



The Relationships between Structural and Psychological Empowerment of Teachers and Their Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Yahya Altinkurt ¹, Burcu Türkkas Anasız ², C. Ergin Ekinci ³

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine the relationships between structural and psychological empowerment of teachers and their organizational citizenship behaviors. The sample of this descriptive study consists of 384 teachers employed in the province of Muğla. The data of the study were collected through the administration of the questionnaires (namely Conditions of Work Effectiveness Questionnaire, Psychological Empowerment Scale and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale) to the teachers in the sample. In the analysis of the data, descriptive statistics, t test, ANOVA and hierarchical multiple regression analysis were conducted. The study revealed that the level of teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) is higher than the medium level. Besides, teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors differed significantly in terms of the variables of gender, school type and school location (urban or rural) whereas there was no significant difference in terms of the variable of seniority. The level of teachers' structural empowerment (SE) was determined to be medium. Moreover, in terms of school type and school location variables, some dimensions of teachers' SE differed significantly, however no significant difference was found in terms of gender and seniority variables. On the other hand, the level of teachers' psychological empowerment (PE) was high. In terms of gender and school type variables, some dimensions of teachers' (PE) differed significantly, yet it did not differ significantly according to the variables of seniority and school location. In addition, teachers' psychological and SE explained one third of the OCB. According to the results of regression analysis, both the dimensions of knowledge and opportunity and the dimension of individual oriented empowerment were identified to be significant predictors of OCB. In addition, some recommendations were developed in the study in order to increase teachers' structural and psychological empowerment.

Keywords

Structural empowerment
Psychological empowerment
Organizational citizenship
Teacher

Article Info

Received: 04.18.2016
Accepted: 09.26.2016
Online Published: 10.21.2016

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2016.6437

¹ Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, yaltinkurt@gmail.com

² Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, burcuturkkas@gmail.com

³ Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, EEKINCI@MU.EDU.TR

Introduction

It is possible for the organizations to continue their current conditions or develop them if only the balance between the contributions of employees and their expectations in return for their contributions is maintained. While an organization expects its employees to demonstrate extra role behaviors, the structure and climate of the organization ought to support these behaviors. In a sense, this is a requirement for the psychological contract between the organization and employees. Because, employees count on that the management provides appropriate work conditions, behaves fairly and makes them partners for success whereas the organizational management expects its employees to show a solid performance, obey the rules, keep faith with their organization (Rousseau, 1990, 2004; Rousseau & Parks, 1993) and demonstrate citizenship behaviors (Robinson & Morrison, 1995). Just like in all the other organizations, redressing this balance is quite important for educational organizations.

Moreover, the concept of organizational citizenship has been frequently encountered in the literature of administration in the recent years (Baş & Şentürk, 2011; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Ilisu, 2012; Jimmieson, Hannam, & Yeo, 2010; Somech & Ron, 2007; Yılmaz, Altinkurt, & Yıldırım, 2015; Zeinabadi & Salehi, 2011). Especially, the organizations as social and open systems are required to have employees who can go beyond the formal job descriptions in order to continue their existences in the ever-changing circumstances. The OCB of employees has a quite significant role in increasing the organizational efficiency. However, ensuring organizational efficiency depends primarily on the existence of a strong structure that might provide opportunity for employees so as to be successful, in other words it depends on the appropriateness of the work conditions. In this context, it is supposed that the psychological and structural empowerment of the organizations towards their employees will increase their citizenship behaviors considerably. This argument is mostly based on the results of the studies focusing on the effects of contextual variables rather than the results of the studies focusing on the individual characteristics from among the studies oriented towards explaining organizational citizenship behaviors (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005; George & Jones, 1997; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2004; Somech & Ron, 2007). The current study is grounded on the hypothesis that psychological and structural empowerment of employees is a contextual variable of organizational citizenship behaviors and on the idea that psychological and structural empowerment of employees will significantly enhance organizational citizenship behaviors. The current study can be considered to be an attempt to determine this relationship.

Organ (1997, 1988) defined organizational citizenship as the optional behaviors which are not described directly or explicitly by formal reward system and which support the organization to function effectively as a whole. Extra role behaviors include voluntary and benevolent behaviors, and informal common actions, which increase and ensure organizational efficiency. The samples of organizational citizenship behaviors might be those of helping a newly employed colleague to adapt to the organization, behaving kindly to friends in the work, recommending new ideas, avoiding undesirable behaviors and finishing job in time. When the employees do not perform these behaviors, they are not blamed for them in any way; however these behaviors are advantageous for the organization (Ünüvar, 2006). As can be seen in the examples, organizational citizenship behaviors are not related to individuals' performing their described formal duties but to their going beyond their formal job description to be more conducive to their organizations (Organ & Rayn, 1995). In this sense, OCB can be described as a positive manner of behavior which is demonstrated in the organization.

When the benefits expected from OCB specific to educational organizations are taken into consideration, it can be asserted that these behaviors increase the effectiveness of the school and decrease the administrative loads of school administrators (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001), and enhance organizational performance (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Somech & Ron, 2007), and they are also believed to encourage employees to demonstrate other organizational citizenship behaviors (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; George & Jones, 1997). As the organizations cannot anticipate the whole range of behaviors needed for the achievement of organizational goals, OCB is considered

to be very important (Vanyperen, Van den Berg, & Willering, 1999). For schools, where ambiguities and complexities are experienced intensely by its nature, teachers' demonstrating extra role behaviors beyond their formal job descriptions may mean that the behavioral inadequacies which are not anticipated by formal job descriptions can be compensated with voluntary efforts. In this sense, organizational citizenship behaviors provide organizations with additional opportunities and eliminate the need for expensive formal mechanisms otherwise crucial to successful restructuring processes. If to state briefly, in today's rapidly changing world, formal job descriptions in schools are very necessary but not sufficient for predicting school effectiveness. Therefore, schools will have to be more dependent on teachers who are willing to exert considerable effort beyond formal job requirements, namely, to engage in OCB (Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000). Teachers might demonstrate extra role behaviors such as helping students even after course time has finished, helping students with class materials, developing themselves, preparing special assignments for lower or higher students, participating in the school boards voluntarily, setting up learning programs for substitute teachers, helping absent colleagues by assigning learning tasks to their classes, and working collaboratively with others, conducting extra-curricular activities, allocating time for students outside the class hours and assigning extra homework when necessary and monitoring (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; DiPaola & Hoy, 2005; Woolfolk Hoy, Hoy, & Kurtz, 2008).

There is a large number of variables that may influence employees' OCB. In their meta-analysis study, Podsakoff et al. (2000) stated that the premises of organizational citizenship behaviors can be separated into four groups, namely personal characteristics, professional characteristics, organizational characteristics and leadership behaviors. Another variable which might affect the OCB is the structural and psychological empowerment of organizations towards their employees. The structural and psychological empowerment of organizations towards their employees should be evaluated within organizational characteristics rather than within the premises proposed by Podsakoff et al. (2000).

Empowerment can be defined as supporting and encouraging employees, who are the most important resource in an organization to achieve the organizational goals (Moorhead & Griffin, 1995). Empowerment can be described as making the employees energetic. The empowerment means making employees more motivated. Consequently, it can be stated that empowerment brings a new point of view regarding the traditional meaning of motivation (Doğan & Kılıç, 2008). On the other hand, empowerment can also be described as a process in which employees develop competences to take charge of their own development and resolve their own problems (Short, Greer, & Melvin, 1994). The purpose of empowerment is to enable individuals to have the required knowledge, competence and belief in order to be able to deal with the problems which might arise in their working environments. So as to maintain this condition, employees are required to be more autonomous in their works (Fatima, Iqbal, & Imran, 2013), to have authority and responsibility, and to share power and information (Hales & Klidas, 1998). In this sense, empowerment is associated with the concept of devolution. Nevertheless, empowerment is a broader concept including devolution. In the related literature, the concept of empowerment can be encountered in two different ways. The first one of these is the structural empowerment (SE) which contains the principles and applications possessed by the organization in order to arrange the administrative processes and the other one is psychological empowerment (PE) directed towards affecting the perceptions of employees.

SE consists of change and innovation which have recently been given place in the organizational policies. SE refers to the transformation of classical bureaucratic strategies in the organizational administrations into effective and participatory administrative strategies (Cho & Faerman, 2010). According to McDonald (2014), SE enables an individual to take the highest advantage of opportunities and resources in order to accomplish the goals of the organization. SE is the supportive conditions offered to an individual in the work environment. That's to say, SE means that the operation of the organization has a structure to facilitate the works of employees. SE provides opportunities for employees in order to enable them to make decisions about their own jobs and to take responsibility of their own jobs (Erstad, 1997). In other words, SE refers to sharing the power, especially the legal power with the subordinates within the frame of responsibilities (Spreitzer & Quinn, 2001).

In the literature, the concept of SE is mostly associated with the organizational culture as the level of SE increases or decreases depending on the level of organizational culture (Appelbaum, Hebert, & Leroux, 1999). For instance, in an organizational culture in which participatory policy is adopted in the administration, the SE level of employees increases (Çöl, 2006). In the contrary, employees might feel themselves as blocked and so they might be unhappy. SE level of employees is attached to the opportunity and power that is maintained by the organization (Kanter, 1993; Kartal, 2016; O'Brien, 2010; Vacharakiat, 2008). The structure of opportunity refers to the structural arrangement which is required in order for the employees to reach the power resources they might need so as to conduct a particular work and to develop their knowledge and competences in the organization. Employees who have both the opportunity and power structures, in other words individuals who have been empowered structurally, are more dedicated to their professions, their job satisfactions get higher and also their efficiencies for work increase. On the other hand, the burnout levels, job stress, absenteeism, being blocked and perceptions of powerlessness might have a significant decrease (Laschinger, Finegan, & Shamian, 2001; O'Brien, 2010; Vacharakiat, 2008).

The other dimension of empowerment is psychological empowerment (PE). PE is an administrative practice to increase both the quality of work in the organization and the intrinsic motivation of the employees (Odabaş, 2014). Conger and Kanungo (1988) describe PE as the development of the self-efficacy perceptions of employees formally or informally. A fair rewarding behavior can be regarded as an example for formal aspect of PE. Apart from formal organizational structures, organizational communication and social interaction like job companionships contribute to the PE of employees, as well.

Spreitzer (1995) has investigated the perceptions of employees regarding their PE in four dimensions, namely *meaning*, *competence*, *self-determination* and *impact*. In this context, *meaning* refers to individuals' perceiving their jobs as valuable and important. Individuals who attribute a great meaning to their jobs are believed to demonstrate positive behaviors such as dedication and devotedness. *Competence* can be regarded as an individual's inclination and ability about his job. Besides, competence is the belief an individual has towards his skills and abilities regarding the job. The productivity and enthusiasm of individuals who have lost their belief for competence come to disappear. Moreover, *self-determination* can be described as the ability to use initiative that an individual has so as to get started to work. Self-determination is the individual's perception of independence in taking the responsibility of the job. The absence of this perception causes individuals not to keep up with the standardized job patterns. In addition, *impact* can be regarded as the level of leaving a mark on the activities conducted in the organization. In other words, it can be defined as the individual's being aware of that he is useful in the organization. Employees who think that they cannot contribute to their organizations feel themselves incapable and uneasy in the work environment. According to Spreitzer (1995), these four dimensions are holistic. Thereby, holistically and psychologically empowered individuals give value to their organizational structures; they are productive and enthusiastic towards their jobs.

In the related literature, studies regarding teachers' empowerment began to appear in the late 1980s (Edwards, Green, & Lyons, 2002). According to Maeroff (1988), teachers' empowerment consists of the dimensions of developed status, sufficient knowledge and participation in decision-making process. On the other hand, Short and Rinehart (1992) examined teachers' empowerment in six dimensions, which are decision-making, professional development, status, self-efficacy, autonomy and impact. *Decision-making* refers to the participation of teachers in the critical decisions regarding their jobs; *professional development* refers to the teachers' perceptions that the school provides opportunities to grow and develop professionally; *status* can be regarded as the professional respect and favor they received from their colleagues; *self-efficacy* stands for the perception that they are equipped with the skills and ability to help students learn and get the expected outcomes; *autonomy* refers to the teacher's feeling that they have control over various aspects of their profession and working life; and lastly the *impact* refers to the teachers' perceptions regarding that they are able to have an influence on the school life. Besides, Sweetland and Hoy (2000) asserted that empowerment can be much more effective when it is addressed to increase the professionalism of teachers. That's

why teachers' empowerment can be regarded as a considerably significant factor which has a great influence on the school's efficiency (Wall & Rinehart, 1998).

There are many studies in literature conducted regarding the teachers' empowerment. Studies investigating the relationship between the concept of empowerment and job satisfaction (Rinehart & Short, 1994), participation in decision-making (Gruber & Trickett, 1987; White, 1992), organizational commitment (Hamid, Nordin, Adnan, & Sirun, 2013; Wu & Short, 1996; Odabaş, 2014), organizational conflict (Johnson & Short, 1998; Rinehart, Short, & Johnson, 1997; Short, 1994), teaching practices and student achievement (Marks & Louis, 1997; Smylie, 1994) and leadership (Blase & Blase, 1996; Johnson & Short, 1998; Kirby & Colbert, 1994; Reitzug, 1994; Rinehart, Short, Short, & Eckley, 1998) can be regarded to take place among these research topics. However, there are rather limited studies examining the relationships between empowerment and OCB, which constitute the research topic of this present study (Bogler & Somech, 2004). However, the number of studies dealing with organizational citizenship behaviors in general and in educational organizations in particular is quite limited (Bogler & Somech, 2004) and in Turkey no study investigating the relationship between these two variables within the context of education organizations has been encountered. . The current study is built on the insight that psychological and structural empowerment of teachers is a contextual/organizational variable of organizational citizenship behaviors and psychological and structural empowerment directed towards teachers enhance organizational citizenship behaviors to a great extent. Empowerment of teachers is basically a source of energy for organizational citizenship behaviors which is viewed as investment of more effort than that required by one's described job responsibilities (Spreitzer, 1995), and an effective administrative application domain for administrators (Bowen & Lawler, 1992). As such, the current study is believed to make important contributions to the literature and practice. Within this framework, the purpose of this study is to determine the relationships between both teachers' psychological and structural empowerment and their OCB. Within this general frame the following questions were addressed:

1. To what extent do the teachers exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors?
2. How do the teachers perceive the structural and psychological empowerment provided in their schools?
3. Do the teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors and the psychological and structural empowerment perceptions differ significantly by the variables of gender, school type, school location and seniority?
4. Is the perception of teachers about their psychological and structural empowerments provided at schools a significant predictor of their organizational citizenship behaviors?

Method

The population of this descriptive study consists of 7.965 teachers working in the province of Muğla in 2014-2015 academic year. As the number of the teachers in the population is known, $n=t^2.p.q/d^2$ formula was used in the specification of the sample. Although the sample size of the study was calculated as 368 for 95% confidence level, it was decided to seek responses from 450 teachers by taking possible lower return rates or imprecise completion of scales into consideration, 450 teachers were reached by applying disproportionate cluster sampling method. In the specification of the sampling, each school in the province of Muğla was considered to be a cluster and a total of 450 teachers were reached from the schools randomly selected through disproportional cluster sampling technique. Because of improper completion and unreturned questionnaires, the data analysis was conducted on the data obtained from 384 eligible questionnaires.

54.4% (n=209) of the participant teachers were female and 45.6% (n=175) were male. Moreover, 32.3% (n=124) of the teachers were employed at primary schools; 32.6% (n=125) of them at secondary schools; and 35.2% (n=135) at high schools. In addition, 37.5% (n=144) of the participant teachers working in the province, 50.8% (n=195) working in the counties and 11.7% (n=45) working in the districts or villages of Muğla were included in the study. Besides, in terms of the seniority of the teachers, 18.0% (n=69) of them have 9 years or less experience, 39.6% (n=152) between 10-19 years and 42.4% (n=163) have 20 years or more teaching experience. When the seniority of teachers working in their current schools was investigated, it was understood that 76.0% (n=292) of teachers had been

working at the same school for a period less than 9 years whereas 24.0% (n=92) of them had 10 years or more experience in their current schools.

Data Collection Instrument

In this study, the data were collected through the administration of "Conditions of Work Effectiveness Questionnaire", "Psychological Empowerment Scale" and "Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale" to the participants.

Conditions of Work Effectiveness Questionnaire is applied so as to test structural empowerment. The scale was developed by Laschinger, Finegan, Shamian, and Wilk (2001) and adapted into Turkish by Sürgevil, Tolay, and Topoyan (2013). This scale was applied on teachers and its validity and reliability analyses were re-tested by Odabaş (2014). The scale consists of four dimensions, namely knowledge and opportunity, solidarity climate, empowerment resulting from working conditions and flexibility in using time. These four factors explain the 68.75% of the total variance. According to the factor analysis, factor loads of the items in the four dimensions of the scale were found to vary from .48 to .88. The scale consists of 20 Likert-type items and all items in the scale are scored in the intervals of "1: I never have" to "5: I totally have". High scores obtained from the scale stand for the expression that employees are empowered structurally in a positive way by their organizations. Besides, Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient varies from .74 to .90 (Odabaş, 2014). The reliability of the scale was re-calculated for this study and according to that, Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient was found to be .85 for the dimension of knowledge and opportunity, .89 for solidarity climate, .71 for empowerment resulting from working conditions and lastly .70 for flexibility in using time.

Psychological Empowerment Scale was developed by Spreitzer (1995) and adapted into Turkish by Sürgevil et al. (2013). Like the other one, this scale was applied on teachers and its validity and reliability were re-tested by Odabaş (2014). The scale consists of two dimensions, which are individual oriented psychological empowerment and relation oriented psychological empowerment. These two factors explain the 76.15% of the total variance. According to the factor analyses, factor loads of the items in two dimensions of the scale varied from .58 to .90. The scale consists of 24 five-point Likert-type items and the items are scored in the intervals of "1: Strongly Disagree" to "5: Strongly Agree". Moreover, the scale enables to calculate the total scores. The increase in both the total and dimensional scores obtained from this scale refers to that organizational employees are empowered psychologically in a positive way by their organizations. In addition, Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient for individual oriented PE was calculated to be .93 while it was .82 for the dimension of relation oriented psychological empowerment (Odabaş, 2014). The reliability of the scale was re-calculated for this study. In this sense, Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient was found to be .84 for the dimension of individual oriented PE whereas it was .77 for relation oriented PE.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale was developed by DiPaola, Tarter, and Hoy (2005) adapted into Turkish by Taşdan and Yılmaz (2008). The scale has a structure of one-dimensional data collection instrument. The scale consists of 24 five-point Likert-type items and the items are scored in the intervals of "1: Strongly Disagree" to "5: Strongly Agree". The increase in the scores obtained from this scale stands for the fact that employees demonstrate more organizational citizenship behaviors. Besides, factor loads of the items in the scale show a variation from .31 to .82. The variance ratio explained by this scale itself is 45.66%. In addition, Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as .87 (Taşdan & Yılmaz, 2008). On the other hand, Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient, which was re-calculated for this study, was .83.

Data Analysis

In the analysis of the data, descriptive statistics, t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to determine the teachers' perception of psychological and structural empowerments and their organizational citizenship behaviors. In these analyses mean scores were used. For significant F values, Tukey test was used to determine the source of significant difference. In addition, hierarchical multiple regression analysis was applied in order to determine at what level teachers' psychological and structural empowerments predicted their organizational citizenship behaviors. Before the regression analysis, the hypotheses regarding the analysis were tested. In this

regard, extreme values analysis was applied. While determining the extreme values, z-scores ($z < 3$) and Mahalanobis distance values were calculated. Besides, the normality of the distribution was tested by using skewness and kurtosis coefficients and it was identified that these coefficients valued between -1 and +1 (For all the variables, the coefficients of skewness were between -.15 and -.86 whereas the coefficients of kurtosis ranged from -.03 to -.51). Hence, it was agreed that the distribution was normal. Another matter for the regression analysis is the multiple correlations between the predictor variables. In order to determine whether or not there were multiple correlations between variables, Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) analysis and unstandardized coefficients of regression (B) were utilized. When the value of VIF is found to be higher than 10 (Myers, 1990) or the value of B is calculated as higher than 2, it refers to the problem of multiple correlations (Çokluk, 2010). In this study, the value of VIF was calculated as 3.19 and the value of B was 1.09 at the highest rate. In this context, it can obviously be identified that there were no problems regarding multiple correlations.

Findings

The study revealed that the teachers had the perception of OCB above the medium level ($M=3.74$, $S=.59$). Teachers' OCB perceptions differed significantly in terms of the variables of gender [$t_{(382)}=4.07$, $p<.05$], school type [$F_{(2-383)}=8.59$; $p<.05$] and school location [$F_{(2-383)}=20.53$; $p<.05$] whereas there was no significant difference in teachers' OCB perceptions in terms of the variables of total seniority in teaching profession [$F_{(2-381)}=.01$; $p>.05$] and seniority at their current school [$t_{(382)}=.59$; $p>.05$]. Moreover, it was revealed that female teachers ($M=3.85$, $S=.58$) demonstrated more OCB than males ($M=3.61$, $S=.57$); and also teachers working in rural schools ($M=4.00$, $S=.50$) had more organizational citizenship behaviors when compared to teachers working urban schools in central province ($M=3.37$, $S=.52$) and in the counties ($M=3.74$, $S=.63$). Besides, in terms of school types, primary school teachers demonstrated more OCB ($M=3.95$, $S=.63$) than the secondary schools teachers ($M=3.77$, $S=.49$) and high school teachers ($M=3.51$, $S=.54$) whereas secondary school teachers had more OCB when compared to high school teachers.

Teachers' structural empowerment (SE) was found to be above the medium level ($M=3.56$, $S=.77$). Besides, teachers gave the highest scores to the items in the dimension of solidarity climate ($M=3.85$, $S=.78$) and this is followed respectively by the dimensions of knowledge and opportunity ($M=3.60$, $S=.81$), flexibility in using time ($M=3.40$, $S=1.08$) and empowerment resulting from working conditions ($M=3.13$, $S=1.01$). According to the findings obtained from the study, teachers' SE differed significantly in terms of school type and school location whereas there were no significant differences found in teachers' SE by gender, total seniority in teaching profession and teachers' seniority at their current school. On the other hand, there was a significant difference in teachers' SE scores by *school type* both in terms of the dimensions knowledge and opportunity [$F_{(2-381)}=6.59$; $p<.05$], solidarity climate [$F_{(2-381)}=12.60$; $p<.05$], empowerment resulting from working conditions [$F_{(2-381)}=5.38$; $p<.05$] and in their total scores [$F_{(2-381)}=4.60$; $p<.05$]; however the score attained by teachers did not differ significantly in the dimension of flexibility in using time [$F_{(2-381)}=1.66$; $p>.05$]. The difference in the total score of SE was found to be between primary school teachers ($M=3.76$, $S=.74$) and high school teachers ($M=3.39$, $S=.83$). Besides, the difference in the dimension of knowledge and opportunity was between primary school teachers ($M=3.79$, $S=.78$) and high school teachers ($M=3.43$, $S=.88$); the difference in the dimension of working conditions was determined to be between primary school teachers ($M=3.35$, $S=1.03$) and high school teachers ($M=2.95$, $S=1.01$), as well. In addition, the significant difference in the dimension of solidarity climate was found to be between high school teachers ($M=3.61$, $S=.89$) and both the primary school teachers ($M=4.09$, $S=.67$) and secondary school teachers ($M=3.86$, $S=.67$). Teachers' SE scores by school location differed significantly only in the dimension of solidarity climate [$F_{(2-381)}=3.13$; $p<.05$]. However, there were no significant differences in the total scores [$F_{(2-381)}=1.39$; $p>.05$] and in the dimensions of structural empowerment, namely knowledge and opportunity [$F_{(2-381)}=1.13$; $p>.05$], empowerment resulting from working conditions [$F_{(2-381)}=.48$; $p>.05$], and flexibility in using time [$F_{(2-381)}=.15$; $p>.05$]. Moreover, it can be stated that teachers working in the villages and districts ($M=4.11$, $S=.66$) perceived solidarity climate as more positive when compared to teachers working in the

province ($M=3.77$, $S=.77$) and its counties ($M=3.84$, $S=.80$) it was determined that there was no significant difference in teachers' SE by *gender*, in terms of both the total scores [$t_{(382)}=.96$; $p>.05$] and all its dimensions, which were knowledge and opportunity [$t_{(382)}=.91$; $p>.05$], solidarity climate [$t_{(382)}=1.71$; $p>.05$], empowerment resulting from working conditions [$t_{(382)}=.29$; $p>.05$], and flexibility in using time [$t_{(382)}=1.17$; $p>.05$]. Similarly, teachers' SE by *total seniority* did not differ significantly not only in terms of the dimensions, namely knowledge and opportunity [$F_{(2-381)}=.20$; $p>.05$], solidarity climate [$F_{(2-381)}=.83$; $p>.05$], empowerment resulting from working conditions [$F_{(2-381)}=.61$; $p>.05$], flexibility in using time [$F_{(2-381)}=1.52$; $p>.05$] but also in terms of total scores obtained from SE [$F_{(2-381)}=.23$; $p>.05$]. It was observed that there were no significant differences in teachers' SE by *seniority at the current school* in terms of both the total scores [$t_{(382)}=.28$; $p>.05$] and all its dimensions, which were knowledge and opportunity [$t_{(382)}=.48$; $p>.05$], solidarity climate [$t_{(382)}=1.02$; $p>.05$], empowerment resulting from working conditions [$t_{(382)}=1.27$; $p>.05$], and lastly flexibility in using time [$t_{(382)}=1.08$; $p>.05$].

Teachers' PE levels were found to be high ($M=4.18$, $S=.61$). It was determined that teachers gave higher scores to the dimension of individual empowerment ($M=4.49$, $S=.64$) when compared to relational empowerment ($M=3.89$, $S=.73$). According to the findings obtained from this study, teachers' PE perceptions differed significantly in terms of the variables of gender and school type whereas there were no significant differences found in teachers' PE in terms of school location, total seniority in teaching profession and teachers' seniority at their current school. In terms of *gender*, teachers' PE demonstrated a significant difference not only in the dimensions of individual empowerment [$t_{(382)}=2.96$; $p<.05$] and relational empowerment [$t_{(382)}=2.10$; $p<.05$] but also in the total scores [$t_{(382)}=2.80$; $p<.05$] obtained from the scale. The individual empowerment ($M=4.57$, $S=.64$), relational empowerment ($M=3.96$, $S=.69$) and the total PE ($M=4.27$, $S=.60$) scores of the female teachers were determined to be higher when compared to the scores regarding the individual empowerment ($M=4.38$, $S=.63$), relational empowerment ($M=3.80$, $S=.78$) and the total PE ($M=4.09$, $S=.63$) of the males. Furthermore, teachers' PE by *school type* differed significantly both in terms of the total scores obtained from the scale [$F_{(2-381)}=11.59$; $p<.05$] and its dimensions, namely individual empowerment [$F_{(2-381)}=4.28$; $p<.05$] and relational empowerment [$F_{(2-381)}=15.50$; $p<.05$]. The individual empowerment ($M=4.63$, $S=.61$), relational empowerment ($M=4.17$, $S=.70$) and the total PE ($AO=4.39$, $S=.60$) scores of primary school teachers' were identified to be higher than not only the individual empowerment ($M=4.43$, $S=.69$), relational empowerment ($AO=3.82$, $S=.69$) and the total PE ($AO=4.12$, $S=.63$) of secondary school teachers but also the individual empowerment ($M=4.42$, $S=.60$), relational empowerment ($M=3.69$, $S=.72$) and the total PE ($M=4.05$, $S=.57$) of high school teachers. Moreover, in terms of *school location* variable, it was determined that teachers' PE differed significantly both according to the dimensions which were individual empowerment [$F_{(2-381)}=.32$; $p>.05$] and relational empowerment [$F_{(2-381)}=1.54$; $p>.05$] and also according to the total scores [$F_{(2-381)}=.98$; $p>.05$]. In addition, it was observed that there were not significant differences in teachers' PE according to *seniority* in both the total scores [$F_{(2-381)}=.14$; $p>.05$] and its dimensions, namely individual empowerment [$F_{(2-381)}=.11$; $p>.05$] and relational empowerment [$F_{(2-381)}=.22$; $p>.05$]. Similarly, it was identified that, according to the variable of *seniority at the current school*, teachers' PE did not significantly differ not only in the dimensions, namely individual empowerment [$t_{(382)}=.99$; $p>.05$] and relational empowerment [$t_{(382)}=.41$; $p>.05$] but also in terms of total scores [$t_{(382)}=.27$; $p>.05$] obtained from the scale.

The last objective of this study was to determine whether or not PE and SE predict teachers' OCB. Within this scope, hierarchical regression analysis was conducted. In this analysis, the variables were included in the regression analysis in three groups. At the first model, the effect of SE and at the second model, the effects of PE on teachers' OCB were tested. On the other hand, all the variables in these two models were included in the analysis at the third model. The results of the regression analysis regarding the prediction of OCB are demonstrated in Table 1.

Table 1. Regression Analysis Results for the Prediction of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Model	Variable	B	Standard Error	β	t	p	Zero-order (r)	Partial (r)	VIF
1	Constant	26.78	1.97	-	13.57	.00	-	-	-
	Knowledge and Opportunity	.61	.10	.46	5.81	.00	.48	.30	2.83
	Solidarity Climate	.04	.11	.03	.37	.70	.37	.02	3.11
	Work Conditions	.21	.23	.07	.93	.34	.38	.05	3.16
	Using Time	-.38	.26	-.10	1.45	.14	.26	-.07	2.25
<i>R=.49, R²=.24, F₍₄₋₃₇₉₎= 26.51, p=.00</i>									
2	Constant	16.41	3.48	-	4.71	.00	-	-	-
	Individual Empowerment	1.09	.22	.28	4.84	.00	.41	.26	1.43
	Relational Empowerment	.63	.15	.23	1.01	.00	.39	.21	1.43
<i>R=.45, R²=.21, F₍₂₋₃₈₁₎= 43.47, p=.00</i>									
3	Constant	11.89	3.36	-	3.53	.00	-	-	-
	Knowledge and Opportunity	.42	.10	.32	3.94	.00	.48	.21	3.17
	Solidarity Climate	-.05	.11	-.03	.43	.66	.37	-.02	3.18
	Work Conditions	.34	.23	.12	1.53	.12	.38	.08	3.19
	Using Time	-.21	.26	-.05	.84	.39	.26	-.05	2.28
	Individual Empowerment	.87	.22	.22	3.99	.00	.41	.21	1.51
	Relational Empowerment	.28	.15	.10	1.77	.07	.39	.09	1.61
<i>R=.55, R²=.31, F₍₆₋₃₇₇₎=24.49, p=.00</i>									

As indicated in Table 1, Model 1 ($R=.49, R^2=.24, p<.01$) and Model 2 ($R=.45, R^2=.21, p<.01$) can be regarded as the important predictors of teachers' OCB. Model 1, by itself, explained the 24% of organizational citizenship behaviors whereas Model 2 explained 21% of them separately. Furthermore, Model 3, which was developed in order for psychological and structural empowerment to predict OCB, was rather significant ($R=.55, R^2=.31, p<.01$). However, first and second models together explained 31% of teachers' OCB. Including PE in the regression analysis provided a 7% contribution. According to the coefficient of standardized regression (β), comparative order of importance regarding the predictor variables on teachers' OCB was as follows; knowledge and opportunity, individual empowerment, empowerment resulting from work conditions, relational empowerment, flexibility in using time and solidarity climate. When the t- test results regarding the significance of coefficients for regression are investigated, it can be asserted that both knowledge and opportunity, a dimension of PE and individual oriented empowerment, a dimension of SE were significant predictors of teachers' OCB. However, the other dimensions of psychological and structural empowerment had no significant effect on teachers' OCB. Besides, when the coefficients of partial regression are examined, it can be remarked that there were positive and low level of correlations between teachers' OCB and both the dimension of knowledge and opportunity ($r=.21$) belonging to PE, and the dimension of individual oriented empowerment ($r=.26$) pertaining to structural empowerment.

Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

In this study, it was aimed to determine to what extent teachers' psychological and structural empowerments predicted their OCB. First of all, descriptive statistics regarding these variables were conducted. It was determined that teachers' OCB was above the medium level. This result coincides with the other results obtained from various studies in the literature (Altınkurt & Yılmaz, 2012; Baş & Şentürk, 2011; Yılmaz, 2010, 2012). Moreover, it was concluded that the OCB of teachers differed significantly in terms of gender, school type and school location variables whereas there was no significant difference in terms of teachers' total seniority and their seniority at the current school. These findings indicate that teachers display voluntary efforts to take more responsibilities than the ones expected from them within their formal job description and that they support activities directed towards the improvement of organizational performance. By considering these tendencies of teachers, school principals may try to enhance environmental conditions and thus facilitate the improvement and maintenance of organizational citizenship behaviors. Besides, primary school teachers exhibited more OCB when compared to secondary school and high school teachers; secondary school teachers demonstrated more OCB than high school teachers. In the related literature, there have been various results of studies investigating teachers' organizational behaviors in terms of different variables. Yılmaz et al. (2015) conducted a meta-analysis study whose purpose was to determine the effect of variables such as gender, seniority and branch on the OCB of teachers in Turkey. According to the results of this study, it was identified that demographical variables had affected teachers' OCB, albeit at a low level. In addition, it was stated in this current study that the female teachers demonstrated more OCB when compared to the males; senior teachers had more organizational citizenship than teachers with a less experience and also classroom teachers exhibited more OCB than branch teachers. Similarly, according to the meta-analysis study of Elma and Aytaç (2015), senior teachers' OCB were found to be rather high despite having a weak effect level. However, it was a remarkable result obtained from these studies that both of them were conducted by examining quite a few researches. Even though the number of studies whose subject matter is OCB, which have been conducted in Turkey has increased in the recent years, when the meta-analysis studies about similar subjects conducted in the international literature are taken into account, it can be argued that the number of studies regarding this subject is rather limited. In this regard, conducting studies focusing on descriptive statistics and analysis of difference might contribute to developing studies, especially meta-analysis studies, which can increase generalizability of the subject matter. Hence, within the scope of this study, in spite of not being the main objective, reporting these analyses regarding the variables has been regarded to be pretty important.

Another objective of the study was to determine the perceptions of teachers regarding structural and psychological empowerment. As a result of this study, it was identified that the general SE of teachers was at a medium level. This finding indicates that schools provide teachers with self-development opportunities and resources sufficient enough to reach a medium level of SE. This finding matches up with the results of some other studies (Odabaş, 2014). In Turkey, the current organization of the education system is overtly centralized and in this organization, school principals' duties are restricted to certain works and operations, which considerably hinder the structural empowerment of teachers. For instance, determination of educational programs and textbooks and even the methods and techniques to be used in class centrally restricts the autonomy of teachers. This negatively affects the empowerment intended to promote professionalism in teaching claimed to be very influential on school and class (Sweetland & Hoy, 2000). Teachers having a limited self-determination absolutely feel themselves as blocked. Therefore, there is not an organizational environment which enables teachers to feel themselves as powerful at a high level. Ingersoll (2007) has created a description for teachers as "they have a little power but a great deal of responsibilities" by focusing on the fact that there is an imbalance between empowerment and responsibility in the teaching profession. On the other hand, Laschinger, Finegan, and Shamian (2001) concluded in their study which was conducted on nurses that their perceptions regarding the general SE was also close to the medium level. Moreover, Knol and Van Linge (2009) stated in their study that employees

having a medium level of SE also had medium level of innovating behaviors. Though these studies were conducted within organizations outside education, they are of great importance considering the similarity of employee behaviors depending on work environment. Hence, it is required for the educational organizations to make structural arrangements which can support teachers' attempts for autonomy because employees who are structurally empowered have become more committed to their organizations and their job satisfaction as well as their job efficiency increase. Besides, the burnout levels of these individuals and their perceptions regarding the job stress, absenteeism, being blocked and powerlessness might decrease. This finding is supported by studies on nurses in the literature (Laschinger, Finegan, & Shamian, 2001; O'Brien, 2010; Vacharakiat, 2008). Furthermore Ayral et al. (2014) has drawn attention to another dimension through the research conducted within the context of PISA 2009 about investigating the relationship between students' achievement and teachers' autonomy. According to this study, it was indicated that there was a positive and medium level of significant relationship between PISA results and autonomy (determination of the courses, policies for evaluation, contents of the courses and selection of courses etc.).

On the other hand, teachers' SE did not demonstrate a significant difference by gender and seniority. However, there were significant differences in some of the dimensions of SE by school type and school location. This significant difference was found to be in terms of dimensions of knowledge and opportunity, solidarity climate and work conditions. For all these three dimensions, the arithmetic mean scores of primary school teachers were determined to be higher when compared to those of secondary school teachers and high school teachers. In their study about school culture, Oğuz and Yılmaz (2006) concluded that primary school teachers had demonstrated behaviors at a high level such as support, sense of mission and collaboration. In addition, it was identified that the bureaucratic culture was found to be at a lower level in primary schools. On the other hand, in terms of the variable of school location, the significant difference in teachers' SE was only in the dimension of solidarity climate. Teachers working in rural schools had a more positive perception of solidarity climate compared to other teachers. It is rather understandable that solidarity climate is high in such schools because there are few teachers and students in these schools.

Furthermore, according to the results obtained from the current study, teachers' PE was determined to be higher when compared to their SE. Besides, when the dimensions of PE were compared, it was indicated that teachers' agreement to the dimension of individual empowerment was higher than relational empowerment. According to the other studies in literature (Çekmecelioglu & Eren, 2007; Ilisu, 2012; Karadal & Kılıç, 2008) it was determined that the perceptions of participants regarding the PE was high, which can be regarded as similar to the result obtained from this study. It is quite interesting that individual oriented empowerment was higher. When the items taking place in the scale are investigated, this condition can be understood obviously. The items regarding the individual oriented empowerment (For instance; I decide how I will operate my work) are not directed to empower the employee, instead they are related to the perceptions of employees' feeling themselves individually powerful. In other words, even though according to the dimension of relation oriented empowerment, the employees have the perception that they are not supported by their organizations sufficiently (For instance; I considerably have the opportunity to conduct my job independently), they take a risk individually in a sense and they demonstrate extra role behaviors. The closeness between the scores teachers attained from SE and relation oriented empowerment promotes this interpretation. The problems stemming from organizational structure and functioning in structural empowerment can be overcome by enhancing the competencies of school principals within psychological empowerment. In this regard, selection and training of school principals are of great importance.

Additionally, it was designated that teachers' PE differed significantly by the variables of gender and school type while there were not any significant differences in their PE in terms of the variables of school location and seniority. It was asserted that when compared to the males, the female teachers had more positive opinions regarding the individual oriented PE. However, there are some studies in literature not supporting this result (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Odabaş, 2014). On the other hand, in relation to school type variable, it was stated that primary school teachers had a higher level of relation oriented PE when compared to secondary school and high school teachers. With regards to this current study, not only the OCB but also the structural and psychological empowerments of primary school teachers were determined to be higher than their other colleagues, which can be regarded as a remarkable result since in many of the studies about organizational behavior, similar results have been obtained. Classroom teachers normally become teachers just like all the other teachers through a similar educational formation and background. Thereby, the difference might be clarified by the fact that primary schools are smaller than other schools and therefore teachers working in these small schools have a closer relationship with their administrators, colleagues and students. However, more detailed research is needed to support in this interpretation. In short, empowerment of teachers, promotion and maintenance of their organizational citizenship behaviors offer great opportunities for school directors to utilize their competencies.

The last purpose of this study was to determine to what extent teachers' psychological and structural empowerments predict their organizational citizenship behaviors. In accordance with this purpose, first of all, structural and psychological empowerment was analyzed separately so as to determine how much they predicted teachers' organizational empowerment and then they were evaluated together. Within this framework, three models were created. At the first model, the effect of structural empowerment, at the second model, the effect of PE and at the last model, the effect of structural and PE together on teachers' OCB were aimed to be revealed. According to the results of the first model, it was asserted that there were medium or approximate to medium level and close relationships between the dimensions of SE and OCB. However, when the significance of the regression coefficients was investigated, it was identified that the dimension of knowledge and opportunity was a significant predictor of OCB. Besides, SE, by itself, was determined to explain one quarter of teachers' OCB. On the other hand, according to the results obtained from the second model, it was identified that there were medium level of relationships between teachers' OCB and both individual and relation oriented empowerments. Thereby, when the significance of the regression coefficients was examined, it was determined that both of these dimensions, namely individual oriented empowerment and relation oriented empowerment were significant predictors of teachers' OCB. Additionally, it was asserted that PE, on its own, explained one fifth of teachers' OCB. However Model 3, which was developed by including structural and psychological empowerments together in the analysis, explained one third of the teachers' OCB. According to the results of the regression analysis, it was identified that not only the dimension of knowledge and opportunity belonging to SE but also individual oriented empowerment, a dimension of PE, were important predictors of teachers' OCB. It was rather remarkable that the relation oriented empowerment, which was found to be significant in the second model, did not have a significant effect on teachers' OCB at the third model. The reason of this condition might be the fact that individual empowerment is a more subjective perception whereas relational empowerment is more directed to structural empowerment. Hence, including the SE in the analysis abolishes the effect of relation oriented PE on teachers' OCB. Besides, when the zero-order and partial correlations are scrutinized, this interpretation can obviously be supported. The medium level of correlations in zero-order comparisons disappear when the effect of other variables are taken under control. That is to say, making provisions in order for teachers to attain more information and opportunity in terms of not only SE but also, in terms of PE and efforts to make employees individually feel themselves as powerful have a rather important role in increasing their OCB. As stated in the introduction section, employees individually feeling competent and organizationally supported tend to increase the objectives to be accomplished. In the literature, there are some findings indicating that empowerment positively affects employees' organizational citizenship behaviors. (Bogler & Somech, 2004). In short, empowerment of teachers and promotion

and maintenance of their organizational citizenship behaviors offer great opportunities for school principals to utilize their competencies.

On the other hand, school administrators have rather an important responsibility to empower teachers. In spite of the fact that the educational organization in Turkey's excessively centralized education system delimits especially teachers' SE, school principals might deal with this problem by utilizing effectively the power resources they possess. Many studies in the literature have found out that the attitudes of employees towards their jobs are influenced by the behaviors demonstrated by the administrators. The efforts of school administrators to create collaborative environments to encourage and to promote teachers' effort for professional development may cause teacher to feel themselves powerful through the increased autonomous behaviors (Akan, 2014; Bayrak, Altinkurt, & Yılmaz, 2014; Çolak, 2016; Garvin, 2007). This result refers to the increase in extra role behaviors of teachers as the findings of this study has identified.

In light of the findings of the current study, these inferences and recommendations can be made: (1) The teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors are above the medium level, however, when the positive relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational efficiency is considered (Brief & Motowidlo, 1989), it becomes clear that efforts to promote more of these behaviors should be increased. (2) The teachers' perception of psychological empowerment is stronger and as psychological empowerment is directed to individuals' self-perception, it is an administrative mechanism that can be used in the current conditions. (3) The teachers' structural empowerment perception is at the medium level and enhancement of structural empowerment is associated with organizational structure and functioning. (4) By empowering teachers, it is possible to positively affect teachers to perform extra-role behaviors; therefore, school principals should utilize more of their administrative and leadership competencies to this end. (5) The study is the first to investigate the empowerment of teachers and citizenship behaviors in Turkey. Repetition of similar studies on different samplings is important in terms of the generalizability of the results. Moreover, as there is a limited number of studies addressing the issue of structural and psychological empowerment in Turkey, further studies are needed to investigate the relationship between the empowerment of teachers and other variables related with teacher qualifications.

References

- Akan, D. (2014). The relationship between democratic attitudes of primary and secondary school managers and school culture as measured by teachers' perceptions. *Journal of Educational Sciences Research, 4*(2), 35-48.
- Altinkurt, Y., & Yılmaz, K. (2012). Relationship between school administrators' organizational power sources and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 12*(3), 1-20.
- Appelbaum, S. H., Hebert, D., & Leroux, S. (1999). Empowerment: Power, culture and leadership-a strategy or fad for the millennium. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 11*(7), 233-254.
- Ayral, M., Özdemir, N., Türedi, A., Yılmaz-Fındık, L., Büyükgöze, H., Demirezen, S., Özarslan, H., & Tahirbegi, Y. (2014). The relationship between teacher autonomy and student achievement: PISA sample. *Journal of Educational Sciences Research, 4*(1), 207-218.
- Baş, G., & Şentürk, C. (2011). Elementary school teachers' perceptions of organisational justice, organizational citizenship behaviours and organisational trust. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 17*(1), 29-62.
- Bayrak, C., Altinkurt, Y., & Yılmaz, K. (2014). The relationship between school principals' power sources and school climate. *Anthropologist, 17*(1), 81-91.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1996). Facilitative school leadership and teacher empowerment: Teachers' perspectives. *Social Psychology of Education, 1*, 117-145.
- 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*, 277-289.
- Bowen, D. E., & Lawler, E. E. (1992). The empowerment of service workers: What, why, how, and when. *Sloan Management Review, 33*(3), 31-39.
- Brief, A., & Motowidlo, S. (1989). Prosocial organization behaviors. *Academy of Management Review, 11*, 710-725.
- Cho, T., & Faerman, S. R. (2010). An integrative approach to empowerment construct definition, measurement and validation. *Public Management Review, 12*(1), 33-51.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review, 13*(3), 471-482.
- Çekmecelioğlu, H., & Eren, E. (2007). Psikolojik güçlendirme, örgütsel bağlılık ve yaratıcı davranış arasındaki ilişkilerin değerlendirilmesi. *Yönetim, 18*(57), 13-25.
- Çokluk, Ö. (2010). Logistic regression: Concept and application. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 10*(3), 1357-1407.
- Çolak, İ. (2016). *Okul iklimi ile öğretmenlerin özerklik davranışları arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master's thesis). Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Muğla.
- Çöl, H. (2006). Güçlendirme algılarını etkileyen sosyal yapısal özelliklerin analizi. *ODTÜ Gelişme Dergisi, 33*, 63-86.
- DiPaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership, 11*, 424-447.
- DiPaola, M. F., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). School characteristics that foster organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of School Leadership, 15*, 308-326.
- DiPaola, M., Tarter, C. J., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). Measuring organizational citizenship in schools: The OCB scale. In W. K. Hoy & C. Miskel (Eds.), *Educational leadership and reform*. Greenwich, CN: Information Age Publications.
- Doğan, S., & Kılıç, S. (2008). Örgütsel bağlılığın sağlanmasında personel güçlendirmenin yeri ve önemi. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 29*, 37-61.

- Edwards, J. L., Green, K. E., & Lyons, C. A. (2002). Personal empowerment, efficacy, and environmental characteristics. *Journal of Educational Administration, 40*(1), 67-86.
- Elma, C., & Aytac, T. (2015). Effect of seniority on teachers' organizational citizenship behavior: A meta-analysis. *Mevlana International Journal of Education, 5*(1), 58-76.
- Erstad, M. (1997). Empowerment and organizational change. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 9*(7), 325-33.
- Fatima, A., Iqbal, M. Z., & Imran, R. (2013). Organizational commitment and counterproductive work behavior: role of employee empowerment. *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Management Science and Engineering Management, 185*, 665-679.
- Garvin, N. M. (2007). *Teacher autonomy: Distinguishing perceptions by school cultural characteristics* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.
- George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (1997). Organizational spontaneity in context. *Human Performance, 10*, 153-170.
- Gruber, J., & Trickett, E. J. (1987). Can we empower others? The paradox of empowerment in an alternative public high school. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 15*, 353-372.
- Hales, C., & Klidas, A. (1998). Empowerment in five-stars hotels: Choice, voice or rhetoric?. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 10*(3), 88-95.
- Hamid, S. F., Nordin, N., Adnan, A., & Sirun, N. (2013). A study on primary school teachers' organizational commitment and psychological empowerment in the district of Klang. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 90*, 782-787.
- Ilisu, İ. (2012). *Personel güçlendirmenin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ve işten ayrılma niyetine etkisi üzerine bir araştırma* (Unpublished master's thesis). Niğde University, Institute of Social Science, Niğde.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2007). Short on power long on responsibility. *Educational Leadership, 65*(1), 20-25.
- Jimmieson, N. L., Hannam, R. L., & Yeo, G. B. (2010). Teacher organizational citizenship behaviours and job efficacy: Implications for student quality of school life. *British Journal of Psychology, 101*(3), 453-479.
- Johnson, P. E., & Short, P. M. (1998). Principal's leader power, teacher empowerment, teacher compliance and conflict. *Educational Management and Administration, 26*(2), 147-159.
- Kanter, R. M. (1993). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Karadal H., & Kılıç, S. (2008). A study on the role of empowerment in providing organizational commitment. *The Proceedings of 4th International Strategic Management Conference 19-21 June* (pp. 893-904). Sarajevo: Bosnia-Herzegovina.
- Kartal, S. E. (2016). Determining school administrators' perceptions on institutional culture: A qualitative study. *Educational Process: International Journal, 5*(2), 152-166.
- Kirby, P. C., & Colbert, R. (1994). Principals who empower teachers. *Journal of School Leadership, 4*(1), 39-51.
- Knol J., & Van Linge R. (2009) Innovative behavior: The effect of structural and psychological empowerment on nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 65*(2), 359-370.
- Laschinger, H. K. S., Finegan, J. E., & Shamian, J. (2001). Promoting nurses' health: Effect of empowerment on job strain and work satisfaction. *Nursing Economics, 19*(2), 42-52.
- Laschinger, H. K. S., Finegan, J. E., Shamian, J., & Wilk, P. (2001). Impact of structural and psychological empowerment on job strain in nursing work settings: Expanding Kanter's model. *Journal of Nursing Administration, 31*, 260-72.
- Maeroff, G. I. (1988). *The empowerment of teachers: Overcoming the crisis of confidence*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Marks, H. M., & Louis, K. S. (1997). Does teacher empowerment affect the classroom? The implications of teacher empowerment for instructional practice and student academic performance. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 19*, 245-275.
- McDonald, A. M. (2014). *Simulation education of communication skills and the effects on nurse empowerment* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Columbia University, New York.
- Moorhead, G., & Griffin, R. (1995). *Organizational behavior, managing people and organizations*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Myers, R. (1990). *Classical and modern regression with applications*. Boston, MA: Duxbury.
- O'Brien, J. L. (2010). *Structural empowerment, psychological empowerment and burnout in registered staff nurses working in outpatient dialysis centers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The State University of New Jersey, New Jersey.
- Odabaş, İ. (2014). *Yapısal güçlendirme ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişkide psikolojik güçlendirmenin ara değişken rolü: Öğretmenler üzerinde bir çalışma* (Unpublished master's thesis). İstanbul Kültür University, Institute of Social Science, İstanbul.
- Oğuz, E., & Yılmaz, K. (2006). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin okul kültürüne ilişkin algıları (Yozgat örneği). *Eğitim ve Bilim, 31*(142), 89-98.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Journal of Human Performance, 10*(2), 85-92.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 48*, 775-802.
- Podsakoff, N. P., 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.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance, 10*, 133-151.
- Reitzug, U. C. (1994). A case study of empowering principal behavior. *American Educational Research Journal, 31*, 283-307.
- Rinehart, J. S., & Short, P. M. (1994). Job satisfaction and empowerment among teacher leaders, reading recovery teachers, and regular classroom teachers. *Education, 114*(4), 570-580.
- Rinehart, J. S., Short, P. M., & Johnson, P. E. (1997). Empowerment and conflict at school-based and nonschool-based sites in the United States. *Journal of International Studies in Educational Administration, 25*, 77-87.
- Rinehart, J. S., Short, P. M., Short, R. J., & Eckley, M. (1998). Teacher empowerment and principal leadership: Understanding the influence process. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 34*, 630-649.
- Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E. W. (1995). Psychological contracts and OCB: The effect of unfulfilled obligations on civic virtue behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*, 289-298.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1990). New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligation: A study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*, 389-400.
- Rousseau, D. M. (2004). Psychological contracts in the workplace: Understanding the ties that motivate. *Academy of Management Executive, 18*, 120-127.
- Rousseau, D. M., & Parks, J. M. (1993). The contracts of individuals in organizations. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 1- 43). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Short, P. M., & Rinehart, J. S. (1992). School participant empowerment scale: Assessment of level of empowerment within the school environment. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52(6), 951-960.
- Short, P. M. (1994). Exploring the links among teacher empowerment, leader power, and conflict. *Education*, 114(4), 581-584.
- Short, P. M., Greer, J. T., & Melvin, W. M. (1994). Creating empowered schools: Lessons in change. *Journal of Educational Research*, 32(4), 38-52.
- Smylie, M. A. (1994). Redesigning teachers' work: Connections to the classroom. *Review of Research in Education*, 20, 129-177.
- Somech, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2000). Understanding extrarole behavior in schools: The relationships between job satisfaction, 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(1), 38-66.
- Spreitzer, G. M., & Quinn, R. E. (2001). *A company of leaders: five disciplines for unleashing the power in your workplace*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442-1465.
- Sürgevil O., Tolay, E., & Topoyan, M. (2013). Yapısal güçlendirme ve psikolojik güçlendirme ölçeklerinin geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik analizleri. *Journal of Yaşar University*, 8(31), 5371-5391.
- Sweetland, S. R., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). School characteristics and educational outcomes: Toward an organizational model of student achievement in middle schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(5), 703-729.
- Taşdan, M., & Yılmaz, K. (2008). Organizational citizenship and organizational justice scales' adaptation to Turkish. *Education and Science*, 33(150), 87-96.
- Ünüvar, T. G. (2006). *An integrative model of job characteristics, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior* (Unpublished master's thesis). Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Vacharakiat, M. (2008). *The relationships of empowerment, job satisfaction and organization commitment between Filipino and American registered nurses working in the USA* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). George Mason University, Fairfax VA.
- Vanyperen, N. W., Van den Berg, A. E., & Willering, M. (1999). Towards a better understanding of the link between participation in decision-making and organizational citizenship behaviour: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 377-392.
- Wall, R., & Rinehart, J. S. (1998). School-based decision making and the empowerment of secondary school teachers. *Journal of School Leadership*, 8, 49-64.
- White, P. A. (1992). Teacher empowerment under "ideal" school-site autonomy. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 14(1), 69-82.
- Woolfolk Hoy, A., Hoy, W. K., & Kurtz, N. M. (2008). Teacher's academic optimism: The development and test of a new construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 821-832.
- Wu, V., & Short, P. M. (1996). The relationship of empowerment to teacher job commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 25, 85-89.
- Yılmaz, K. (2010). Kamu ortaöğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları ile ilgili görüşleri. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 29(1), 1-16.
- 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.

- Yılmaz, K., Altinkurt, Y., & Yıldırım, H. (2015). The effects of gender, seniority and subject matter variables on teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors in Turkey: A meta-analysis. *Education and Science, 40*(178), 285-304.
- Zeinabadi, H., & Salehi, K. (2011). Role of procedural justice, trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of teachers: Proposing a modified social exchange model. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29*, 1472-1481.