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ÖZET

Örgütlern yoğun rekabet ortamında kendi çıkarlarını koruyabilmeleri için çalışanlarıın bağlılığına ve yaratıcılık faaliyetlerine önem vermeleri gerekmektedir. Çalışanları dışlayarak örgüt çıkarlarının korunması şeklindeki bir yönetim analayışının başarılı olması beklentememelidir. Bu durumda liderlik ve çalışanlar arasındaki ilişkiler ön plana çıkmaktadır. Örgüt içinde özellikle çalışma arkadaşını desteğinin sağlanması çalışanların tecrübelerini, bilgilerini ve uzmanlıklarını paylaşarak birbirlerine görevlerinde yardım etmesi örgüt içinde bahsedilen bağlılığı ve yaratıcılığı artıracaktır. Araştırmamanın amacı kapsamında GSM firmalarında çalışan uzman seviyesindeki 400 personelden toplanan anketler analize tabi tutulmuştur. Değişkenler için Faktör Analizi, Path Analizi ve Mediation effect analizlerinde Smart PLS 3.2 programı kullanılmıştır. Analizler sonucunda amaç odaklı liderliğin; çalışma arkadaşını desteği, örgütsel bağlılık ve çalışanların yaratıcılığı üzerindeki olumlu etkisi, çalışma arkadaşını desteği, örgütsel bağlılık ve çalışanların yaratıcılığı üzerindeki olumlu etkisi son olarak ise çalışma arkadaşını desteğinin olumlu mediatör etkisi bu sektör için ortaya çıkarmıştır.
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ABSTRACT

Organizations need to give importance to employee loyalty and creativity activities in order to protect their interests in an intensely competitive environment. A management approach that protects organizational interests by excluding employees will be less successful. In this case, the relations between leadership and employees come to the fore: providing colleague support within the organization, sharing the experience and expertise of the employees, helping fellow colleagues in their duties and providing support will increase the commitment and creativity mentioned within the organization. Within the scope of the purpose of the research, surveys collected from 400 staff experts working in GSM companies were analyzed. The Smartpls 3.2 program was used for Factor Analysis and Path Analysis and Mediation effect analysis for variables. As a result of the analysis, the positive effect of task-oriented leadership on co-worker support, organizational commitment and employee creativity of employees, and the positive effect of co-worker support on organizational commitment and employee creativity, and finally, the positive mediator effect of co-worker support was revealed for this sector.
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INTRODUCTION

Today, the rapid rise of the service sector and increased competition have captured the attention of organizations, effectively giving them customer relations, which is the determining factor of success, profitability, and efficiency. In first world countries, and with the rapid rise of the service sector, the share of the production sector in the economy has decreased. This radical change has led to the fact that communication skills are more important than the physical strength demanded from employees in the past (Chu & Murrmann, 2006). Customer satisfaction is seen as an identifier of the quality of service offered due to the important role of one-to-one communication with the customer in the service provided (Leidner, 1999). In this, the communication and support element between the employees comes to the fore. At the same time, leadership is of course the most important key role of strong communication within the organization. Leadership is the sum of the knowledge and abilities to gather a group of people around specific goals and mobilize them to achieve these goals. Regardless of the sector, the most important element in this environment is the human element. The leader motivates his followers to achieve the set goals, but it is the attitudes and behaviors that make the leader a leader. Leaders that provide the creativity and organizational commitment of employees are needed for all organizations that are changing and developing, becoming increasingly complex, and might be creating an oppressive environment for their employees versus a more livable environment. It is important for employees to both be valued by the institution to which they are members and to be establishing bonds with their organizations; in addition, employees should not feel that they are alone in good or bad times and that they feel the support of the organization behind them (Karacaoglu & Arslan, 2013). Organizational support can be considered to have a great contribution for both employees and the organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). In this, the importance of solidarity between employees, i.e. support activities, becomes evident. Colleague support is the support of the employee in the hierarchy, perceived from individuals doing similar or similar work and is very important (Giray, 2013). This is particularly true, because in an organizational environment where both leader and colleagues support is felt, employees develop positive attitudes towards work and their productivity increases (Babin & Boles, 1996). For this reason, it is an expected result that the support of managers and colleagues will have effects on life satisfaction as well as the effect on work performance (Kale, 2015). In line with the general trend in the world, mobile phone/smart phone and start increasing use of the Internet has reduced the use
of landlines in Turkey. Between 2007 and 2018, landline subscriptions decreased from 25.8 percent to 14.1 percent, while mobile phone subscription increased from 87.8 percent to 99.8 percent. For these reasons, in companies in the GSM sector, the relationships between task oriented leadership, co-worker support, organizational commitment, and employee creativity variables are examined.

**Literature Review**

**Co-Worker Support**

Working individuals spend most of their time at work. Therefore, they are together with their managers and colleagues, as much if not more than with their families. The workplace where the individual spends most of his/her time is therefore becoming an environment where the need for belonging can be met. Employees do not expect only money or concrete success from their work. Since they spend more than half their daily lives at work, a supportive business environment is important for employees (Erdoğan, 1999). Individuals who have positive relationships and communication with their colleagues are expected to be more productive while working (Bergbom & Kinnuen, 2014). The support of colleagues involves sharing their experience and expertise when needed to help each other in their duties and encourage each other to support each other (Zhou & George, 2001). It is also defined as the belief that employees are willing to provide work-related help to help their colleagues perform their service-based tasks (Susskind et al., 2003): perceived co-workers include support, colleague counseling, and dating relationships (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006). Social relationships between colleagues are important in meeting instinctive needs to build and belong (Deci & Ryan, 2000). By helping each other and developing and supporting colleagues, they can make the job more enjoyable (Bishop & Scott, 1997). In times where the work becomes routine and annoying, the positive relationships with colleagues help to eliminate or diminish a drop in motivation and productivity (Çoruh, 2001). Social support from colleagues and managers reduces personal problems while increasing satisfaction at work (Humphrey et al., 2007). Indeed, it is stated that co-worker and executive support is an important precursor to job satisfaction (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008). Employees can have different social networking relationships with different partners within the organization, for example with the organization itself or their colleagues (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Employees obtain support from their colleagues in the fight against stress they might experience because they share similar experiences with their colleagues (McGuire, 2007). Therefore, colleagues and managers are people who can affect the performance of employees, and as such, the quality of the relationships that employees develop with colleagues and managers can significantly affect burnout levels (Charoensukmongkol et al., 2016).

**Employee Creativity**

One of the ways organizations can adapt to rapidly changing environmental conditions is to make creativity an important part of organizational life by effectively using their human capital. It has also become very important for organizations to provide the necessary conditions for the realization of change through innovative practices, business processes, products and services. Multiple conditions in which organizations adapt to change are emphasized: organizations should be flexible, adaptable, and can tolerate uncertainty in short, encourage creative employees (Kaufman & Sternberg, 2010). Creativity in organizations depends on the successful implementation of new programs, new products and services, and encourages employees or teams who have a good idea and develop this idea in a way that differs from its first state (Amabile et al., 1996). Therefore, creativity is a concept that is closely related
to the ideas of employees. Indeed, it has been suggested that an original idea with no potential value may be unusual but may not be creative (Zhou & George, 2003). The person with creative thinking is the person who tries to achieve the same goal in different ways. The creative individual has a structure that can easily work as a team with other people and is willing to experience different cultures. In order for organizations to develop creativity and innovation in the workplace, the key catalyst rests in their ability to grow trained and motivated leaders. Leaders are the ones who can place creativity in the organization. Leaders reveal the creative abilities that exist in the organization and create the vision necessary for this issue (Halbesleben et al., 2003). To develop the creativity of organizations, encourage everyone in the organization to produce new ideas and say them without hesitation, to evaluate and try the thoughts that arise so that creativity does not decrease over time, and empower employees and their own within certain limits, they must allow them to make their decisions. In addition, improving the quality of communication towards employees, avoiding giving messages that will cause anxiety and other emotional responses to employees, clearing the business environment from dangers for employees, believing that employees will be successful and trusting them will altogether increase the chance of success. Therefore, opportunities should be provided for employees to realize themselves in the field of individual freedom by providing suitable conditions, regardless of their position within the organization (Mumford et al., 2012). Within this scope, the following hypotheses is examined and developed:

\[ H1. \text{CS has a positive impact on EC} \]

### Organizational Commitment

Organizations that try to continue their activities in a rapidly changing technological environment can achieve this change with the human factor, which is the most important of their organizational factors. Keeping employees in the organization has become a priority since they are the most distinctive feature of organizations in competitive conditions. Moorhead and Griffin (2008) think that their commitment to the organization increases more if the employees’ internal values overlap with the organization. According to Mowday et al. (2013), the commitment of the organization is the desire to be a permanent employee of the organization, with the efforts made to ensure that the employees in the organization constantly go further in order to achieve their goals since the first day of the organization. Organizational commitment includes the individual’s attitude and behavior towards the institution he/she works for: the strength and loyalty of the bond he/she feels. Organizational commitment of employees is required for effective use of staffing, which is defined as the process of giving assistance, sharing, training, teamwork, improving the institutional capabilities and internal skills of employees, encouraging them to take independent decisions, and giving them a wider authority to use them. Because it has been seen that there are employees who prefer to leave a workplace with high wages and prefer to work in another workplace with less wages, in such a situation, factors that bind the employees to the organization emerge. These factors can make a difference in the reasons for preferences among the employees. Loyalty is defined as an obligation shown and must be fulfilled against a person, a thought, or an institution (Saldañal, 2009). Organizational commitment means that the organization’s aims and objectives, rules and norms, and volunteers for the employees help them to survive. Today, organizational commitment plays a key role in rapidly evolving environmental conditions. The employees’ commitment to their colleagues or managers, as well as working with the organization in the same institution, is that they want to stay in the organization and develop themselves to ensure their continuity in the organization and improve their performance. Within the scope of this scope, the hypotheses examined and developed is as follows:

\[ H2. \text{CS has a positive impact on OC} \]
Task-Oriented Leadership

Leadership behavior is the attitude of the leader when he/she directs the group. Since the leader is the most influential person in helping the organization to reach its goals and motivating the people in the organization towards this goal, his/her behavior is also very important (Özdevecioğlu & Kanıgür, 2009). The behavior of leaders has many individual and organizational effects, such as the level of organizational commitment of employees. Cummings and Schwab (1973) are of the opinion that the leader’s characteristics and the attitudes and behaviors they exhibit affect the organizational performance. Madjar et al (2002) argued that the supportive behavior of the leader positively influences the creativity of the employees in the organization. Since the 1950’s, extensive research has been conducted on leadership behavior. As a result, three types of leadership behavior emerged: task oriented, human oriented, and participatory (Gordon & Yukl, 2004). Zorn (1981) argues that effective leaders should have features such as compromise, tolerance, representation and persuasion, mobilization for the structure, ensuring participation, caring for viewers, influencing their superiors, and increasing productivity and production. Leaders who act towards these missions are more focused on jobs. Their only goal is to finish the work on time and achieving success. In other words, leaders in the task make results-oriented decisions, create ideas in the face of problems, propose new ideas, and deploy tasks among their subordinates. According to Reitz (1971), the leaders of the mission are in the role of decision-making in the organization. In other words, leaders for the task expect complete compliance within the planned schedule, determining who will work on a specific mission and when the task will be completed. According to Lantieri and Goleman (2014), leaders who are enforceable, rigid, distant from members of the organization and try to do everything on their own are ineffective, while the leadership of people who are more successful in human relations, democratic, and reassuring are more effective. Because leaders who behave like this motivate the group members to work by keeping their morale high, they also strengthen organizational commitment in employees and provide more selfless work. This can result in the fact that employees in such an environment can perform the goals set for the organization more willingly and this can increase the success of the organization. In other words, it can be said that a leader is the person who lays the foundation of the success or failure of the organization he or she is head of (İşliel, 2013). Within the scope of this scope, the hypotheses examined and developed is as follows:

**H3. CS has a positive impact on TOL**

**H4. TOL has a positive impact on EC**

**H5. TOL has a positive impact on OC**

**H6. The relationship between Task Oriented Leadership and Employee Creativity has a Co-Worker Support regulatory effect. In fact, in cases where colleagues have support, the strength of the positive relationship between Task Oriented Leadership and Employee Creativity will increase.**

**H7. The relationship between Task Oriented Leadership and Organizational Commitment has a Co-Worker Support regulatory effect. The fact is that in cases where colleagues have support, the strength of the positive relationship between Task Oriented Leadership and Organizational Commitment will increase.**

**Methodology**

Within the scope of the research, the SmartPLS 3.2 program was used for factor, PLS-SEM Path and Mediation effect analysis of the questionnaires were collected from 400 employees. First of all, the scale prepared was subjected to a pre-test, and the questions that were misunderstood or not understood
were identified, and the actual measurements were provided to clarify the questions. A scale prepared about variables was presented to 400 employees, and an ideal time was given to prevent Common Method Variance from emerging, and at the same time, anonymity rules were reminded for the scale practitioner. A scale consisting of 10 indicators for TOL (Hua, 2020) variables, 9 for CS (Limpanitgul et al., 2013), 8 for OC (Farrukh et al., 2017) and 4 for EC (Akgunduz et al., 2018) was presented to the participants. However, when the data obtained were subjected to Factor analysis by entering the SmartPLS program, 1 indicator from TOL variable, 1 from CS variable and 1 from EC variable were excluded from the analysis because they did not show the appropriate factor load. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient as a whole was found to be 0.912 for the 24-expression scale used after the implementation of the healthy questionnaire. Since the Partial Least Square Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) has the advantage of sample size, that is, it can result in small samples, a sample of 400 units is a suitable sample size. In the application part, SmartPLS 3.2 program was used for both factor analysis and Path analysis, and PLS-SEM model was tested. Wold (1975) laid the foundations for the PLS-SEM. With this model, the technique is a second-generation multivariate technique and also has the possibility to apply in almost any field where Covariance Based SEM is applied. PLS-SEM has no assumptions like other multivariate analysis. Small sample sizes can also be processed. At the same time, there has been an increase in books, articles, etc. related to PLS-SEM in recent years. The reason for using PLS-SEM in this study is that the prediction of the dependent variable is focused. The data size is suitable for both CB-SEM, PLS-SEM and many other multivariate analyses. At the same time, there are both formative and reflective structures in the model. This has been an important factor in selecting PLS-SEM as a model.

**Research Framework**

The data collected for the research was subjected to an analysis process to determine the relationships between dependent and arguments, and the rectangular variable description values of arguments. The outline of the model to be tested is given in Figure 1 below. There are seven hypotheses to be tested according to this Figure 1. Since the results of the analysis will be reflected as given by SmartPLS, the distribution of the hypotheses is as follows:

![Figure 1. Research Model](image-url)
Analysis

All stages of the study were made and interpreted in the SmartPLS program. Analysis reviews and narrations were presented with the results. The inner model in Fig 2 was tested using PLS-SEM. After the data was subjected to factor analysis, the Confirmatory Tetrat Analysis was applied and the Confidence Interval (CI) low and CI up values were compared (−, +) structures for each of the latent variables and the model was proved to be a reflective model. Analyses and interpretations are given on reflective model structure.

Figure 2. Inner Model for PLS-SEM Path Analysis

Figure 2 shows four variables. Arrows between variables provide information about the direction of the relationship. In this case, the model was primarily used to test the first five hypotheses. The outer shape of the model and the initial analysis results were given in Figure 3 so that the indicators and latent variables and latent variables would not confuse each other when the Outer model was presented.

Figure 3. Outer Model for PLS-SEM Path Analysis
In Figure 3, there are indicators of all latent variables along with $R^2$ values between factor loads, path coefficients and hidden variables. Tol2 in the TOL variable, CS6 in cs variable and EC 4 factor in the variable were removed from the analysis because it did not show the load. The values written on the arrows between latent variables and indicators show factor loads. The values in the arrows between the four latent variables give the path coefficients. Values written in factor circles are $R^2$ values. $R^2$ values show how much of exogenous latent variables explain the change in Endogenous latent variables. In order to rely on factor analysis results and determine the use of appropriate factors, it is preferable to have at least 70% of factor loads, while a descriptive analysis is done over 40% acceptable (Hulland, 1999). The SmartPLS program presents results in reference ranges defined by its creators with green type. Appropriate factor loads were obtained for the factors and presented in Figure 3 and Appendix 1. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient is one of the most commonly used metrics to determine the intrinsic consistency of the scale. Measurements with a coefficient of 0.50 or higher are considered sufficient (Nunnally, 1978; Hair et al., 2019). It is an $R^2$ value from the results obtained from the analysis, which indicates how much of the change in one hidden variable is explained by the other hidden variable. $R^2$ is expected to be greater than 0.26 (Cohen, 2013). It can be seen in Table 1 that all values are greater than 0.26. The Rho_A coefficient is a coefficient that shows data consistency, and the results obtained are whether factor elements are reliable and are a very important safety measure for PLS (Ringle et al., 2018; Dijkstra & Henseler, 2015). The fact that the resulting coefficients are greater than 0.70 is indicative of the data being suitable for reliability and compliance. Table 1. Rho_A values are presented and all values can be seen to be greater than 0.70. The model is a reliable model and compatible, as in the interpretation of the Cronbach Alpha coefficient.

**Table 1. Model Factor analysis results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Rho_A</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>0.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Variance Extracted (AVE) convergent gives validity value. Composite Reliability (CR) values for the model must be greater than AVE values and all AVE values greater than 0.50. In this way, a model convergent is suitable for validity. When Table 1 was examined, it was seen that the most 0.50 reference required for AVE and the requirement that all AVE values are less than CR values were provided. AVE values were used to find Discriminant Validity (DV) values. The square roots of these values were given the DV values calculated according to the criteria for Fornell and Larcker (1981). DV values were interpreted in Path analysis results. In Appendix 1, t test results were also given to determine whether all the indicators were suitable to explain the latent variable they were related to, i.e. whether the coefficients are significant. All t test $P$ value values indicated that the test is less than 0.05, which is the level of significance, and these expressions were statistically significant to the model. The presence of the multiple connection problem in the model caused misleading results. Therefore, multi-link analysis between indicators was required. VIF values have been developed to examine this multi-link problem. There are sources in the literature saying that it is suitable for VIF values below 5 or 10, but Diamantopoulos and Siguaw (2008) have stated that there is no multiple linearity problem when VIF values are not above 3. For SmartPLS, this value is also limited to 3. For this reason, VIF values were compared to 3. In Appendix 1, all VIF values are below 3. There is no multiple connection problem.
between indicators. Variables and indicators show how convenient the Factorization made with Table 1 values presented and the structure can be used for Path analysis. The coefficients that indicate the degree of separation of factors in the model are called Discriminant validity coefficients or measurements. These values include Discriminant Validity value and Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) according to Fornell and Larcker (1981) criteria. According to the criteria of Fornell and Larcker (1981), if a latent variable is compared with itself, the discriminant validity value obtained must be greater than all values in the same column and in the same row of the table (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Table 2: Latent Variables Covariances, Discriminant Validity and F Square Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariances</th>
<th>Discriminant Validity (Fornell-Larcker Criterion)</th>
<th>Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT)</th>
<th>F Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>CS EC OC TOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.746</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.766</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.766 .771 .820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 2, covariances of Latent variables, Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratios are given along with Discriminant Validity values according to Fornell and Larcker (1981) Criteria. These rates are one of the recommended values for the Discriminant Validity (Henseler et al., 2009). If the HTMT ratio of 0.85 (Clark & Watson 1995; Kline, 2011) or 0.90 (Gold et al., 2001) is greater then Discriminant Validity is not achieved. Table 2 showed the HTMT values obtained for the model. All values in the table were less than 0.90, which can be taken as reference limit. According to the Fornell and Larcker (1981) criterion, all values shown in bold are the largest values of the row and column in which they are located. Therefore, Discriminant validity was also provided in this way. In order to see whether the effect of a particular exogenous variable on an endogenous variable was important, the change in the R square values should be investigated, this change is called the effect size, and these effect size values can be measured with F square (Vinzi et al., 2010). The values of F square coefficient interpretations 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35, respectively, have small, medium or large effects. According to Table 1, F square values for CS-EC, CS-OC, TOL-EC comparisons are larger on the endogenous variable of exogenous variables; it has a medium effect on TOL-OC and a small effect on TOL-EC. Fit Summary values are not too much for PLS-SEM. Standardised Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) and NFI values can be interpreted. For the SRMR value, values below 0.08 are defined as good fit values (Hu & Bentler, 1999), whereas the SRMR value is 0 indicates perfect fit (Hooper et al., 2008). The SRMR values for the model were calculated as 0.055. This value is below 0.08. The NFI value must be above 0.90, but for the model, this coefficient is 0.876. The NFI value did not provide an appropriate result for compliance. SmartPLS does not value GoF, but this value can be calculated manually. The Value of GoF is indicative of the value of the favorability of harmony and is achieved by the geometric average of The AVE averages with R square grooves. The GoF value was 0.60 when the transactions were made. The fact that the value is greater than 0.36 is a good sign of harmony (Tenenhaus et al., 2005). In determining these values, the hypotheses established through the model can be tested.
Table 3. Path coefficients and test results for hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hip.</th>
<th>Paths</th>
<th>Path Coefficients</th>
<th>T Statistics</th>
<th>P Values</th>
<th>Unsupported/Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>CS à EC</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>14.240</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>CS à OC</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>13.781</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>TOL à CS</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>13.104</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>TOL à EC</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>5.205</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>TOL à OC</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>7.749</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Path gives the results of the model. In all hypotheses, the fact that p value values for Path Coefficient are less than 0.05, the level of meaningfulness of the test, resulted in the support of all relationships, and the T statistics values for Path Coefficient values belonged to a 95% trust level table value is greater than 1.96. This resulted in the fact that the model made sense. The hypotheses established are related to the structure and are descriptive. The positiveness of all Path values suggests that there is a positive correlation between variables, i.e. the effects are positive. The final stage will be on the mediator effects. The presence of CS’ mediator effect between both TOL and OC and TOL and EC has been uncovered. The results and comments obtained are presented below.

Table 4. Mediator Effect Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hip.</th>
<th>Paths</th>
<th>Path Coef. (a)</th>
<th>Path Coef. (b)</th>
<th>T.Ind. Eff (a)*(b)</th>
<th>Total Eff (a*b+c)</th>
<th>T Stat.</th>
<th>P Values</th>
<th>VAF</th>
<th>Unsupported/Supported</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>TOL à CS à EC</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>9.492</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>TOL à CS à OC</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>9.835</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the last part of the study, tests of two hypotheses were performed for the mediator effect. In both tests, p value values are less than 0.05 and t statistic values are higher than 1.96. This indicates that both H6 and H7 hypotheses have been accepted. In other words, cs has a mediator effect on the model. The VAF value has been used to determine the size of this mediator effect. The VAF value shows the ratio of indirect effect to total effect and was proposed by Nitzl et al (2016). The VAF value is found with $a^*b/(a^*b+c)$. (a) Path value between the first variable and the second variable (b) Path value between the second variable and the third variable (c) Path value between the first variable and the third variable. Indirect for the $a^*b$ model and total ($a^*b+c$) also have a total effect. If VAF values are below 20%, zero mediator effect is mentioned, while VAF value between 20% and 80% is partial and more than 80% means full mediator effect (Hair et al., 2019). When Table 4 is analyzed, a partial mediator effect of CS was revealed for H6 and H7 hypotheses.

Discussion

When the leadership literature is analyzed, it is among the findings that behavioral leadership theory has an important place in terms of watching the leaders and seeing their reflections on the institution. However, studies examining the relationship between leadership behaviors towards the task and human beings are inadequate. Because cultural differences, differences in working conditions, differences in the attitudes and behaviors of employees, and studies due to sectoral factors can not be the desired levels, only generalizations can be made. We also believe that through the work we have done,
it is possible to obtain different results if similar studies are carried out in different sectors and different cultures. In analyzing the data obtained as a result of the study, both the task-oriented leadership style and cooperation between employees have a positive impact. This shows that employees are individuals who are productive, qualified, have the desire to create change and be part of change, nurture positive thoughts about the institution they work and the jobs they do, and are responsible and loyal to their institutions make their institutions meaningful. This assumption can be explained by the generalizations as mentioned earlier. Both executive support and co-worker support can have an impact on the employee’s behavior by providing social support to people (Martínez Corts et al., 2011). Co-worker support is particularly important for the well-being of those working in the service sector (Sloan, 2012). Beehr et al. (2000) noted that communication between employees about non-work and non-business issues can help eliminate negative emotions at work. Employees receiving colleague support are more likely to develop a high sense of personal success (Charoensukmongkol et al., 2016). Robbins and Coulter (2012) attributed the concept of organizational commitment to the degrees of employees’ desire to establish identification with their own organizations. If the positive attitudes towards the existing business in the organization are supported by organizational commitment, the satisfaction for the job-making and the quality of the job can be seen as the improvement (Nouri & Parker, 2013). Looking at the results of the research, it was revealed that organizational commitment can be achieved if employees are positively affected by both their leaders and colleagues’ relationships. Kletke et al (2001) stated that employees play a critical role in creating an institutionalized creative organizational culture and this aim can be achieved by improving the creativity capabilities of the employees. In his research on British companies’ senior executives, Williamson (2001) found that the way managers understand the concept of creativity is insufficient and this misunderstanding prevents the creativity of employees and organization rather than increasing it. According to Williamson (2001), managers ignore creativity as an individual-based characteristic and a special talent, ignoring creativity as a process that improves business performance and produces new ways of doing business. What needs to be done is to adopt the mission-oriented leadership style and act with employees and ensure cooperation between employees. In this way, elements that positively affect creativity, such as teamwork, brainstorming, and discussion of thoughts will be provided.

**Conclusion**

An individuals’ work life and social life are intertwined with each other. As a social entity, human beings are constantly interacting with other people. Managers and colleagues are the people most in contact in the working environment where the individual spends a large part of his/her time. Their relationship with these people and the level of support they feel from these people are also reflected in their non-work lives. Because both lives directly or indirectly affect each other, individuals’ performance, efficiency, productivity, and happiness are constantly affected by this cycle. In a rapidly changing world, the development of technology, communication, transportation, and the advantage for businesses that closely follow innovations are disadvantages for those who can’t keep up with the age. The relentless commercial aspect of the competition can quickly end up in weak businesses. Businesses must adapt to many elements in order to survive, and quickly eliminate their shortcomings. The best way for organizations to express themselves to their target audience is through the strong relationship between the leader-employee and employees provided within the organization. The stronger the link between the leader and the employees and the other between the employees, the more positively it reflects on the output of the organization. Factors that may adversely affect the love and loyalty of employees to
their companies pose a danger to corporations because employees who have negative feelings towards their organization will tend to quit. And, the thought of leaving the staff may cause a decrease in efficiency because their attachment to the organization has now disappeared. In the event that an employee leaves his/her job, the institution will face both the damage to be caused by the person leaving the business and the environment, and the education cost of the person who will replace him/her. The time that passes until the efficiency of the person leaving the job is reached is a loss to the enterprise. In order to prevent the intention to quit, emotional commitment of employees to their institutions should be ensured and measures to increase their continuity should be taken. This also shows the importance of the working conditions provided within the organization. Employees with high organizational commitment have positive feelings towards their businesses. Employees with high organizational commitment who feel the business as their own or a sense of belonging to the company always want their institutions to be better. Looking at the results of the research, the importance of both leadership style and support among employees becomes evident because both the task-oriented leadership style and the support of the employees to each other positively affect creativity and organizational commitment. In terms of working constraints, it is beneficial to apply the study to wider audiences, since it is done in a certain sector and a certain sample population. In future studies, we argue that this study should be considered as a basic study in order to focus on the attitudes and behaviors of employees with different variables, to conduct studies on new leadership styles, and to conduct research to bring new concepts to the literature.
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Appendix 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variable</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>T Statis.</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Worker Support (CS)</td>
<td>CS1. My colleagues help me do my job.</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS2. My colleagues are always ready to listen to my work issues.</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS3. My colleagues appreciate me when I do a good job.</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS4. My colleagues back me up when I have a problem with management.</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS5. My colleagues make my life easier.</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS7. My colleagues listen to me when I need to speak.</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS8. My colleagues are the people I can trust when things get stuck.</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS9. My colleagues are close and understanding when I have a problem.</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Creativity (EC)</td>
<td>EC1. I develop appropriate programs and plans for the implementation of new ideas.</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC2. I often have new approaches that have not been used before when it comes to problems.</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC3. I go forward with new ways to improve the quality of my work and work.</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Commitment (OC)</td>
<td>OC1. I’m so happy to finish the rest of my career in this business.</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC2. I feel like I have my own problems with the problems of the institution I work for.</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC3. I feel like part of the family in the institution where I work.</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC4. The institution I work for has a great personal understanding for me.</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC5. I feel a strong sense of belonging to the institution I work for.</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented Leadership (TOL)</td>
<td>TOL1. My manager set performance criteria (standards) for employees.</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOL3. My manager clearly explains what each employee's roles and responsibilities within the group are.</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOL4. My manager tells the employees what to do.</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOL5. My manager develops a transaction plan for employees (a plan for how to do things).</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOL6. My manager prepares a plan for employees on how to do things.</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOL7. My manager explains to employees what his role within the group is.</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOL8. My manager advises employees on how to solve problems.</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOL9. My manager makes clear what is expected of employees (criteria for what to expect).</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOL10. My manager tells the employees what to do.</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>