



An Investigation of the Effect of School Principals' Spiritual Leadership Competencies on Teachers' Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Bayram Bozkurt

MEB, bayram0102@windowslive.com

Fatih Töremen

Zirve University, fatih.toremen@zirve.edu.tr

Abstract

This study investigated the effects of school principals' spiritual leadership competencies on teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors. Data were collected from 409 teachers and vice principals working in one of the central districts of a large southeastern city in Turkey via a data collection form. Spiritual Leadership Scale and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Scale were used for data collection. The obtained data were analyzed using quantitative analysis techniques in the SPSS program. Findings of the research indicated that there was a statistically significant and positive relationship between spiritual leadership, organizational citizenship behaviors and sub-dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviors. Furthermore, regression analysis revealed that spiritual leadership was a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors.

Key Words: Spiritual Leadership, Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, School Principal.



Introduction

Rapid changes which occur in social, economic, technological and political spheres today lead to changes in organizations and lives of individuals establishing them. This situation manifests itself in individuals' emotions, feelings, commitment and behaviors as well (Özgan et al., 2013). Individuals make up the most significant part of organizational structures, and they attend the organization not only through their physical presence but also their spiritual characteristics (Karadağ, 2009). Obviously, individuals' presence in the organization, per se, was evaluated within the framework of formal practices in traditional management approach; in later practices, however, employees' emotions, communication, interaction, norms and values were considered important, and informal practices started to take place in organizations (Baloğlu & Karadağ, 2009). Organizations which are aware of these changes and transformations have to pay attention to individuals in managerial activities in order to increase organizational productivity and effectiveness. Effective leadership can help organizations survive and undertake management activities which may integrate employees and organizational values, and lead employees exhibit voluntary behaviors apart from presence, belongingness and formal behaviors in their organizations (Fry, 2003). In other words, using the required individual resources robustly so as to attain organizational goals could be possible via effective leadership. Studies on leadership have been considered important in all periods of history (Karadağ, 2009). For example, Bass (1990a: 43) argues that employees could be more successful when organizational leaders exhibit leadership competencies which pave the way for employees' self-growth, self-expression and development. This way, employees in the organization will develop a sense of belongingness, make sacrifices for the organization and carry out organizational citizenship behaviors. In addition, Rost (1993: 182) emphasizes the importance of developing new leadership models that can meet needs and aspirations of individuals in the post-industrial society. More specifically, he draws attention to the fact that leaders need to understand their followers, make their roles in the organization meaningful and help them feel themselves as a part of the organization. In this sense, among various leadership approaches, spiritual leadership has also come to the fore in schools recently.



In this research, the researchers hoped to investigate the effect of school principals' spiritual leadership competencies on teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors. To this end, firstly, theoretical frameworks regarding spiritual leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors were examined in detail.

Spiritual Leadership

The term "spiritual leadership" originates from the word "spirit". According to Anderson (2000), spirit is a derivative of *spiritus* which means breath in Latin. Spirit, which is thought to be a lively, intangible power keeping individuals alive, is a way of knowing the profound relationship the individual establishes between the self and truths in the human nature (Fairholm, 1997). In philosophy and religion, spirit is defined as the metaphysical aspect of the human existence which sustains the individual's being after his/her death (Baloğlu and Karadağ, 2009). Ihvan-ı Safa, one of the written works of 9th century, proposes three views regarding human and his/her nature (Filiz, 2001:105, 106):

- A human being is made of physical properties such as flesh, blood and bones.
- A human is a dual being made of spirit and body, this view is accepted by dualists.
- Body is nothing but a cloth or cover for a human; its real aspect is just the spirit. This is the view which spiritualists advocate.

When Plato's ideas about the spirit are examined, it can be seen that body is regarded as a kind of cage in which the spirit has to stay after having fallen down into this world. Body, which is a reflection of existence in this world, is finite; however, the spirit is infinite. Therefore, spirit is more important, and death is spirit's separation from the body. This separation enables the spirit to be alone and reach true scholarship. Death is an end for the body but a beginning for the spirit (Keskin, 2010). Given the spirit-body relationship, it is known that the understanding that the spirit has a metaphysical being which is distinct from the body is emphasized in the works of prominent Islamic philosophers (albeit having some differences) like Al- Kindî, Al-Razi, Al-Farabi, Avicenna (Ibn Sina) and Al-Ghazali (Karaman, 2008).

The concept of spirituality is not defined in terms of one single authority (Narayanasamy, 1999). Each individual is within the interactional spectrum of his/her family, culture and environment, language and communication, beliefs and rituals and customs and doctrines. Biological, societal, psychological, cultural and spiritual aspects must be taken into consideration as a whole when evaluating an individual (Kurtar, 2009). Spirituality is a



situation in which the individual differs from others, shapes his/her behaviors and interprets the meaning of life in a discrete way. Spirituality, therefore, can be perceived as a specific personal attribute.

With its wider meaning in the literature, spirituality is conceptualized as making efforts for meaning and purpose of life and internal relief beyond commitment to a religious or divine faith (Kurtar, 2009). Spirituality is a multifaceted phenomenon which needs to be assessed in terms of different aspects (e.g. religion, meaning, purpose, vision, commitment and loyalty).

Fry (2005), who is regarded as the founder of the spiritual leadership theory, identified the dimensions of spiritual leadership under nine categories (cf. Özgan et al., 2013: 73, 74). These are:

1. **Vision:** According to Fry (2005), the core features of vision are that the individual knows himself/herself and his/her environment, remembers who he/she is constantly and is aware of what needs to be done.
2. **Self-denial:** It is to hold organizational interests before individual ones. It means to act in favor of others (Monroe, 2002).
3. **Hope and Faith:** Fry (2005) proposes that hope and faith are a phenomenon which is believed to exist for an individual's internal dynamics and intrinsic motivation. Hopeful and faithful people own a vision regarding where they go and how they attain their goals; they put up with sorrows and challenges in order to achieve their goals (McArthur, 1998).
4. **Meaningfulness:** This refers to awareness about the meaning of life. The scale developed by Fry (2005) is expected to make sense of the importance of the task(s) being or to be carried out, to ensure that each task is performed in accordance with its purpose and to make a difference in each individual's life.
5. **Membership:** This means that the individual is understood and appreciated. A group of individuals with a sense of belongingness bring about commitment and integration (Karaduman, 2010).
6. **Organizational Commitment:** This is like psychological contract with the organization. It demonstrates commitment to the goals, albeit not being written. According to Swailes (2002), it means to accept organizational goals and purposes, volunteer to sacrifice everything for the organization and have a highly robust willpower in relation to organizational commitment.



7. **Productivity:** Individuals need to do their best in their work unit or department, attach greater importance to work quality and use the existent organizational resources efficiently (Fry, 2005).
8. **Spiritual Life:** Two distinctive approaches are highlighted in the spiritual leadership theory. The first one is the movement which relates spirituality to religious and universal values including Fry. The second one is the movement asserting that spirituality cannot be separated from religious motifs (Dağlı and Ardiç, 2014).
9. **Life Satisfaction:** This refers to individuals' having moral values in their lives (Dağlı and Ardiç, 2014).

Isaacson (2001) suggests that spirituality plays a significant role in educational organizations, the only aim of which is to raise successful individuals in every sphere of life. This is because school life includes a mixed interaction of spiritual and physical worlds (Akar, 2010:6). Schools are institutions which attempt to develop individuals, socially, psychologically, biologically and physically. Spiritual leadership is more likely to make lives of the students and teachers meaningful, help them be satisfied with life and display altruistic and extra-role behaviors (Dağlı and Ardiç, 2014). Therefore, effective leaders need to analyze and put into practice spiritual leadership behaviors, considering these dimensions.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Studies on organizational citizenship behaviors depend on the research conducted by Katz (1964) (İplik, 2010:8). Organizational citizenship behavior theory was first used by Organ and Bateman in 1983 (Giap et al., 2005). Organ (1988) defines organizational citizenship behavior as individual behavior which is not identified directly and clearly in the formal rewarding system of the organization, but helps the organization function effectively and efficiently and depends on willingness (Baş and Şentürk, 2011). This kind of behavior refers to discretionary, voluntary behavior which enables the organization perform its tasks effectively (Gürbüz, 2008). In this respect, organizational citizenship behavior requires employees to exhibit informal and voluntary behaviors for effectiveness, efficiency and survival of the organization.

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB hereafter), basically, exists with organizational members' voluntary involvement, it has a meaning beyond expected behaviors and is divided into two kinds (İplik, 2010). The first kind of OCB comes out in form of active involvement and contribution to the organizational structure, practices and goals. The second



kind of OCB, however, manifests itself in keeping away from anything which might damage organizational practices and goals. Taken together, OCB necessitates voluntary actions facilitating attainment of organizational goals and avoidance of disruptive behaviors which might impinge on the organizational structure.

Smith and colleagues conducted research which aimed at determining measures to be taken to improve employee performance, and they revealed that altruism and conscientiousness are two dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior (Smith, Organ and Near, 1983). Besides these two dimensions, Organ (1988) proposed three more dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior: sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue. Organ's classification of dimensions of OCB provides a useful framework to investigate organizational citizenship behaviors.

Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors:

1. ***Altruism:*** Altruism refers to employees' helping each other voluntarily to increase effectiveness and efficiency for relevant tasks. In organizations, experienced employees' helping their new colleagues is accepted as altruism (Çetin, 2004).
2. ***Courtesy:*** This dimension refers to discretionary behaviors which aim at informing others prior to carrying out activities or making decisions likely to affect their tasks (Burns & Collins, 2000: 2; Deluga, 1995).
3. ***Conscientiousness:*** This dimension underlines employees' discretionary behaviors which go well beyond the minimum role requirements of the organization (Barksdale and Werner, 2001:148; Organ, 1988).
4. ***Sportsmanship:*** This dimension can be defined as willingness to accept unavoidable problems or challenges related to tasks without complaining (Podsakoff et al., 2000: 639; Netemeyer et al., 1997:86).
5. ***Civic virtue:*** This dimension refers to a high sense of mission. It is about being devoted to the organization by showing respect for its rules, beyond observing organizational requirements (Yılmaz, 2010: 3). A high sense of mission may include complying with decisions regarding attainment of school goals, striving to go to work on time and being tidy in workplace in schools.

Literature review yields a growing body of research on spiritual leadership. For example, Dağlı and Ardiç (2014) conducted a study to investigate middle school teachers' perceptions of spiritual leadership. Karadağ (2009) examined the effect of primary school principals'



spiritual leadership behaviors on organizational culture. Fry (2003) conducted research studies regarding both spiritual leadership theory and spiritual leadership paradigm. Fairholm (1997) investigated collectivism and spiritualism in American workplaces to get to the heart of leadership. In addition, Polat (2011) carried out a study regarding both university students and lecturers' perceptions of spiritual leadership. Bozkuş and Gündüz (2014) searched for a link between spiritual leadership and organizational commitment. Dinç Özcan, Vardarlıer, Erdilek Karabay, Konakay and Çetin (2012) attempted to reveal the role of trust in the mediating effect of leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors and turnover intentions. Oğuz (2011), Yılmaz and Taştan (2009), Titrek, Bayrakçı and Zafer (2009) and Baş and Şentürk (2011) conducted various research studies on teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors.

However, literature review did not yield any studies on the relationship between school principals' spiritual leadership competencies and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors. This study attempts to make a contribution to fill this gap in the related literature.

In this study, the researchers hoped to investigate the effect of school principals' spiritual leadership competencies on teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors. The research question guiding this research was as follows:

-Is there a significant relationship between school principals' spiritual leadership competencies and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors?

Methodology

This research is designed using the survey model. General survey models include studies conducted on the entire population or an appropriate proportion (sample) in order to reach a general judgment regarding the entire population which is made of a number of elements, and they are used for research which aims at describing a case as it is (Karasar, 2006: 77-79). Meanwhile, this kind of research attempts to find out what the reality is and provides a complementary perspective to make sense of the existing case (Ural and Kılıç, 2006: 19).

Population and Sample

The population of the study consists of primary and secondary school teachers working at schools located in Şahinbey and Şehitkamil districts of Gaziantep Province in the academic year of 2014-2015. The sample was chosen using simple random sampling technique. The sample of the research was comprised of 450 teachers. Of the data collected



from teachers, 41 questionnaires were eliminated due to being incomplete or not filled out properly. Thus, statistical analysis was conducted on the data gathered from 409 teachers.

The sample consists of 216 female teachers and 193 male teachers. 276 of the teachers are married, while 173 teachers are single. 215 of the teachers are 21-30 years old, 151 of them 31-40, 38 of them 41-50 years old, and 5 teachers 51 or above years old, respectively. 271 teachers had 1-10 years of teaching experience, 13 of them 21-30, and 2 of them 31-40 years of teaching experience. 389 participants are working as teachers, and 20 participants are working as vice-principals.

Demographic characteristics of the teachers indicate that most of them are female (53%), most of them are married (58%), and most of them are 21-30 years old (53%). Only 1% of the participants are 51 or above years old. Furthermore, 95% of the participants are working as teachers, and 5% of them are working as vice-principals. As for teaching experience, it is seen that 66% of the participants have 1-10 years of teaching experience, 33% of them 11-20 years of teaching experience, and 1% of them had 30 or above years of teaching experience.

Data Collection Instruments

In the research, data were collected using Spiritual Leadership scale and Organizational Citizenship Behavior scale. *Spiritual Leadership scale* was developed by Fry (2007) and adapted to Turkish culture by Kurtar (2009), conducting exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis along with validity and reliability studies. Kurtar (2009) found Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient to be ,95 for the whole scale in his study on the reliability of the 5-point Likert-type scale. In this study, Cronbach's Alpha was found to be ,93.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior scale was prepared using two different studies (Vey and Campbell, 2004; Williams and Shiaw, 1999). Basım and Şeşen's (2006) form is a 5-point Likert-type scale including 19 items and five dimensions (Altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship and civic virtue). They found Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient to be ,89 for the whole scale, while it was found to be ,87 in the current study. The data collection form was prepared using the two scales, instructions regarding the scales and demographic information about participants.

In the data collection process, teachers were given enough time to fill out the questionnaires, and data were gathered from teachers in form of 10-20 groups. Although 450



questionnaires were administered to teachers, only 409 of them were used in the research as the rest were eliminated due to being filled out improperly.

Data Analysis Procedures

The data were analyzed using the SPSS 21.0 statistical package program. Correlation coefficients were calculated in order to determine the relationship between school principals' spiritual leadership competencies and teachers' organizational citizenship behavior and its dimensions. T-test, One-way ANOVA, Post-Hoc test, Scheffe's test and correlation analysis were performed to determine the relationship between the participants' responses. To determine the effects of independent variables on dependent variables, multiple linear regression analysis was performed. "Multiple linear regression analysis is a kind of analysis which aims at predicting dependent variables based on two or more independent variables (predicting variables) related to dependent variables" (Büyüköztürk, 2008, p. 98).

Findings

To examine the effect of spiritual leadership competencies on organizational citizenship behaviors, a correlation analysis was performed on the data to reveal whether there was a significant relationship between teachers and vice principals' perceptions of organizational citizenship behavior and its dimensions and spiritual leadership.

Table 1. Results of Correlation Analysis of the Relationship between Spiritual Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Its Dimensions

Variables	Spiritual leadership	OCB	Altruism	Conscientiousness	Courtesy	Sportsmanship	Civic virtue
Spiritual leadership	1						
OCB	,524**	1					
Altruism	,341**	,747**	1				
Conscientiousness	,457**	,746**	,455**	1			
Courtesy	,289**	,707**	,464**	,406**	1		
Sportsmanship	,458**	,801**	,412**	,535**	,518**	1	



Civic virtue	,435**	,793**	,421**	,508**	,449**	,575**	1
	409	409	409	409	409	409	409

OCB: Organizational Citizenship Behavior

It was found that values of the correlation analysis varied between (-1,+1). Statistical analyses demonstrated that the data were normally distributed.

Table 1 indicates that there was a positive relationship between spiritual leadership and organizational citizenship behavior and its dimensions. The correlation coefficient was found to be $r=0,524$ between spiritual leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors, and there was a positive relationship between these variables.

When the relationship between spiritual leadership and organizational citizenship behavior and its dimensions are examined, it is seen that there was a positive relationship between these variables. The lowest relationship ($r= 0,289$) was detected between spiritual leadership and the courtesy dimension; however, the highest relationship ($r= 0,458$) was found between spiritual leadership and sportsmanship.

Given the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and its dimensions, it was revealed that there was a positive relationship between the whole construct and its dimensions. The lowest relationship was found between organizational citizenship behavior and courtesy ($r= 0,707$), while the highest relationship was detected between organizational citizenship behavior and sportsmanship ($r= 0,801$).

Table 2. Means, standard errors and standard deviations regarding organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) scale and its dimensions

Dimensions	N	\bar{X}	Std.	
			Err.	Sd
OCB	409	3,8393	,02503	,50611
Altruism	409	3,6254	,03006	,60790
Conscientiousness	409	3,6764	,03517	,71126
Courtesy	409	4,4409	,03006	,60800
Sportsmanship	409	3,8093	,03345	,67655
Civic virtue	409	3,8075	,03574	,72279



As can be seen in Table 2, means of the dimensions were between 3,5-4,5 (Agree) intervals. Choices regarding measurement of teachers' organizational citizenship behavior in the scale were: (1) 'Strongly disagree' choice between 1.00 and 1.79; (2) 'Disagree' choice between 1.80 and 2.59; (3) 'Undecided' choice between 2.60 and 3.39; (4) 'Agree' choice between 3.40 and 4.19 , and (5) 'Strongly agree' choice between 4.20 and 5.00 score intervals. Based on the score intervals taken as reference, it may be suggested that the participants evaluated their organizational citizenship behaviors as positive.

Results of t-test and one-way ANOVA, which were performed to reveal whether organizational citizenship behavior scores and its dimensions differed according to demographics variables, are presented in tables below.

Table 3. T-test results regarding the difference between organizational citizenship behavior scores according to position variable

Position	N	\bar{X}	sd	df	t	p
Vice principal	20	4,1184	,40151	407	2,546	0,011*
Teacher	389	3,8249	,50718			

*p<0,05 **p<0,01 ***p<0,001

Table 3 demonstrates that there was a statistically significant difference between vice principals and teachers' perceptions (p<0,05). Given the means of the scores, it can be seen that vice principals' organizational citizenship behavior scores were higher than those of teachers ($X_{\text{vice principal}}=4,118$; $X_{\text{teacher}}=3,824$). It may be concluded that vice principals exhibit organizational citizenship behavior at a higher level when compared to teachers.

Table 4. T-test results regarding the difference between scores obtained from Altruism dimension according to position variable

Position	N	\bar{X}	sd	df	t	p
Vice principal	20	4,0200	,41498	407	3,006	0,03*
Teacher	389	3,6051	,60969			

*p<0,05 **p<0,01 ***p<0,001



As can be seen in Table 4, a statistically significant difference was found between vice principals' and teachers' perceptions in altruism dimension ($p < 0,05$). Means of the scores indicated that vice principals' scores in altruism dimension were higher than teachers' scores ($X_{\text{vice principal}} = 4,020$; $X_{\text{teacher}} = 3,605$). This finding suggested that vice principals were more successful and behaved more altruistically, thus helping other staff to enhance school effectiveness.

Table 5. T-test results regarding the difference between scores obtained from conscientiousness dimension according to position variable

Position	N	\bar{X}	sd	df	t	p
Vice principal	20	4,0167	,67082	407	2,204	0,028*
Teacher	389	3,6590	,70969			

* $p < 0,05$ ** $p < 0,01$ *** $p < 0,001$

Table 5 demonstrates that there was a statistically significant difference between vice principals and teachers' perceptions in conscientiousness dimension ($p < 0,05$). Means of vice principals' scores were higher than those of teachers' scores in conscientiousness dimension ($X_{\text{vice principal}} = 4,016$; $X_{\text{teacher}} = 3,659$). Based on this finding, it may be suggested that vice principals went beyond the minimum role requirements and displayed voluntary behaviors.

Table 6. T-test results regarding the difference between scores obtained from civic virtue dimension according to position variable

Position	N	\bar{X}	sd	df	t	p
Vice principal	20	4,1625	,61918	407	2,264	0,024*
Teacher	389	3,7892	,72371			

* $p < 0,05$ ** $p < 0,01$ *** $p < 0,001$

As presented in Table 6, there was a significant relationship between scores of vice principals and teachers in civic virtue dimension ($p < 0,05$). Means of vice principals' scores were higher than means of teachers' scores in civic virtue dimension ($X_{\text{vice principal}} = 4,162$; $X_{\text{teacher}} = 3,789$). It may be argued that vice principals were more respectful for and committed to rules than teachers.



Table 7. T-test results regarding the difference between scores obtained from sportsmanship dimension according to marital status variable

Marital						
status	N	\bar{X}	sd	df	t	p
Married	239	3,8651	,66369	407	1,984	0,048*
Single	170	3,7309	,68856			

*p<0,05 **p<0,01 ***p<0,001

Table 7 demonstrates that there was a significant relationship between scores of married and single participants in sportsmanship dimension ($p < 0,05$). Means of married participants' scores were higher than means of single participants' scores ($X_{\text{married}} = 3,865$; $X_{\text{single}} = 3,730$). This finding can be interpreted to suggest that married participants were more willing to solve problems without complaining.

Table 8. Frequencies, means, standard deviations and standard errors of scores obtained from Organizational Citizenship Behavior scale according to age variable

Age Groups	N	\bar{X}	sd	Std. Err.
21-30 years old	215	3,7934	,46681	,03184
31-40 years old	151	3,8947	,51339	,04178
41-50 years old	38	3,8130	,65345	,10600
51-60 years old	5	4,3368	,29912	,13377
Total	409	3,8393	,50611	,02503

Table 9. Results of One-way ANOVA regarding scores obtained from Organizational Citizenship Behavior scale according to age variable

Source of Variance	Sum of squares	Sd	Mean of squares	F	p	Significant diff.
Across Groups	2,181	3	,727	2,878	,036	Group1-Group 4
Within Groups	102,325	405	,253			
Total	104,506	408				

*p<0,005 **p<0,001 ***p<0,000



As can be seen in Table 9, one-way ANOVA and Post-Hoc Scheffe's test results indicated that there was a significant difference between organizational citizenship behavior scores of group 1 and group 4 according to age variable ($F_{(3-405)}=2,878$, $p<0,05$). Older participants in group 4 (51-60 years old) exhibited organizational citizenship behavior at a significantly higher ($X=4,3368$) level than younger participants in group1 ($X=3,7934$). This finding may suggest that experienced teachers displayed organizational citizenship behavior more than beginning teachers did.

Table 10. Results of simple linear regression analysis regarding whether school principals' spiritual leadership levels predict teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors

Independent Variables		B	Std. Err.	Beta	t	p
Step 1	Constant	3,779	,082		46,034	,000
	Gender (dummy)	-,009	,053	-,009	-,170	,865
	Age	,138	,059	,193	2,327	,020
	Seniority	-,111	,072	-,126	-1,540	,124
Step 2	Constant	1,941	,164		11,837	,000
	Gender (dummy)	-,033	,045	-,033	-,737	,461
	Age	,078	,051	,109	1,539	,125
	Seniority	-,018	,062	-,020	-,286	,775
	Spiritual Leadership	,497	,040	,525	12,387	,000

Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behavior

$\Delta R^2=0,271***$

* $p<0,05$ ** $p<0,01$, *** $p<0,001$

Table 10 shows that spiritual leadership predicted organizational citizenship behavior at a significant level ($\beta= 0,525$; $p<0,001$). Thus, it can be concluded that enhancing school principals' spiritual leadership competencies may lead to an increase in teachers' exhibiting organizational citizenship behaviors. When controlling for demographic variables, spiritual leadership explained 27% of teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors ($\Delta R^2=0,271$; $p<0,001$).



Discussion, Conclusion and Implications

In the present research, it was attempted to find an answer to the question; “Is there a relationship between school principals’ spiritual leadership competencies and teachers’ organizational citizenship behavior?”

It was concluded that there was a significant positive relationship between spiritual leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors ($r=0,524$). In this respect, it may be suggested that school principals’ spiritual leadership behaviors can increase teachers’ displaying organizational citizenship behaviors. When teachers put forward extra, voluntary efforts and allot extra time, schools will turn into better places and educational systems will be more quality (DiaPaola and Hoy, 2005). Related literature about leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) revealed a significant positive relationship between teachers’ OCB and school principals’ transformational leadership (Topaloğlu 2005; Oğuz, 2011).

The findings indicated that there was a positive relationship between spiritual leadership and dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviors. The lowest correlation was found between spiritual leadership and courtesy ($r= 0,289$), while the correlation between spiritual leadership and sportsmanship was the highest ($r= 0,458$).

Leadership is one of the core concepts influencing employees’ attitudes and behaviors in the organization. Leaders’ attitudes and behaviors towards employees affect their thoughts about the organization and work (Dinç Özcan, Vardarlier, Erdilek, Karabay, Konakay and Çetin, 2012). Çetin et al. (2012) found that there was not a relationship between transactional leadership and dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior; however, they revealed a significant relationship between transformational leadership and courtesy, civic virtue, sportsmanship, conscientiousness and altruism.

According to the findings, there was not a significant relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and its dimensions and seniority variable. Inconsistent with this study, Titrek, Bayrakçı and Zafer (2009) concluded that less experienced teachers exhibited organizational citizenship behavior at higher levels than those who were more experienced. Another finding of the research was that there was a significant difference between organizational citizenship behavior scores of age groups as a result of one-way ANOVA and Post-Hoc Scheffe’s test ($F_{(3-405)}=2,878$, $p<0,05$). Mean values of the groups indicated that older participants (51-60 years old) in group 4 exhibited organizational



citizenship behaviors ($\bar{X}=4,3368$) at a higher level than younger participants in group 1 ($\bar{X}=3,7934$). Older teachers tended to display organizational citizenship behavior more than younger or beginning teachers did. In her study on organizational citizenship behaviors, Ölçüm-Çetin (2004) concluded that there was a significant difference between teachers' organizational citizenship behavior and its dimensions according to gender, age and seniority variables.

However, in this research, a significant relationship was not detected between teachers' organizational citizenship behavior and its dimensions according to gender variable. Consistent with this study, Oğuz (2011), Yılmaz and Taştan (2009), Titrek, Bayrakçı and Zafer (2009), and Baş and Şentürk (2011) found similar results in their research.

When the findings are examined, it is seen that spiritual leadership was a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behavior ($\beta= 0,525$; $p<0,001$). This finding suggests that enhancing school principals' spiritual leadership competencies may result in an increase in teachers' displaying organizational citizenship behavior at higher levels. Spiritual leadership predicted 27% of teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors ($\Delta R^2=0,271$; $p<0,001$).

Results demonstrated that vice principals exhibited organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) at a higher level than teachers; and vice principals' scores were significantly higher than teacher's scores in altruism, conscientiousness and civic virtue dimensions, when examining OCB and its dimensions according to position variable. Results revealed that spiritual leadership affected organizational citizenship behavior. Therefore, school principals must set up motivating and enabling atmospheres to encourage teachers to display organizational citizenship behaviors in order to make schools more effective and efficient. They need to behave fairly in distributing tasks, duties and rewards and applying school rules, and have positive relationships with teachers. Professional collaboration, participation in decision making, compliments and meaningful rewarding systems could help enhance teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors. Teachers must be galvanized into in decision making and be informed about decision making process and related practices.

Further research can investigate how leadership styles affect organizational citizenship behaviors. The relationship between spiritual leadership and productivity, performance, job attendance and communication requires further investigation.



References

- Anderson, P. (2000). *This place hurts my spirit!* *Journal for Quality and Participation*, 23(4), 16-17.
- Akar, A. C. (2010). “*Ruhsal Liderlik ve Ruhsal Liderliğin Eğitim Örgütlerinde Uygulanabilirliği Hakkında Teorik Bir Çalışma*” (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). İstanbul: Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Baloğlu, N. and Karadağ, E. (2008). *Ruhsal liderlik üzerine teorik bir çözümleme. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 58, 165-190.
- Barksdale, K. and Werner, J. M. (2001), “*Managerial Ratings of In-Role Behaviors, Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Overall Performance: Testing Different Models of Their Relationship*,” *Journal of Business Research*, 51: 145-155.
- Baron, J. (2000), *Thinking and Deciding* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3th Ed.).
- Basım, H., and Şeşen, H. (2006). *Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Ölçeği ve Karşılaştırma Çalışması*. Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi, 4.
- Bass, B. M. (1990), Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: *Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*, New York: The Free Press.
- Baş, G. and Şentürk, C. (2011). *İlköğretim Okulu Öğretmenlerinin Örgütsel Adalet, Örgütsel Vatandaşlık ve Örgütsel Güven Algıları*, s: 29-62 *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi* Cilt 17, Sayı 1.
- Bozkuş, K. and Gündüz, Y. (2014). *Ruhsal Liderlik ile Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişkinin Modellenmesi*, "Ist Eurasian Educational Research Congress ".
- Burns, B. M. and Collins, R. W. (2000), “*Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in the US Context*,” <http://hsb.baylor.edu/ramsower/acis/papers/burns.html> Alıntı tarihi: 06.01.2015.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç-Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. and Demirel, F.(2008). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Pegem Akademi
- Dağlı and Ardıç, (2014). *Ortaokullarda Görevli Öğretmenlerin Ruhsal Liderliğe İlişkin Algıları*, *Elektronik Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, Cilt:3, Sayı:5, (56-73)
- Deluga, R. J. (1995), “*The Relation Between Trust in The Supervisor and Subordinate Organization al Citizenship Behavior*,” *Military Psychology*, 7/1: 1-16.



- Dinç, Ö. , Vardarlıer, P. , Erdilek, K. , Konakay, K. And Çetin, G. (2012). *Liderliğin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ve işten ayrılma niyeti üzerindeki etkisinde güvenin rolü*, C.10, S.10, Ocak 2012.
- DiPaola, M. F. and Hoy, W. K. (2005). *Organizational citizenship of faculty and achievement of high school students*. The High School Journal, 88, 35–44.
- Fairholm, G. W. (1997). *Capturing the hearth of leadership: Spirituality and community in the new American workplace*. Westport, CT.: Praeger.
- Filiz, Ş. (2001) “*Ihvan-ı Safa (X.yy) ’Ya Göre İnsanın Biyolojik ve Psikolojik Yapısı.*” Selçuk Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi. Sayı: 10, Ss: 101-124.
- Fry, L. W. (2003). “*Toward A Theory of Spiritual Leadership.*” The Leadership Quarterly, No:14, Pp: 693–727.
- Fry, L. W. (2005). *Toward a paradigm of spiritual leadership*. The Leadership Quarterly, 16, 619-722.
- Fleischman, P. R. (1990). *The healing spirit: Explorations in religion and psychotherapy*. Cleveland, SC: Bonne Change Press.
- Giap, B. N., Hackermeier, I., Jiao, X., and Wagdarikar, S. P. (2005). *Organizational citizenship behavior and perception of organizational justice in student jobs*.
- Gürbüz, S. and Yüksel, M. (2008). *Çalışma Ortamında Duygusal Zeka: İş Performansı, İş Tatmini, Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı ve Bazı Demografik Değişkenlerle İlişkisi*, Doğu Üniversitesi Dergisi, 9 (2): 174-190.
- Karadag, E. (2009). *Spiritual Leadership and Organizational Culture: A Study of Structural Equation Modeling*. Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 9(3), 1391-1405.
- Karaduman, S. (2010). *Modernizmden postmodernizme kimliğin yapısal dönüşümü*. Journal of Yasar University
- Karaman, F. (2008). “*İsmail Fethi ’nin Ruh ve Ahlâk İle İlgili Görüşleri*” (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Karasar, N. (2006). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. 16. Baskı, Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Katz, D. (1964). Motivational basis of organizational behavior. Behavioral Science , 9(2):131-146.



- Kurtar, Ş. (2009). *Ruhsal liderlik ölçeği: Türkçe dilsel eşdeğerlik, geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması*. (yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi), Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Keskin, Ş. (2010). “*Platon’un Ruh Anlayışının Siyaset Anlayışına Etkisi*” (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi) Sakarya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Maddock, R. D. and Fulton, R. L. (1999). *Motivation, emotions, and leadership: The silent side of management*. Westport: Quorum Books.
- Narayanasamy, 1999, *A Model For Actioning Spirituality* ’ den aktaran Sulu E. 2000, Neck
- Netemeyer, R., MC Kee, D. O., Mc Murran, R. (1997), “*An Investigation Into The Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior in a Personnel Selling Context,*” Journal of Marketing, 61/3: 85-98.
- İplik, F. N. (2010). *Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı*, Adana: Nobel Kitabevi, Özyurt Matbaacılık.
- Oğuz, E. (2011). *Öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları ile yöneticilerin liderlik stilleri arasındaki ilişki*. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi, 17(3), 377-403.
- Organ, D. W. (1988), *Organizational Citizenship Behavior : The Good Soldier Syndrome* (Lexington, England: Lexington Books).
- Ölçüm & Çetin. M. (2004). *Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı*. Ankara: NobelYayın Dağıtım.
- Özgan, H., and Bozbayındır, F., B. A. B. F. (2013). *Öğretmenlerin Ruhsal Liderlik Algıları İle Motivasyonları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi*. Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 12.
- Ural, A., & Kılıç, İ. (2006). *Bilimsel araştırma süreci ve SPSS ile veri analizi: SPSS 10.0-12.0 for windows*. Detay Yayıncılık.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B. and 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.
- Polat, S. (2011). “*The Level of Faculty Members' Spiritual Leadership (SL) Qualities Display According To Students in Faculty of Education.*” Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences No: 15.
- Rost, J.C. (1993), *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*, Westport, CT: Praeger.



- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W. and Near, Y. (1983), “*Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents*,” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68: 653-663.
- Swales, S. (2002). *Organizational commitment: a critique of the construct and measures*. International journal of management reviews.
- Taşdan, M. & Yılmaz, K. (2008). *Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ve örgütsel adalet ölçeklerini Türkçe’ ye uyarlama*, TED Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi. 33 (150).
- Topaloğlu G. (2005), *Dönüştürücü liderlik ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranış arasındaki ilişki*, (yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi) Gebze İleri teknoloji Enstitüsü, Gebze.
- Titrek, O. & Bayrakçı, M. & Zafer, D. (2009), *Öğretmenlerinin Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışlarına İlişkin Görüşleri*, *Akademik Bakış*, Sayı 17 Temmuz – Ağustos - Eylül, 2009 Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler E-Dergisi, ISSN:1694-528X, , İktisat ve Girişimcilik Üniversitesi, Türk Dünyası Kırgız- Türk Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Celalabat-KIRGIZİSTAN
- Ural, A. and Kılıç, İ. (2006). *Bilimsel Araştırma Süreci ve SPSS ile Veri Analizi*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Yılmaz, K. (2010). *Kamu ortaöğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları ile ilgili görüşleri*, On Dokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,29(1)
- Vey, M. A. and Campbell, J. P. (2004). *In-role or extra-role organizational citizenship behavior: Which are we measuring?.* *Human Performance*, 17(1), 119-135.
- Williams, S. and Shiaw, W. T. (1999). *Mood and organizational citizenship behavior: The effects of positive affect on employee organizational citizenship behavior intentions*. *The Journal of Psychology*, 133(6), 656-668.