, using time effectively, coming to work on time, continuing to work, using business hours effectively. Courtesy, which includes behaviors that help prevent problems that may arise, consists of exemplary behaviors such as warning, informing and reminding colleagues. Gentlemanship, on the other hand, is when employees work without complaining when faced with difficulties and difficult work (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2000).

The organizational citizenship behaviors of the employees strengthen the social structure of the institution and decrease the disagreements within the institution (Sezgin, 2005). The social mechanism of the organization is facilitated, conflicts are minimized, organizational efficiency and productivity increase (Organ, 1988), it positively affects the individual's performance and organizational efficiency, contributes to the effectiveness of the organization, and has a positive effect on the performance evaluations and career success of the employees (Allison, Voss & Dryer, 2001). As the tendency of the employees to show organizational citizenship behavior increases, it will be easier to reach the organizational goals and the level of success will increase (Demir, 2014). Organizational citizenship behavior, besides contributing to organizational communication, provides protection and efficient use of resources, increasing the service and product produced, directing the time correctly, and thus organizational savings and profitability. In addition, negative situations such as intention to leave the job, delegating the job to others or absenteeism are less common in employees who display organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff et al., 2000; Polat, 2007).

It can be said that it is not enough for the teachers, who are at the central point, to fulfill their official duties, but to exhibit extra behaviors beyond these duties in order for the schools to be effective and successful. Because, helping teachers with a workload, following academic and pedagogical developments, sharing related practices with colleagues, guiding new colleagues, being willing to participate in activities that are not included in the curriculum contribute to the formation of a positive school climate and increase organizational efficiency (Belogolovsky & Somech, 2010; Runhaar, Konermann, & Sanders, 2013). Teachers who have internalized and adopted organizational citizenship behaviors in schools continue to do their jobs with self-sacrifice, without giving up the obstacles they may experience, avoid all approaches that may have a negative impact on the educational atmosphere they work in, stay away from gossip, and pay attention to avoid harmful actions (Burns & Carpenter, 2008). Teachers who show organizational citizenship behavior are constantly improving themselves personally and professionally, in order to be more productive to students, to contribute more and to reach the school's goals in a shorter time than expected; He strives to make sure that his lessons are in the most effective way, he tries to make the programs, lessons and social activities in his schools extra efficient and effective, and he regularly shares his ideas and suggestions (DiPaola, Tschannen-Moran, 2001; DiPaola & Hoy, 2005). The display of organizational citizenship behavior by teachers, which contributes to individual and organizational effectiveness, contributes positively to the effectiveness of the school, educational success, and communication among employees (Sezgin, 2005). Teachers' organizational citizenship behavior enables the lessons to be more efficient and effective, the emergence of a high-quality planning and program, colleague assistance, and the teachers to work in cooperation in cooperation with the teachers without showing intimidation (Allison, Voss, & Dryer, 2001; Bogler & Somech, 2005; Nguni, Sleegers, & Denessen, 2006). Adhering to a strong team spirit and behaving with the will and awareness of "us", they become more beneficial to their institutions by showing more than expected, willingness, self-sacrifice and self-sacrifice (Bogler & Somech, 2005).

When the literature is examined, job satisfaction of supportive leadership (Arzi & Farahbod, 2014; Asamani et al., 2016; Chih et al., 2018; Kazemi & Corlin, 2020; Kulkarni, 2017; Shin et al., 2016), job performance (Hwang et al., 2015), innovative behavior (Janssen, 2005), extra role performance (Euwema et al., 2007), person-organization fit (Sökmen et al., 2015), intention to stay at work (Asamanie et al., 2016), organizational commitment (Şama & Kolamaz, 2011), school effectiveness (Namlı, 2017), task performance (Shin et al., 2016), absenteeism and presenteeism (being absent at work) (Schmid et al., 2017), development of professional skills (Yu, 2017) employee voice (Elsaied, 2019) appears to be related to organizational climate (Kazemi & Corlin, 2020) and supportive climate (Kim et al., 2021). Therefore, the limited number of studies on supportive leadership in educational organizations in Turkey and abroad and the fact that supportive leadership is associated with many organizational behaviors reveals the originality of the research. In this study, it was aimed to determine the relationship between school administrators' supportive leadership behaviors and organizational citizenship according to teacher perceptions. For this purpose, answers to the following questions were sought:

1- What is the level of teachers' perceptions of school administrators' supportive leadership behaviors and organizational citizenship?
2- Is there a significant relationship between the supportive leadership behaviors of school administrators and organizational citizenship?
3- Is the supportive leadership behavior of school administrators a significant predictor of teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors?

METHOD

Research Design

The research, which aims to determine the relationship between the supportive leadership behaviors of school administrators and organizational citizenship according to teacher perceptions, was designed in the relational survey model, which is one of the quantitative research methods. In the relational screening model, the researcher can investigate both the correlations between the variables and the effect of the independent variable(s) on the dependent variable(s) (Mertens, 2010). Ethical approval for this research was obtained from the Ethics Committee of Human Research in Social Sciences, Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, with the decision dated 27.06.2022 and numbered 2022/292.

Study Group and Sample

The study population of the research consisted of 465 teachers working in primary schools in the city center of Bolu in the 2021-2022 academic year. Since it was aimed to reach the entire universe of the study in the research, sampling was not used and valid data were obtained from 306 teachers. This number indicates that the acceptable number of teachers has been reached within the scope of the study population and sample sizes (Ural & Kılıç, 2005). The scales were delivered to the researchers online. 45.4% of the teachers were female (n=139), 54.6% were male (n=167); 88.6% (n=271) were at undergraduate level, 11.4% (n=35) were at postgraduate level; 17% are 20-30 years old (n=52), 31.4% are 31-40 years old (n=96), 35.3% are 41-50 years old (n=108) 16.3% are 51 and over (n=50).

Data Collection Tools

Supportive leadership scale and organizational citizenship scales were used to collect data in the research.

Supportive Leadership Scale

The supportive leadership scale was developed by Hoy (1991) and its reliability and validity studies were conducted by Çankaya and Aküzüm (2010). The four-point Likert scale is rated as rarely (1), sometimes (2), often (3), and very often (4). The scale consists of 9 items and one sub-dimension. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale was determined as .89 by Çankaya and Aküzüm (2010), and the Cronbach Alpha coefficient calculated in this study was determined as .84.

Organizational Citizenship Scale

The organizational citizenship scale developed by DiPaola, Tarter and Hoy (2005) was adapted into Turkish by Taşdan and Yılmaz (2008). Consisting of one dimension and 12 items, the scale was developed in a five-point Likert style. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale was calculated as .87 by Taşdan and Yılmaz (2008). The Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale calculated in this study is .89. In this context, it can be said that the reliability coefficient of the scales are high. The five-point Likert scale is evaluated as 1.00-1.80 "very low", 1.81-2.60 "low", 2.61-3.40 "moderate", 3.41-4.20 "high", 4.20-5.00 "very high".

Analysis of Data

The data obtained in the research were analyzed using the SPSS 22 program. Skewness and Kurtosis coefficients were calculated to examine whether the data showed a

normal distribution. As a result of the examination, the total scores of the Supportive Leadership Scale (Skewness: -,281; Kurtosis: ,473) and the Organizational Citizenship Scale (Skewness: -,590; Kurtosis: ,352) were found to be between +1.5 and -1.5. Therefore, the values of kurtosis and skewness between +1.5 and -1.5 indicate that the data show a normal distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). In this sense, parametric tests were used in this study.

In the study, the Durbin-Watson coefficient was between 1.5-2.5 (d=2.32); r coefficients are lower than .80 (.63); It was determined that the variance magnification factor value varied between 6.21 and 2.88 (below VIF:10), and the tolerance values were between .29 and .54 (greater than 0.2). These values show that there is no autocorrelation, multiple co-linearity and correlation problem in the study (Field, 2009; Kalaycı, 2009; Stevens, 2009; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

Ethical review board name: Ethics Committee of Human Research in Social Sciences, Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University. Date of ethics review decision: 27.06.2022, Ethics assessment document issue number: 2022/292

FINDINGS

In this section, teachers' perceptions of school administrators' supportive leadership behaviors and organizational citizenship, the relationship between supportive leadership and organizational citizenship, and the findings of supportive leadership's predictive level of organizational citizenship are included.

Teachers' perceptions of school administrators' supportive leadership behaviors and organizational citizenship are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Teachers' Perceptions of School Administrators' Supportive Leadership Behaviors and Organizational Citizenship

Scales	N	$\bar{x}$	SS
Supportive leadership	306	3.81	0.41
Organizational citizenship	306	4.13	0.76

When Table 1 is examined, it has been determined that teachers' perceptions of school administrators' supportive leadership behaviors ($\bar{x}$ =3.81) and organizational citizenship perceptions ($\bar{x}$ =4.13) are high. These findings show that school administrators, as supportive leaders, help teachers with their problems related to their lessons and make an effort to work peacefully, they make constructive criticisms towards teachers, they listen to teachers effectively, they treat teachers equally, they are open to teachers' suggestions and they appreciate teachers; It can be interpreted that teachers help students in their personal time, help new teachers, are willing and willing to take part in extra-curricular activities and committees, use their class time effectively, share information with their colleagues, and make constructive criticisms for the improvement of the school.

The results of the Pearson Correlation Coefficient for determining the relationships between teachers' school administrators' supportive leadership behaviors and organizational citizenship perceptions are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Correlation Analysis Results for the Relationship Between Supportive Leadership and Organizational Citizenship

Scale	Organizational citizenship
Supportive leadership	0.63**

*p<.01**. The correlation was significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Absolute value correlation coefficient: 0.71-1.00 high; 0.70-0.31 medium; 0.30-0.00 indicates a low level of relationship (Büyüköztürk, 2011).

When Table 2 is examined, a moderately positive and significant relationship (r=.63; p<0.01) was found between the supportive leadership behaviors of school administrators and organizational citizenship according to teacher perceptions. This finding can be explained by the fact that with the increase in the supportive leadership behaviors of school administrators, teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors will also change in the same direction.

The regression results for the predictive level of organizational citizenship behaviors of school administrators' supportive leadership behaviors are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Regression Results for the Predictive Level of Organizational Citizenship by Supportive Leadership

Independent variable	The dependent variable Organizational citizenship		
	ß	t	p
Constant	2.57	3.56	0.00*
Supportive leadership	0.83	2.71	0.00*
	F 53.02		
	p 0.00*		
	R^2 0.44		

When Table 3 was examined, it was determined that the supportive behaviors of school administrators were a significant predictor of organizational citizenship (F=53.02; p<0.01). Reinforcing leadership behaviors of school administrators explain 44% ($R^2= 0.44$) of the total variance in teachers' perceptions of organizational citizenship. This finding shows that with the increase of supportive leadership behaviors of school administrators, organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers will also increase.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

According to the results of the research, teachers' perceptions of school administrators' supportive leadership behaviors are high. This result is very important in terms of supporting teachers by school administrators, who are at the most strategic point in influencing teachers. Because when employees are supported and empowered by leaders, they can provide valuable input to the school (Grant, 2011). It is claimed that the lack of support from administrators encourages teachers to leave their profession (Ingersoll, 2001).

Since the basis of supportive leadership is based on relationship-oriented behaviors, it is very important to consider the needs and feelings of employees, to accept them, and to deal with their needs (Yukl, Gordon & Taber, 2002). It is one of the most important roles of supportive leaders to support all of their positive behaviors by being in close relationship with all of the group members, to exhibit positive attitudes and behaviors in their criticism and feedback, and to make explanations while informing the employees (Okumuş, 2013). Therefore, supportive leader managers should know their human resources well, establish good relations with them and help them in solving the problems they encounter and in

achieving success in their work. In supportive leadership, employees show loyalty to their leaders regardless of financial or other power. Therefore, supportive leaders should create an organizational climate that will contribute to the development and business success of employees in line with organizational interests (Izgar, 2005). In schools where communication and interaction are very important, supportive leadership behaviors of school administrators gain importance in this sense. School administrators have important duties in supporting teachers, increasing their job satisfaction and creating a pleasant working environment at school. For example, when teachers lack confidence in their ability to complete a task and need motivation to keep going, school administrators create a friendly climate as supportive leaders and get to know teachers verbally. Also, supportive people in leadership show respect, treat everyone equally, and are concerned for the well-being of their subordinates. The supportive leader should use expertise to improve activities and school structures (Thuku, Jeremiah & Edward, 2018). When the literature is examined, it has been concluded that teachers' perception of supportive leadership is high in studies conducted by Quigney (2000) and Özdemir (2010). Çankaya and Aküzüm (2010), on the other hand, concluded in their study that teachers' perceptions of school administrators' supportive leadership behaviors were at the level of agree. In some studies (Abdurrezzak, 2015; Sarıer, 2013; Özgözgü, 2015), it has been concluded that school administrators often use supportive leadership, support teachers' professional development, and appreciate positive behaviors. Katıtaş, Doğan and Yıldız (2022), on the other hand, emphasized that school principals see their teachers' needs and wishes before them, value them, and are willing to support teachers' development.

According to the results of the research, teachers' perceptions of organizational citizenship are at a high level. Having a high level of organizational citizenship perception of teachers will increase the quality of education and training services offered to students and will ensure the success of students and therefore schools to be successful and effective. Because teachers who show high level of organizational citizenship behavior not only give importance to their professional development, but also support their students during rest hours, participate voluntarily in programs and activities other than teaching activities, develop suggestions and ideas for better quality education services, and help their colleagues. As a matter of fact, Burns and Carpenter (2008) emphasized that teachers with a high level of organizational citizenship behavior work with great devotion and effort by avoiding destructive, abrasive words, attitudes and behaviors that may negatively affect the school and working climate. Ertürk (2022) also emphasized that the effective use of resources by creating a positive school environment and the teachers' working in cooperation and taking part in other educational activities besides teaching works, will increase the success of the students and thus the efficiency of the school. In this context, it can be said that the organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers, one of the most important elements of schools, are very important in terms of organizational, managerial and individuality in schools.

Studies supporting the result of this research in the literature (Akdemir, 2018; Alarçin, 2020; Arlı, 2011; Çelik & Konan, 2021; Çimen, 2016; Ertürk, 2018; Ertürk, 2022; Mete & Serin, 2015; Somech & Ron, 2007; Sönmez & Cemaloğlu, 2017; Tabancalı & Çakıroğlu, 2017; Uslu & Balcı, 2012), besides teachers' organizational behaviors are at very high (Buluç, 2008; Çerezci, 2019) and moderate (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Kurtulmuş, 2016; Yılmaz, 2012) levels. There are studies that have concluded that The emergence of different results in the studies may be due to the fact that the studies were conducted in different places and sample groups, and the different management styles in the schools.

According to another result of the study, there is a moderately positive and significant relationship between the supportive leadership behaviors of school administrators and organizational citizenship. Supportive leadership is a significant predictor of organizational citizenship. Although there is no study in the literature that deals with supportive leadership

and organizational citizenship behavior together, Organ et al. (2006) emphasized that supportive leadership attitudes and behaviors and the leader's empowerment attitude affect organizational behavior. Namlı (2019) concluded that there is a moderately significant positive relationship between supportive leadership and collective trust and school effectiveness, and that supportive leadership has a significant effect on collective trust and school effectiveness. Şama and Kolamaz (2011) concluded that supportive and developing leadership characteristics positively affect the identification and internalization dimensions of organizational commitment; Çankaya and Aküzüm (2010) Çankaya and Aküzüm (2010) found that there is a positive relationship between supportive leadership and teachers' communication competencies, and that supportive leadership is a significant predictor of teachers' communication levels. Rallis and Goldring (2000), on the other hand, concluded that the supportive leadership roles of school administrators have a positive effect on teachers' professional solidarity and communication competencies. In addition, job satisfaction of supportive leadership (Arzi & Farahbod, 2014; Chih et al., 2018; Kazemi & Corlin, 2020; Kulkarni, 2017; Maurya & Agarwal, 2015; Shin et al., 2016; Sökmen et al., 2015), job performance (Hwang et al., 2015), innovative behavior (Janssen, 2005), extra role performance (Euwema et al., 2007), person-organization fit (Sökmen et al., 2015), intention to stay at work (Asamanie et al., 2016), organizational commitment (Şama & Kolamaz, 2011), school effectiveness (Namlı, 2017), task performance(Shin et al., 2016), absenteeism and presenteeism (not being at work) (Schmid et al., 2017), development of professional skills (Yu, 2017) employee voice (Elsaied, 2019) seems to be related to organizational climate (Kazemi & Corlin, 2020). As can be seen, leadership behaviors supportive of school administrators affect many organizational behaviors positively.

Organizational citizenship positively affects performance and organizational productivity, strengthens social relations by reducing conflicts in the organization (Sezgin, 2005). In this sense, a school administrator who wants to increase the individual performance of teachers at school, increase the efficiency of the school, reduce or prevent conflicts at school can create these positive situations by displaying supportive attitudes and behaviors towards teachers. Because supportive leadership behaviors both have a positive relationship with organizational citizenship and significantly predict organizational citizenship.

As a result, it is very important for teachers to help students and new teachers in their personal time, to take part in extra-curricular activities and boards, to use their time effectively, to share information with colleagues, to make constructive criticisms for the development of the school, and to increase the success level of students in the school's effectiveness and efficiency. On the other hand, supportive leadership behaviors of school administrators are an important and meaningful predictor of teachers' organizational citizenship behavior. Therefore, school administrators, as supportive leaders, help teachers with their problems related to their lessons, strive to create a quality and peaceful working environment for teachers, make constructive criticism, create a fair working environment at school, be open to teachers' opinions and suggestions, appreciate their success, and encourage the emergence of organizational citizenship behaviors. can provide. This situation, in addition to increasing the quality of the education offered to the students, will ensure the success of the students, the efficiency of the school and the formation of many positive outputs.

The following recommendations were developed within the scope of research findings and results:

1- In order to maintain the high level of supportive behavior of school administrators, school administrators; continue to help teachers solve their problems, listen to them when communicating with teachers, explain why when criticizing and make constructive criticism, strive to provide the resources teachers need and improve working conditions, treat teachers equally and fairly, thank teachers when necessary, should reward teachers, take into account the suggestions of teachers, support teachers to control their work and be autonomous in their

work.

2- In order to ensure continuity in the supportive leadership behaviors of school administrators, it will be good to ensure continuity in their professional development. In this regard, they can participate in in-service trainings, workshops, panels and symposiums and congresses related to their fields.

3- In order to reveal and increase teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors, school administrators should display supportive behaviors.

4- A qualitative research can be conducted to reveal the supportive leadership behaviors of school administrators.

Limitations of the Research

This research; It is limited to the answers given by 306 teachers working in primary schools in Bolu city center for the 2020-2021 academic year to the supportive leadership and organizational citizenship scales. The findings and results obtained in the research reflect the views of the teachers in the study universe.

REFERENCES

Abdurrezzak, S. (2015). *Explore of teachers' perceptions on effective school and school leadership* [Master thesis], Cumhuriyet University.

Akdemir, Y. (2018). *Evaluation of management behavior skills and organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers* [Master thesis], Okan University.

Alarçin, S. (2020). *The relation between school principals' charismatic leadership behaviors and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors* [Master thesis], Bahçeşehir University.

Allison, B. J., Voss, R. S., & Dryer, S. (2001). Student classroom and career success: The role of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Education for Business, 76*(5), 282-288.

Arlı, D. (2011). *The examination of teachers? organizational citizenship behaviours regarding their culture perceptions and organizational trust level* [Doctoral dissertation], Cumhuriyet University.

Arzi, S., & Farahbod, L. (2014). The impact of leadership style on job satisfaction: A study of Iranian hotels. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business. 6*(3) 171-186.

Asamani, J. A., Naab, F., & Ofei, A. M. A. (2016). Leadership styles in nursing management: implications for staff outcomes. *Journal of Health Sciences*, *6*(1), 23-36. https://doi.org/10.17532/jhsci.2016.266

Aytürk, N. (2019). *Organizational behavior organizational theories and practices* (1st ed.). Nobel.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: the relationship between affect andemployee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, *26*, 587-595.

Belogolovsky, E., & Somech, A. (2010). Teachers' organizational citizenship behavior: Examining the boundary between in-role behavior and extra-role behavior from the perspective of teachers, principals and parents. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(4), 914-923. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.10.032

Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *20*(3), 277-289. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.02.003

Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2005). Organizational citizenship behavior in school: How does it relate to participation in decision making? *Journal of Educational Administration*, *43*(5), 420-438. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230510615215

Buluç, B.(2009). The relationships between organizational commitment and leadership styles of principals based on elementary school teacher's perceptions. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, *57*, 5-34. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/108266

Burns, T., & Carpenter, J. (2008). Organizational citizenship and student achievement. *Journal of Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives in Education*, *1*(1), 51-58. Retrieved from https://mxtsch.people.wm.edu/Teaching/JCPE/Volume1/JCPE_2008-01-08.pdf

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2011). *Manual of data analysis for social sciences. PegemA Academy.*

Çelik, M. (2007). *Organizational culture and organizational citizenship behavior-an application* [Doctoral dissertation], Ataturk University.

Çelik, O. T., & Konan, N. (2021). The relationship between school principals' empowering leadership with teachers' self-efficiancy and organizational citizenship behaivors. *Education and Science, 46*(206), 241-261, https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2020.8841

Çerezci, Ç. (2019). *The relationship between teachers' organizational citizenship behaviours and their level of resistance to change* [Master thesis], Ondokuz Mayıs University.

Chih, Y.-Y., Kiazad, K., Cheng, D., Emamirad, E., & Restubog, S. L. (2018). Interactive effects of supportive leadership and top management team's charismatic vision in predicting worker retention in the philippines. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, *144*(10), 04018095. https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)co.1943-7862.0001553

Çimen, İ. (2016). the relationship between teachers' perception of spiritual leadership and their organizational citizenship behaviours. *Journal of Dicle University Ziya Gökalp Faculty of Education*, *27*, 9-19. http://dx.doi.org/10.14582/DUZGEF.573.

Daft, R. L. (2005). *The leadership experience* (3th ed.). Thompson South Western.

Dayanti, P. R., Eliyana, A., Emur, A. P., & Pratama, A. S. (2022). Supportive leadership: A literature review. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS)*, *5*(2), 74-80. https://doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ijsms-v5i2p109

Demir, A. (2014). *School administrators antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior they use power supply* [Master thesis], Cumhuriyet University.

DiPaola, M. F., & Hoy, W. (2005). Organizational citizenship of faculty and achievement of high school students. *The High School Journal*, *88*(3), 35-44. https://doi.org/10.1353/hsj.2005.0002

Dipaola, M. F., & Neves, P. M. M. (2009). Organizational citizenship behaviorsin Americanand Portuguese public schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 47*(4), 490-507. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09578230910967464

DiPaola, M. F., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership*, *11*(5), 424-447. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052684601011005

Elsaied, M. M. (2019). Supportive leadership, proactive personality and employee voice behavior: The mediating role of psychological safety. *American Journal of Business*, *34*(1), 2-18. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJB-01-2017-0004

Ertürk, R. (2018). Paternalist leadership behavior of school administrators, the relationship between organizational citizenship and emotional commitment perceptions.E. Babaoğlan, E. Kıral, A. Çilek (Eds.), In *frames from education* (pp. 24-44). Eyuder Publishing.

Ertürk, R. (2022). The relationship between school administrators' empowering leadership behaviors and teachers' perceptions of organizational citizenship. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, 6*(1), 1-26.

Euwema, M. C., Wendt, H., & Van Emmerik, H. (2007). Leadership styles and group organizational citizenship behavior acrosscultures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28,* 1035-1057. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.496

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3th ed.). Sage Publications Ltd.

Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., & Donnelly, J. H. (2000). *Organizations: Behavior, structure, processes* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Grant, C. P. (2011). *Dissertation on the relationship between distributed leadership and leadership effectiveness.* North Carolina State University.

House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business, 3,* 81-97.

Hwang, S. J., Quast, L. N., Center, B. A, Chung, C T. N., Hahn, H. J., & Wohkittel, J. (2015). The impact of leadership behaviors on leaders' perceived job performance across cultures: Comparing the role of charismatic, directive, participative, and supportive leadership behaviors in the US and four Confucian Asian countries. *Human Resource Development International*, *18*(3), 259-277. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2015.1036226

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(3), 499-534. Retrieved from https://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/94

Izgar, H. (2005). Educational leadership. A. M. Sünbül (Ed.), In *the world of the teacher* (pp. 23-39). Odunpazarı Municipality Publications.

Janssen, O. (2005). The joint impact of perceived influence and supervisor supportiveness on employee innovative behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 78,* 573-579. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317905X25823

Jones, G., & George, K. (2011) *Contemporary management*. McGraw-Hill.

Kalaycı, Ş. (2009). *SPSS applied multivariate statistics applications.* Asil Publishing.

Katıtaş, S., Doğan, S., & Yıldız, S. (2022). The Effect of Servant Leadership Behaviors of School Principals on Teachers' Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Education and Recreation Patterns (JERP), 3*(2), 01-20. https://doi.org/10.53016/jerp.v3i2.48

Kazemi, A., & Corlin, TE (2020). Linking supportive leadership to satisfaction with care: proposing and testing a service-profit chain inspired model in the context of elderly care. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, *35*(4), 492-510. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHOM-10-2020-0393

Kim, KY, Atwater, L., Jolly, P., Ugwuanyi, I., Baik, K., & Yu, J. (2021). Supportive leadership and job performance: Contributions of supportive climate, team-member exchange (TMX), and group-mean TMX. *Journal of Business Research*, *134*, 661-674. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.06.011

Kulkarni, S. M., (2018). The relationship between supportive leadership and employee satisfaction. *International Journal of Research in Business Management, 6*(2), 13-20.

Kumari, P., & Thapliyal, S. (2017). Studying the impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational effectiveness. *Human Resource Management*, *4*(1), 9-21.

Kurtulmuş, M. (2016). The effect of diversity management on teachers' organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction 6(3), 277-302, http://dx.doi.org/10.14527/pegegog.2016.015 .

LaRocco, J. M., & Jones, A. P. (1978). Co-worker and leader support as moderators of stress-strain relationships in work situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 63*(5), 629-634. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.63.5.629

Leana, P. M. (2013). An investigation of path-goal theory, relationship of leadership style, supervisor-related commitment, and gender. *Emerging Leadership Journeys, 6*(1), 13-44.

Lievens, F., & Anseel, F. (2004). Confirmatory factor analysis and invariance of an organizational citizenship behavior measure across samples in a dutch-speaking context. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77*(3), 299-306. https://doi.org/10.1348/0963179041752727

Lin, M., & Ling, Q. (2021). The role of top-level supportive leadership: A multilevel, trickle-down, moderating effects test in Chinese hospitality and tourism firms. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, *46*, 104-113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.11.013

Maurya, M. K., & Agarwal, M. (2015). Relationship between supportive leadership, mental health status and job satisfaction of civil police constables. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, *41*(3), 103-111. Retrieved from

http://www.jiaap.org.in/Listing_Detail/Logo/839b11c7-22e5-4ff4-8d4d-721fde1fdee0.pdf

Mertens, D. M. (2010). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology*. Sage Publications.

Mete, Y. A., & Serin, H. (2015). Relationship between school administrators' paternalist leadership behaviours and teachers' organizational citizenshıp and organizational cynicism behaviours. *HAYEF Journal of Education, 12*(2), 147-159.

Namlı, A. (2017). *Effects of high school principals' supportive leadership behaviors and collective trust on school effectiveness* [Doctoral dissertation], Fırat University.

Nguni, S., Sleegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: The Tanzanian case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, An International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice, 17*(2), 145-177. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450600565746

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Okumuş, K. (2013). *Relationship between leadership styles, organizational learning ability, innovation and firm performance* [Master's thesis]. Gebze Advanced Technology Institute.

Organ, D. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome.* Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents and consequences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Özdemir, A. (2010). The relationship of perceived superior support and ındividualismcollectivism with organizational citizenship behaviors in primary schools. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 16*(1), 93-112.

Özgözgü, S. (2015). *The relationship among administrators' leadership behaviours, knowledge management, organizational culture in educational organizations* [Doctoral dissertation], Ege University.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management, 26*(3), 513-563. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600

Polat, S. (2007). *Relation between organizational justice perceptions, organizational trust levels and orgnazational citizenship behaviors of secondary education teachers* [Doctoral dissertation], Kocaeli University.

Quigney, T. A. (2000). Effective school administration in an age of educational reform. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, *13*(4), 21-27.

Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership: Conceptual and empirical extensions. *Leadership Quarterly, 15,* 329-354. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.009

Rallis, F. S., & Goldring, E. B. (2000). *Principals of dynamic schools: Taking charge of change.* CA: Corwin Press.

Rowold, J., & Schlotz, W. (2009). Transformational and transactional leadership and followers' chronic stress. *Leadership Review, 9,* 35-48. Retrieved from https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/66060/

Runhaar, P., Konermann, J., & Sanders, K. (2013). Teachers' organizational citizenship behaviour: Considering the roles of their work engagement, autonomy and leader member exchange. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 30*, 99-108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.10.008

Şama, E., & Kolamaz, C. (2011). The relationship between supportive and developing leadership characteristics and organizational commitment. *Turkish Journal of Educational Sciences,* 9(2), 313-342.

Sarıer, Y. (2013). *Examination of the relations between the leadership of the principals of educational institutions and the school outputs using the meta-analysis method* [Doctoral dissertation], Eskişehir Osmangazi University.

Schmid, J. A., Jarczok, M. N., Sonntag, D., Herr, R. M., Fischer, J. E., & Schmidt, B. (2017). Associations between supportive leadership behavior and the costs of absenteeism and presenteeism: An epidemiological and economic approach. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, *59*(2), 141-147. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000919

Schmidt, B., Loerbroks, A., Herr, R. M., Wilson, M., Bosch, J. A., & Fischer, J. E. (2014). Associations between supportive leadership and employees self-rated health in an occupational sample. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 21*(5), 750-756. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12529-013-9345-7

Sezgin, F. (2005). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Conceptual Analysis and Some Inferences for the Schools. *Gazi University Journal of Gazi Education Faculty, 25*(1), 317-339.

Shin, Y., Oh, W. K., Sim, C. H., & Lee, J. Y. (2016). A multilevel study of supportive leadership and individual work outcomes: The mediating roles of team cooperation, job satisfaction, and team commitment. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, *32*(1), 55-70. https://doi.org/10.19030/jabr.v32i1.9523

Sökmen, A., Bitmiş, M. G., & Üner, M. M. (2015). The mediating role of person-organization fits in the supportive leadership-outcome relationships. *E an M: Economics a Management*, *18*(3), 62-72. https://doi.org/10.15240/tul/001/2015-3-006

Somech, A., & Ron, I. (2007). Promoting organizational citizenship behavior in schools: The impact of individual and organizational characteristics. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(1), 38-66. http://dx/doi.org/10.1177/0013161X06291254

Sönmez, E., & Cemaloğlu, N. (2017). The relationship between primary school teachers' occupational image perception and their organizational citizenship behaviors. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of the Faculty of Education, 17*(4), 2117-2141.

Stevens, J. P. (2009). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (15th ed.). Routledge.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Allyn and Bacon.

Tabancalı, E., & Çakıroğlu, K. (2017). Relationship between ethical leadership of school principals and organızational citizenship behaviors of teachers. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education,13*(1), 392-417. http://dx/doi.org/10.17860/mersinefd.296254

Thuku, W., Jeremiah M. K., & Edward K. T. (2018). Relationship between supportive leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction in Nakuru County, Kenya. *European Journal of Education Studies, 5*(2), 280-292. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1442819

Titrek, O., Bayrakçı, M., & Zafer, D. (2009). The perceptions of teachers' regarding organizational citizenship behaviors. *Academic Overview, International Refereed E-Journal of Social Sciences, 17*, 1-28.

Ural, A., & Kılıç, İ. (2005). *Scientific research process and data analysis with SPSS.* Detay Publishing.

Uslu, B., & Balcı, E. (2012). Relationship between primary school teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational communication perceptions, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 18*(3), 461-489. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/108173

Yelamanchili, RK (2019). Impact of supportive leadership on perceived sales team cohesion: Mediation of critical thinking and moderation of empowerment. *International Journal of Business Excellence*, *18*(4), 508–526. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBEX.2019.101533

Yılmaz, K. (2012). The relationship between primary school teachers' job satisfaction levels and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International, 2*(2), 1-14.

Yu, P. L. (2017). Innovative culture and professional skills: The use of supportive leadership and individual power distance orientation in IT industry. *International Journal of Manpower*, *38*(2), 198-214. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-10-2014-0214

Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 9*, 15-32. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/107179190200900102

Author(s)' statements on ethics and conflict of interest