

The Relationship between Principals’ Transformational Leadership Style and Teachers’ Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Seyedesmaeil Hashemi Sheykhshabani,
PhD
College of Education and Psychology
Shahid Chamran University of
Ahvaz

Ameneh Shojaei, MA
Department of Educational
Psychology

Nooshin Mashayekhi, MA
Department of Industrial and Organizational Psychology

The purpose of the present study was to examine the relationships between principals’ transformational leadership style and teachers’ organizational citizenship behaviors in Bushehr-Iran. The participants of the study were 235 teachers who were working at Bushehr education department that were selected using multi-stage random sampling. The instruments which used in this study were Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Bass and Avolio, 1995) and teachers’ organizational citizenship behaviors questionnaires developed by Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2000). In this research we used the Pearson correlation and stepwise regression analyses. The results show that the range of positive correlation coefficients between subscales of transformational leadership (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration), and the three components of the construct of the teachers’ organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) (teachers’ OCBs toward the school, teachers’ OCBs toward the team, and teachers’ OCBs toward the students) are from .13 to .28 which are significant at $p < .01$ and $p < .05$. In addition, the results of the stepwise regression technique showed that the individualized consideration had the most significant correlations with the teachers’

OCBs, teachers' OCBs toward the students, and teachers' OCBs toward the school. Furthermore, idealized influence, had the most significant relationship with teachers' OCBs toward the team.

Keywords: transformational leadership, teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors, stepwise regression analyses

Schools are increasingly faced with ever growing demands, like enhanced diversity in the classroom, higher expectations regarding pupil achievements, and new psychological insights concerning pedagogy and learning that require educational changes (OECD, 2006). These demands make the schools' success more and more dependent on teachers' willingness to go above and beyond the call of duty in order to attain their schools' goals and objectives (Runhaar, Konermann, & Sanders, 2013; Somech & Ron, 2007). In this sense, voluntary and optional behaviors are claimed to have existed in the working group and thus more research has been done frequently in relation to the extra-role behaviors of the followers (Oguz, 2010). In addition, educational systems move in to an area of reorganization and are required to work in a competitive and complex environment (Miller, 2002), success of schools fundamentally depends on teachers who are committed to school goals and values (Somech & Ron, 2007) and more willing to go above and beyond the call of duty to contribute to successful change, that is, to engage in such organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). So, extra-role behaviors or more exactly the term of organizational citizenship behaviors have become more important for educational organizations (Runhaar, et al. 2013; Moriano & Molero, 2011; Belogolovsky and Somech, 2009; Givens, 2008).

The concept of organizational citizenship behavior was introduced by Batman and Orghan in the early 1980s. Orghan (1983) defined organizational citizenship behavior as the individual behaviors which are discretionary and not recognized by the formal reward system, and promote and facilitate the overall effective function of the organization (Shahzad, Rehman, & Abbas, 2010). The preliminary research carried out on organizational citizenship behavior was mostly to recognize the neglected teachers' responsibilities and duties (Hosseini, Zarepoor, Abdolmaleki, & Abdolmaleki, 2009). The organizational citizenship behavior is necessary for the effective and smooth functioning of the organization. The organizations are constantly striving to increase their products and decline simultaneously their costs. One of the ways in which the personnel can facilitate the organization progress is through the extra-role behaviors. Fifi (2008) points out that these behaviors include supporting fellow staffs, helping new employees, promoting the organization in the community, and making constructive suggestions. So, extra-role behaviors have become more important for organizations (Oguz, 2010).

The organizational citizenship behaviors have recently been considered in the learning environments. The organizational citizenship behaviors in the learning environments refer to all helping behaviors on the part of teachers towards colleagues, principals, and students such as helping the fellow staffs with work overload, providing special assignments for students with high or low intelligence levels, and extending these behaviors to a wider level, e.g., school, through making improvement suggestions in educational issues and talking favorably about the school to outsiders (Somech & Ron, 2007). The teachers' organizational

citizenship behavior consists of behaviors beyond the specified role requirements and they are directly towards school, group, and individual to promote the objectives of the organization. This definition of organizational citizenship behavior puts an emphasis upon three main characteristics of extra-role behaviors. First, the behavior needs to be optional, i.e., it should not be predetermined or a part of official duties of teachers. Second, it emphasizes mostly upon the behaviors which are efficient for the organization. Third, these definitions of organizational citizenship behavior reflect that it is multi-dimensional by nature (Runhaar, Konermann, & Sanders, 2013; Oguz, 2010; Belogolovsky & Somech, 2009; Givens, 2008). The conducted field studies demonstrated that organizational citizenship behavior increases the schools efficiency, because they are for more productive purposes, without considering particular sources, they assist coordinate activities within the organization and enables teachers to adopt more effectively to the environmental changes (Somech & Ron, 2007). Teachers who exhibit less absenteeism and have less turnover intentions, are more productive and efficient, and are able to increase customer satisfaction (Podsakoff et al., 2009). Furthermore, teachers with high level of OCB have more organizational commitment and are strongly engaged with their work (Runhaar, Konermann, & Sanders 2013). Moreover, high level of OCB enhance teacher innovation in particular (Gebert, Boerner, & Kearney, 2006).

Review of the literature related to citizenship behavior illustrates that different studies have been carried out regarding the variables having effects on the citizenship behavior. Among the most important variables are work engagement (Runhaar, Konermann, & Sanders, 2013), job satisfaction (Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000),

organizational commitment (Ling, & Ibrahim, 2013; Shahzad, Rehman, & Abbas, 2010; Noor, 2009; Yilmaz & Cokluk-Bokeoglu, 2008), organizational justice (Young, 2010), Organizational support (Dan & Dan, 2011; Henry, 2008), and personality traits (Gan & Cheung, 2011; Chou, 2008; Elanein, 2007).

It cannot be denied that school administrators have an important role in making teachers feel that they are a part of the organization and in their working more efficiently. Consequently, it is important that school administrators are the people who should have clear objectives, be open to transformation, be able to make ethical decisions, and respect and appraise teachers' opinions.

Researchers have identified various factors that influence organizational citizenship behavior of which leadership is an important one (López-Domínguez, Enache, Sallan, Simo, 2013; Runhaar, Konermann, Sanders, 2013; Oguz, 2010; Givens, 2008). For more than two decades, school researchers have emphasized the effective research investigating the relationship between leadership behaviors of principals and promoting organizational performance (Podsakoff et al. 2000). Furthermore, the recent paradigm of conceptualization of leadership has shifted the educational researchers to these relations from the perspective of new models of leadership; one of these prominent models of leadership is the transformational leadership style (López-Domínguez, Enache, Sallan, Simo, 2013; Oguz, 2010; Givens, 2008; Barnett, 2003). Although the transformational leadership is almost rare and are not known by teachers, the transformational leadership and teacher leadership are not so new in our literature (Anderson, 2008). For more than three decades, the transformational leadership theory has attracted attention of many researchers in the domain of

organizational leadership. This theory developed by Berenz (1987, cited in Givens, 2008) and extended afterwards by Bass (1985, 1988, cited in Givens, 2008). The major and logical hypothesis underlying this theory is the leaders' abilities to motivate subordinates to do something better than they had planned to do. The transformational leadership comprised four facets: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Givens, 2008). Transformational leadership style is directed to future, innovation, change and reformation. Transformational leaders create their organizational culture with the existing rules, procedures and norms. Transformational leaders try to inspire their followers for a mission and orient them to a dream or a vision. These leaders inspire their followers, give them intellectual stimulation and show concern for each individual. Transformational leaders are guiding their followers so that they can compromise more easily (Bass, 1999). They consider the leadership as a process that stimulates and inspires the followers and also enhances their leadership capacities. Moreover, transformational leaders support their followers to gain problem-solving skills by coaching and mentoring as well as inspiring them (Bass and Riggio, 2006; Oguz, 2010).

To date, few studies have considered the relationship between transformational leadership and the teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors. To gain a better understanding of the effective factors on organizational citizenship behaviors, the researchers have focused their attention on the organizational and personal factors that may affect these relationships (Asgari, Silong, Ahmad, & Abu Sama, 2008). Transformational leadership is an important and critical factor in the productive growth of teachers

and also essential for developing teacher leaders. Transformational leaders have more focus on broadcasting school culture and this is the managerial role which shifts them towards the desired field to be not only manager, but also participant in the learning. Burns (1987) defines the transformational leaders as those who engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers promote each other towards higher levels of morality and motivation through communicating with others (cited in Al-Taneiji, 2006).

Transformational leaders inspire followers to achieve extraordinary outcomes by providing both meaning and understanding. They align the objectives and goals of individual followers and the larger organization (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 3). Transformational leaders are assumed to “stimulate followers to perform beyond the level of expectations” (Bass, 1985; cited in Oguz, 2010). Therefore, it seems likely that transformational leaders, by stimulating followers’ organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff et al., 1990), enhance quality and quantity of follower performance. A transformational leader provides meaning, and thereby makes followers identify with the respective goals and problems (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). In fact, they point out that the previous experimental and theoretical research suggests that there is a good reason to believe that the transformational leadership behaviors affect the extra-role behaviors (organizational citizenship behaviors). Prior research provided consistent support for a positive relationship between transformational leadership and OCB across different settings (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Furthermore, transformational leaders inspire their followers to high expectations through “articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model, fostering the acceptance of group goals, high

performance expectations, individualized support, and intellectual stimulation” (Podsakoff et al., 1990, p.107). In fact, they point out that the previous experimental and theoretical research (Oguz, 2010) suggests that there is a good reason to believe that the transformational leadership behaviors affect the extra-role behaviors (organizational citizenship behaviors).

In summary, previous theoretical and empirical research suggests that there is good reason to believe that transformational leader behaviors influence extra-role or organizational citizenship behaviors. One way is for transformational leader behaviors to directly influence organizational citizenship behaviors, much in the same way that transactional leader behaviors have been shown to influence in-role performance (López-Domínguez, Enache, Sallan, Simo, 2013; Oguz, 2010; Barnett, 2003; Podsakoff et al., 1990). Another possibility, also depicted, is that transformational leader behaviors influence organizational citizenship behaviors directly and indirectly, through their effects on mediators or moderators like followers’ trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Lian, Tui, 2012; Givens, 2008; Podsakoff et al., 1990). With respect to the mentioned materials and the importance of understanding the characteristics of teachers which may affect the accomplishment of educational purposes, the current study aims at investigating the relationship between transformational leadership style and organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers that worked at schools in Bushehr, Iran.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis1: There is a positive relationship between the dimensions of the principals’ transformational leadership and the teachers’ OCBs toward the school.

Hypothesis 2: There is a positive relationship between the dimensions of the principals transformational leadership and the teachers' OCBs toward the team.

Hypothesis 3: There is a positive relationship between the dimensions of the principals' transformational leadership and the teachers' OCBs toward the school students.

Material and Methods

The population was all Bushehr public high school' teachers. Participants were 235 accessible teachers that intended to participate in the study. All of the questionnaires were completed by teachers. The participants were 150 male (%64); 4 teachers held diploma (%2), 40 teachers post-diploma (%17), and 125 teachers had Bachelor's degree (%53), 48 teachers had Master's degree (%20) and 18 teachers (%8) did not mention their education. The Mean and Standard Deviation for the age of the participants were 38.02 and 5.98. The Mean and Standard Deviation for the teaching experience were 18.67 and 6.27, respectively.

Measures

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Transformational leadership was measured using the multifactor transformational leadership questionnaire (MLQ) that was developed by Bass and Avolio (1995). The transformational leadership style questionnaire comprises five components: idealized influence (idealized attributes), idealized influence (idealized behaviors), inspirational motivation, intellectual motivation, and individualized consideration. Four items have been devoted to measuring each facet of transformational leadership. These items ask the teachers to

indicate the extent to which their leaders' engage in behaviors of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation. Teachers indicated how frequently their principals displayed the behavior described in each item using a five-point response scale, where 1=not at all, 2=once in a while, 3=sometimes, 4=fairly often, 5=always. Despite some concerns about psychometric validity of this measure, MLQ has been used extensively in the area of leadership research and is considered the best validated measure of transformational and transactional leadership. This questionnaire is available in two forms. In a form, the employees evaluate the manager and in the other form, the manager assesses his/her own performance. The present study drew on the first form. Bass and Avolio (1997), cited in Sattari (2008) reported the reliability of the questionnaire based on the results of fourteen independent studies between .81 to .94 in the business, industrial, military, and medical jobs. Sattari (2008) translated the questionnaire in Farsi and explored its reliability and validity on the directors of Ministry of Industries and Mines and reported to be high enough. In this study, the Cronbach alpha coefficient to assess the reliability was .93. Besides, the calculated reliabilities for the four components were idealized influence (behavior, .65 and attribute, .67), inspirational motivation (.84), intellectual motivation (.75), and individualized consideration (.70).

Teachers' organizational citizenship behavior questionnaire. Teachers' organizational citizenship behavior was assessed by the 24-item questionnaire developed and validated specifically in the context of schools by Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2000). It consists of three sub-scales: extra-role behaviors towards the student (8 items), extra-role behaviors towards the group (8 items), and extra-

role behaviors towards the school (8 items). Respondents were asked to indicate the extent each item was a teacher's in-role behavior on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2000) reported the reliability of this scale through measuring Alpha Cronbach for three sub-scales as extra-role behaviors towards the student (.79), extra-role behaviors towards the group (.81), and extra-role behaviors towards the school (.83). Belogolovsky and Somech (2009) determined the reliability of this scale in a sample of teachers through measuring Alpha Cronbach for the whole scale (.84). In the present study, the calculated Alpha Cronbach for the whole scale was .94 and for the sub-scales extra-role behaviors towards the student, the group, and the school were .80, .85, and .88, respectively. In order to evaluate the validity of the questionnaire, we used Confirmatory factor analysis. Confirmatory factor analysis was used to analyze the internal structure of the present study scale (three subscales of OCB). As Kelloway (1998) noted, the quality of fit of a theoretical model is based both on whether it provides a good absolute fit to the data and whether it fits better than a competing model. Results indicate that the three-factor solution had good fit indexes: goodness-of-fit index (GFI) = .86, adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI) = .90, normed fit index (NFI) = .78, non-normed fit index (NNFI) = .87, incremental fit index (IFI) = .85, comparative fit index (CFI) = .90, and root mean square error (RMSE) = .08. These results indicate that the three subscale of the present measurement model (OCB) represent concepts that are not only theoretically, but also empirically, distinguishable. Furthermore, the concurrent validity of the scale through correlating the total score of the scale and its sub-scales

including citizenship behaviors towards the student, the group, and the school were 0.90, 0.94, and 0.94, respectively, significant at the $P < .05$ level of significance.

Results

Table 1 presents mean (M), standard deviation (SD), minimum (Min), and maximum (Max) values for the research variables.

Table 1
Mean, Standard Deviation, Minimum, and Maximum Values for the Variables

Variable	M	SD	Min	Max
Transformational leadership style	73.49	13.97	22	97
Idealized influence (behavior)	15.31	2.69	6	20
Idealized influence (attribute)	14.13	3.02	4	20
Inspirational motivation	15.03	3.43	4	20
Intellectual motivation	14.40	2.23	4	20
Individualized consideration	14.61	3.29	4	20
Teachers' organizational citizenship behavior	87.63	16.11	40	120
Citizenship behaviors towards group	29.63	5.84	8	40
Citizenship behaviors towards school	29.50	6.19	9	40
Citizenship behaviors towards students	28.50	5.39	13	40

Table 2 illustrates the correlation between the transformational leadership style and organizational citizenship behavior.

The contents of Table 2 demonstrate that as it was expected the transformational leadership and its dimensions have relationships with the organizational citizenship behavior and its facets. The correlation coefficient related to the total score of transformational leadership style with the teachers' organizational citizenship behavior is ($r=.24$), citizenship behavior towards group is ($r=.26$), citizenship behavior towards school is ($r=.20$), and citizenship behavior towards students is ($r=.19$) which are all significant at the $P<.05$ level of significance

Table 3 shows the results of regression analysis related to teachers' organizational citizenship behavior on the transformational leadership style components.

Table 2
Correlations between the Transformational Leadership Style
and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Variables	Transformational leadership	Idealized influence (behavior)	Idealized influence (attribute)	Inspirational motivation	Intellectual motivation	Individualized consideration
Organizational Citizenship behavior	.24**	.23**	.18**	.22**	.26**	.17*
Group Citizenship behavior	.26**	.28**	.16*	.24**	.28**	.21**
School citizenship behavior	.20**	.18**	.15*	.20**	.22**	.14*
Student citizenship behavior	.19**	.17*	.18**	.15*	.23**	.13

*p< .05 ** p< .01

Table 3
Stepwise Regression Analysis Results Related to the Teachers’
Organizational Citizenship Behavior on the Transformational
Leadership Style Components

Predictive Variables	R	R ²	F P	Regression Coefficients
Individualized Consideration	.255	.065	.008	$\beta=.255$ $t=2.69$ $P=.008$

As Table 3 indicates, among the five components of transformational leadership style, the individualized consideration plays a significant role in predicting the teachers’ organizational citizenship behavior. Moreover, the consideration facet explains 6.5% of the variance of the teachers’ organizational citizenship behavior which is significant at the $P<.05$ level of significance

Table 4 shows the regression analysis results of organizational citizenship behavior towards the group on the transformational leadership style facets.

Table 4
Stepwise Regression Analysis Results Related to Organizational
Citizenship Behavior towards the Group on the
Transformational Leadership Style Facets

Predictive Variables	R	R ²	F P	Regression Coefficients
Idealized Influence (behavior)	.275	.075	8.49 .004	$\beta=.275$ $t=2.91$ $P=.004$

The results included in Table 4 illustrate that among the five facets of transformational leadership style, it is only the idealized influence (behavior) facet that significantly predicts the organizational citizenship behavior towards the group. Furthermore, the idealized behavior component describes 7.5% of the variance in organizational citizenship behavior towards the group which is meaningful at the $P < .05$ level of significance

Table 5 presents the regression analysis results of organizational citizenship behavior towards the school to the transformational leadership style facets.

Table 5
Stepwise Regression Analysis Results Related to the Organizational Citizenship Behavior towards the School on the Transformational Leadership Style Facets

Predictive Variables	R	R ²	F P	Regression Coefficients
Individual Considerations	.212	.045	4.88 .03	$\beta = .212$ $t = 2.209$ $P = .03$

As Table 5 shows, among the five dimensions of transformational leadership style, consideration is the only dimension which plays a significant role in predicting the organizational citizenship behavior towards the school. On the basis of the results, the leadership style of consideration explains 4.5% of the variance in the teachers' organizational citizenship behavior towards the school which is significant at the $P < .05$ level of significance. Table 6 demonstrates the regression analysis results of the organizational citizenship behavior towards the student on the transformational leadership style facets.

Table 6
Regression Analysis Results of the Organizational Citizenship Behavior towards the Student on the Transformational Leadership Style Facets

Predictive Variables	R	R ²	F P	Regression coefficients
Individual consideration	.225	.05	5.55 .02	$\beta = .225$ $t = 2.355$ $P = .02$

Table 6 contents indicate that among the five components of transformational leadership style, it is only the consideration facet which significantly predicts the organizational citizenship behavior towards the student. Moreover, the leadership style of consideration explains .5% of the variance in the teachers' organizational citizenship behavior towards the student which is significant at the $P < .05$ level of significance.

Discussions

This research aimed to explore that each one of the five dimensions of transformational leadership (the two components of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration), maintained a Positive, and significant relationship with the teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors and its facets (citizenship behavior towards the student, towards the group, and towards the school). In other word, as hypothesized, supervisors who exhibited higher levels of transformational leadership behaviors had employees who reported higher levels of organizational citizenship behaviors. Furthermore, the results demonstrated that among the five components of the leadership style, in the relationships between the transformational leadership style and the teachers' organizational citizenship behavior towards group and towards the school, the individual consideration component has a more decisive predicting role. Moreover, in the relationship between the transformational leadership style and the teachers' organizational citizenship behavior towards student, idealized influence (behavior) component has a more decisive predicting role. These findings are consistent with (MercedesLópez-Domínguez et al., 2013; Lian, and Tui (2012), Shahzad, Rehman, and Abbas, 2010; Belogolovsky, and Somech 2009; Seyyednaghavi, Rafa'ti Alashti, and Miri, 2009; Givens, 2008; Asgari et al., 2008; Shukui and Xiaomin, 2008; and Podsakoff et al., 1990).

The transformational leadership means creating sense of pride and dignity, egocentrism, belief in their leaders and its focus to express their views for the organization. For the transformational leadership, Bass (1985) had employed dimensions of charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual motivation, and individualized consideration (cited in

Bruursema, 2004). There are several evidence that transformational leadership is effective in developing positive results for the organization and the subordinates. Bass (1990) pointed out that these behaviors are beyond self-concerned and enable leaders to have strong emotional relationship with their subordinates and this provides more organizational commitment between people (Shukui & Xiaomin, 2008).

The findings of previous research revealed that the behaviors of transformational leaders have positive and significant relationship with the performance and citizenship behavior. In fact, these leaders encourage their subordinates to consider the higher goals in their workplace (Bruursema, 2004). Bass (1986) asserts that the transformational leaders rely on verbal skills to create a compelling vision which causes change in needs, values, and beliefs of the follower (cited in Cahill, 2002). This relationship can be explained as follows, the transformational leaders draw on a large number of their personal abilities including intelligence, magical powers, optimism, creation, decisiveness, etc., to promote others' ideals and transfer the organization and the organizational members to a higher level of performance (Manning & Curtis, 2003, cited in Seyyed naghavi, 2009, et al.). These leaders, indeed, hold some capabilities and features who wish to take citizen action's (Somech & Ron, 2007). One of their features is that these people are intrinsically motivated and with a collective vision they are willing to participate in achieving common goals in the workplace without expectation of immediate and tangible achievements. This willingness to participate is due to the sense of ideal or the sense of self-worth which they have towards themselves (Asgari et al., 2008).

Netemeyer et al. (1997) argue that employees are engaged in the beneficial organizational behavior such as the citizenship

behavior “when they are satisfied with the organization and with their jobs. That is, employees who perceive themselves to be treated well by their organization and who like their jobs will respond in kind through their own behaviors” (cited in McCook, 2002; p.7). Most of the theories have generally propounded that organizational citizenship behavior is a personality trait and it is a social response to the behaviors of supervisors or fellow staffs and a likely response to others’ behaviors that their only motive to this action is the mechanisms and business objectives. In fact, the organizational citizenship behavior is a significant predictor of the employees’ performance which is beyond their defined roles and it positively affects the organizational performance, service quality, efficiency, and maintaining them for a long period of time; these behaviors incorporate those citizenship behavior towards the people or the group as well as towards the organization as a whole or part of it. Therefore, in educational systems, the teachers’ extra-role behaviors will be the fundamental factor in improving the schools’ efficiency (Vigoda-Gadot, Beerli, Birman-Shemesh, & Somech, 2005).

Based on the findings of the current study in relationship of the principal transformational leadership style with teachers’ organizational citizenship behavior towards the student, individual consideration has more important predicting role. The true essence of transformational leadership is that these leaders cause followers to go beyond expectations (VegaVazquez, Cossio, & Martin-Ruiz, 2012). As a result, transformational leadership has an important impact upon extra-role performance and organizational citizenship behaviors. Individualized consideration, a component of transformational leadership, may concentrate on changing followers’ motives, moving them to consider not just their self-interests but also the moral and ethical implications of their actions and goals. The net effect on

the individuals is to re-examine priorities among their needs, aspirations for achievement and impending challenges (Avolio & Bass, 1995; Vila, Perez, & Morillas, 2012). In addition, Rafferty and Griffin (2004) argued that transformational leaders will display a number of developmentally-oriented behaviors, including coaching followers, identifying appropriate training courses for followers to undertake and encouraging followers to develop their job-related skills and abilities, in order to foster their self-confidence on undertaking a wide range of proactive tasks. People can employ transformational leadership behaviors to act in the best way to maintain relationship with the subordinates and accomplishing this is through affection exchange, honesty, and cooperation with the subordinates and this improves the relationships of leaders with the groups. Hence, a tender gentle cycle will form under such good interactions which not only reinforces people commitment towards the organization and reduces the turnover intension, but also improves the employees' organizational citizenship behaviors which results in increasing the effectiveness of the organization (Asgari et al., 2008). In addition, in the relationship between the principal transformational leadership style and teachers' organizational citizenship behavior towards the group and towards the school individual consideration has a more predictor role.

In this study, it was found that idealized influence has a more important forecasting role, in the relationship between the principal transformational leadership style and teachers' organizational citizenship behavior towards student,. According to Bass (1985) the term of "idealized influence" describe the charismatic quality of the transformational leaders. Specifically, this dimension refers to a charismatic leader's ability to develop a vision and to influence others to accept and share that vision

(Jung & Avolio, 2000). The charisma associated with the behaviors of transformational leaders ultimately leads employees to identify with their leaders, which, in turn, helps the leaders rally support for their vision. Idealized influence also occurs when leaders earn the respect and trust of their followers by doing the “right thing” (Avolio, 1999). They elevate employees’ expectations about what they can accomplish, it is also likely to enhance the accomplishment and task orientation aspects of intrinsic motivation. Equally, Kirkpatrick and Locke (1996) demonstrated that employees who have a charismatic leader are likely to perceive their work as more interesting. Consequently, idealized influence, in the relationship between the principal transformational leadership style and the teachers’ organizational citizenship behavior towards the student, has a more decisive predicting role.

Nowadays, the prime responsibility of schools is to train effective citizens who have the knowledge, attitude, and skills compatible with information communities and this important mission requires effective school principals. The key responsibility of school principals should be the efficient and effective activities and the main point is that the organizations can operate and maintain themselves when there is a balance between the organizational goals and the individuals’ business objectives and the efficiency of organization and individuals is in actions and desires which are beyond the defined job requirements. These actions and behaviors are the organizational citizenship behaviors (Tanriogen & Gokmen, 2011).

According to the findings of the current study, the relationship between variables was not strong. In reviewing the related literature, almost all of the investigations have reported weak relationship (López-Domínguez, Enache, Sallan, Simo, 2013; Lian, Tui 2012; Oguz, 2010; Podsakoff et al, 1990). It is

possible that transformational leader behaviors influence followers' citizenship behaviors both directly and indirectly.

Considering the results of this study and other conducted research, it can be concluded that organizational citizenship behavior in schools and among teachers are the fundamental requirements of the schools and educational systems. A principal is the most powerful and influential individual in school and teachers are the primary and the most important human forces in school and undoubtedly one of the foremost responsibilities of schools is to improve the students learning. Organizational citizenship behavior is one of the variables which plays an effective role in teachers' performance and desirable fulfilment of their responsibilities. Therefore, understanding the organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers provides hopeful perspectives to reinforce these behaviors and consequently effective performance of the duties and responsibilities in schools. In this way, it is suggested that due to the significant role of organizational citizenship behaviors in schools' performance and outcome, particularly in educational organizations, the appreciation of the nature and sources associated with it, specially the predictor variables needs to be considered. Identifying the promoting and inhibitory factors of citizenship behavior, particularly among teachers and taking measures to reinforce and remove these factors can provide the way for the growth and improvement of educational organizations.

The present study has several limitations. First, cross-sectional design does not permit conclusions regarding causality among variables. Therefore, future research drawing on longitudinal designs is encouraged. These longitudinal studies can assess, for instance, if exogenous events such as a downturn in company's finances or the loss of key resources drive

organizational members to increase the irresponsibility and to engage in challenging OCB. Secondly, the data of this study comes from self-reported measures, which can lead respondents to some biases due to the social desirability effect. Future research efforts should consider including third-party measures. Moreover, findings of this study cannot be generalized to other organizations, because the study was conducted with teachers that worked in Bushehr Ministry of Education. So, it is necessary to generalize the results cautiously to other organizations. Furthermore, based on the collected demographic data, most of the participants of this study are males; hence the findings should be generalized to female staffs carefully.

References

- Al-Taneiji, S. (2006). Transformational leadership and teacher learning in model schools. *Journal of Faculty of Education*, 23, 21-36.
- Anderson, K. D. (2008). Transformational teacher leadership in rural schools. *The Rural Educator*. Available at http://www.ruraleducator.net/archive/29-3/29-3_Anderson.pdf.
- Asgari, A., Silong, A. D., Ahmad, A., & Abu Sama, B. (2008). The relationship between transformational leadership behaviors, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behaviors. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 6, 140-151.
- Barnett, A. M. (2003). *The impact of transformational leadership style of the school principal on school learning environments and selected teacher outcomes: A Preliminary Report. Self-concept Enhancement and Learning Facilitation Research Centre*. Paper presented at NZARE

- AARE, Auckland, New Zealand. Available at <http://www.aare.edu.au/03pap/bar03777.pdf>.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA; Mind Garden.
- Belogolovsky, E., & Somech, A. (2009). 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, 914-923.
- Brayfield A. H., & Rothe H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35, 307-311.
- Bruursema, K. (2004). *Leadership style and the link with counterproductive work behavior (CWB): An investigation using the job-stress/CWB model*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of South Florida, Tampa, USA. Available at <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/970>.
- Cahill, D. (2002). *The role of transformational leadership, vision communication and vision characteristics on the growth of dotcoms in the Midwest*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Cincinnati, USA.
- Chou, SH. Y. (2008). Big Five Personality: Moderation Effect on People Management and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Available at http://www.midwestacademy.org/Proceedings/2008/papers/Shih_Yung%20Chou_41.pdf.
- Dan, W., & Dan-dan, Z. (2011). *Relationship among organizational support, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior of university faculty members*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Management Science and Engineering (ICMSE), 1769-1775.

- Ejimofo, F. O. (2007). Principals' transformational leadership skills and their teachers' job satisfaction in Nigeria. Cleveland State University ETDs. Available at [http://etd.ohiolink.edu/send-pdf.cgi/Ejimofofor%20Francis%20O.pdf?csu 1202235575](http://etd.ohiolink.edu/send-pdf.cgi/Ejimofofor%20Francis%20O.pdf?csu%201202235575).
- Elanain, H. A. (2007). Relationship between personality and organizational citizenship behavior: Does personality influence employee citizenship? *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 3, 31-43.
- Fife, C. M. (2008). *A social-cognitive assessment of organizational citizenship behavior*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio, USA.).
- Gan, Y., & Cheung, F. (2010). From proactive personality to organizational citizenship behavior: Mediating role of harmony. *Psychological Reports*, 106 (3), 755-765.
- Givens, R. J. (2008). Transformational leadership: The impact on organizational and personal outcomes. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 1, 4-24.
- Kelloway, E. K. (1998). Using LISREL for structural equation modeling: A researcher's guide. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 36-51.
- Lian, L. K., & Tui, G. L. (2012). Leadership styles and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating effect of subordinates' competence and downward influence tactics. *Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, 13(2), 59- 96.
- López-Domínguez, M., Enache, M., Sallan, J. M., & Simo, P. (2013). Transformational leadership as an antecedent of

- change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 66, 2147-2152.
- Henry, E. (2007). Reciprocating perceived organizational support through citizenship behaviors. *Journal of managerial issues*, 19 (4), 554-575.
- Hosseini, S. A., Zarepoor, E., Abdolmaleki, S., & Abdolmaleki, J. (2009). *A comparative study of organizational citizenship behaviors in employees of public and non-profit high schools*. Paper presented at the first national conference on managing organizational citizenship behavior, Tehran, Iran.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A Meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 755–768.
- McCook, K. D. (2002). *Organizational perception and their relationships to job attitudes, effort, performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Luisiana State University. Louisiana, USA.
- Moriano, J. A., & Molero, F. (2011). The influence of transformational leadership and organizational identification on entrepreneurship, *Intentional entrepreneurship Management Journal*, DOI 10.1007/s11365-011-0196-x.
- Noor, A. (2009). *Examining organizational citizenship behavior as the outcome of organizational commitment: a study of universities teachers of Pakistan*. Proceedings 2nd CBRC, Lahore, Pakistan.
- Oguz, E. (2010). The relationship between the leadership styles of the school administrators and the organizational citizenship behaviours of teachers. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 1188–1193.

- OECD. (2006). *Demand-sensitive schooling. Evidence and issues*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leaders, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142.
- Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership: Conceptual and empirical extensions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(3), 329-354.
- Ross, J. A., & Gray, P. (2007). Transformational leadership and teacher commitment to organizational values: The mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17, 179-199.
- 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.
- Sattari, F. (2008). *Investigating the simple and multiple relationship between the big personality traits and transformational and transactional leadership styles in the directors of Ministry of Industries and Mines*. Unpublished Masters' Thesis, Shahid Chamran University, Ahvaz, Iran.
- Seyyednaghavi, M. A., Rafa'tialashti, K., & Miri, M. (2009). *The relationship between transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors*. Paper presented at the first national conference on organizational citizenship behavior, Tehran, Iran.
- Shahzad, K., Rehman, K., & Abbas, M. (2010). HR practices and leadership styles as predictors of employee attitude and

- behavior: Evidence from Pakistan. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 14, 417-426.
- Shukui, H., & Xiaomin, Y. (2008). The impact of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment: A metaanalytical Explanation. Institute of Economics and Management. Available at [http:// www. seiofbluemountain.com /upload /product/200910/2008glhy04a5.pdf](http://www.seiofbluemountain.com/upload/product/200910/2008glhy04a5.pdf)
- Somech, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2000). Understanding extra-role behavior in schools: the relationships between job satisfactions, sense of efficacy, and teachers 'extra-role behavior .*Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 649-659.
- Somech, A., & Ron, I. (2007). Promoting organizational citizenship behavior in schools: The impact of individual and organizational characteristics. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43, 38-66.
- Tanriogen, A., & Gokmen, A. (2011). Teacher perceptions towards organizational citizenship *behaviors in elementary schools* Paper presented at ECER 2011, Urban Education, Berlin Vigoda-Gadot, E., Beerl,
- Birman-Shemesh, T., & Somech, A. (2005). Group-level organizational: A Scale Reconstruction and Validation. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 20 (10), 1-32.
- Vega-Vazquez, M., Cossio, F., & Martin-Ruiz, D. (2012). Does the firm's market orientation behavior influence innovation ' s success? *Management Decision*, 50(8), 1445–1464.
- Vila, L. E., Perez, P. J., & Morillas, F. G. (2012). Higher education and the development of competencies for innovation in the workplace. *Management Decision*, 50(9), 1634–1648.
- Yilmaz, K., & Cokluk-B0keoglu, O. (2008). Organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment in

Turkish primary school. *World applied sciences journal*, 3, 775-780.

Young, L. D. (2010). Is organizational justice enough to promote citizenship behavior at work? A retest in Korea. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 45, 637-648

Received: 17 /12/ 2013

Revised : 28/ 12/ 2014

Accepted: 15/ 2 / 2015