

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Organizational Commitment in Turkish Primary Schools

¹Kursad Yilmaz and ²Omay Cokluk-Bokeoglu

¹Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, Kütahya, Dumlupınar University, Turkey

²Department of Educational Measurement and Evaluation, Faculty of Educational Sciences,
Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey

Abstract: The present study examines the structure of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and its relation to organizational commitment in Turkish primary schools. The data were gathered through a questionnaire returned by a sample of 225 teachers in Turkish primary schools in Ankara. In the survey model study, answers to the given questions were searched. The data were gathered by using “Organizational Citizenship Scale” and “Organizational Commitment Scale”. It was determined that the teachers had positive perceptions about organizational citizenship and organizational commitment. There was a moderate positive relationship between the teachers’ perceptions about organizational citizenship and organizational commitment.

Key words: Organizational citizenship • organizational commitment • primary schools • teachers • Turkey

INTRODUCTION

Employees’ voluntary behavior is quite important in education organizations as it is in all organizations for education organizations are the organizations where extra role behavior are performed as well as the official works. In this context, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior of teachers are very important in education organizations because studies such as organizational commitment and organizational citizenship have an important role in terms of analyzing the relationship the employees have with each other and with the organization.

Smith, Organ and Near [1] introduced the notion of organizational citizenship behavior and defined it as discretionary behavior that goes beyond one’s official role and is intended to help other people in the organization or to show conscientiousness and support toward the organization. Organ [2] proposed the following definition for the Organizational Citizenship Behavior construct: “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization”.

Generally, organizational citizenship behavior is the behavior the employees independently and willingly

perform. In this context, there is a strong relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment. Many related researches state that organizational commitment is premise to organizational citizenship [4-10]. According to this, employees with high level of organizational commitment will have high levels of organizational citizenship behavior tendencies since recent researches [11-15] prove that organizational citizenship behavior are affected by organizational commitment perception.

Although the studies of organizational commitment [16, 17] started long ago, recent studies [18, 19] have played important roles as well. The reason for this is that the analyses related to organizational commitment have functioned effectively in terms of understanding organizational behavior and organizational life.

Organizational commitment is defined as the relative power of one’s participation in a certain organization and his identification with it [16]. In literature, it is seen that organizational commitment consists of at least three elements [20-24]:

- Strong belief and acceptance for the objectives and values of the organization.
- Will to make considerable efforts for the organization.
- Strong will to remain a member of the organization.

According to O'Reilly and Chatman [11], organizational commitment is a concept defining one's level of integration with the organization and it has three dimensions. These are compliance, identification and internalization. *Compliance* means that the commitment is formed not for values, but for winning certain rewards. *Identification* means that the commitment is formed to establish a satisfactory relationship with the others or continue the relationship while *internalization* means commitment is completely based on the accordance between individual and organizational values.

One of the classifications related to organizational commitment was realized by Allen and Meyer [25]. Allen and Meyer [25] point out that organizational commitment has three elements as affective, continuance and normative. Affective and continuance commitment elements were investigated in this study. Allen and Meyer [25] state that affective, continuance and normative commitments are not types of organizational commitment, but elements. Besides, according to Allen and Meyer [25], the employees could reflect their relationship with the organization in different times and levels.

Affective Commitment is the commitment in which the employees feel the values, objectives and aims of their organization as much as they assimilate. In this case, the employee strongly assimilates the values of the organization and wishes to remain as a part of the organization. Affective commitment is considered as the best form in employees' commitment for their organization. Those who work so have positive attitudes in their jobs and are ready to make extra effort when needed [25-28].

Continuance Commitment is the commitment developed by employees' investments into their organizations. In continuance commitment, employees think they spend too much time and effort for their organizations and so it is a must for them to remain as employees in their organizations. One who has continuance commitment towards his organization believes he is going to have fewer options if he leaves the organization. Some of those stay in the organization since they could not find any other jobs. On the other hand, instead of loving the job, some have compelling causes such as health, family issues or having a short time to retirement [25-28]. Continuance commitment is not a negative situation though it is considered so. Continuance commitment is the situation in which the employees stay in the organization while they take into consideration the cost they will pay if they leave the organization. In organizational life, employees who have

strong affective commitment stay in the organizations for they really want to whereas employees with strong continuance commitment stay in the organization because the conditions force them to do so. In this context, affective commitment is affected by variables such as autonomy in work, certainty and significance of work, image of work, qualities the work requires, attitude, behavior and approaches of the administrator and participation in the management while continuance commitment is affected by variables such as age, working times, career satisfaction, will to quit job, education, marital status and other job opportunities [29]. Surely, organizations prefer affective commitment since affective commitment implies that the employees are affective ly committed to the organization, they identify themselves with the organization and participate in organizational process.

In this context, it can be said that employees with high organizational commitment feelings affect organizational performance in positive ways, lessen the frequency of performing negative behavior and improve quality of service. Moreover, Balcı emphasizes that individuals with organizational commitment are more compatible and productive individuals who have higher levels of satisfaction, loyalty and responsibility [30]. Organizational commitment not only increases the success in a certain role, but also encourages the individual to achieve many voluntary actions necessary for organizational life and high standard system success [31].

In Turkey, researches aiming to determine the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior were generally conducted in business enterprise level [32-36], yet there have not been such researches in education organizations. Therefore, the aim of this study is to determine the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior according to the perceptions of primary school teachers. In accordance with this aim, answers to the following questions were searched:

- What are the perceptions of primary school teachers about organizational commitment?
- What are the perceptions of primary school teachers about organizational citizenship behavior?
- Is there significant relationship between primary school teachers' perceptions of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship?

- Is there significant relationship between primary school teachers' perceptions of affective commitment and organizational citizenship?
- Is there significant relationship between primary school teachers' perceptions of continuance commitment and organizational citizenship?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study group: 225 teachers in primary public schools in the city of Ankara in Turkey formed the study group of the research, which is a general survey model. 59.1 % of the teachers who took part in the research were female and 40.9 % of them were male. 56 % of participants had 1-10 years of seniority and 44 % had over 11 years of seniority.

Data gathering tools: "Organizational Commitment Scale [37]" and "Organizational Citizenship Scale [10]" were used as the data gathering tools in the study. Both scales were adapted into Turkish by Altunkese [33]. Organizational Commitment Scale consists of two sub dimensions as "Affective Commitment" and "Continuance Commitment". There are totally 25 likert type items in the scale. High score shows high organizational commitment perception and low score implies low organizational commitment perception in the scale. Organizational Citizenship Scale is a one dimension scale consisting of 13 items. High score shows high organizational citizenship perception and low score implies low organizational citizenship perception in the scale. Both scales are answered as 1- Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3- Moderately Agree, 4-Agree and 5- Strongly Agree [33].

Data analysis: Descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation of teachers' answers to Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship scales were calculated in order to determine primary school

teachers' perceptions of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Afterwards, Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated to determine the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

First of all, primary school teachers' perceptions of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior were tried to be determined. Related findings are presented in Table 1.

In Table 1, it is seen that continuance commitment (\bar{x} =3.12) score means were higher than affective commitment (\bar{x} =3.03) score means when participant teachers' perceptions of organizational commitment. Therefore, it can be said that teachers' perceptions of organizational commitment are positive. This implies that teachers wish to stay in the organization they work for. Similar findings were also found in some researches in Turkey [38-40].

Mean of teachers' perceptions of organizational citizenship (\bar{x} =3.43) was moderate level. Accordingly, it can be said that teachers tend to perform organizational citizenship behavior that are not written in their job descriptions and are totally optional. Similar findings were also found in some researches in Turkey [41-43]. Relationship between primary school teachers' perceptions of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior are presented in Table 2.

As seen in Table 2, there is a general moderate level, positive and significant relationship [r =0.33, p <0.01] between teachers' perceptions of organizational citizenship and organizational commitment. Therefore, it can be said that positive organizational commitment perceptions increase as positive organizational citizenship perceptions increase. It can also be said that 10 % of the

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of primary school teachers' perceptions of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship

Scores	n	Lowest score	Highest score	\bar{x}	S
Organizational commitment	225	2.00	4.62	3.06	0.42
Affective commitment	225	1.00	4.73	3.03	0.45
Continuance commitment	225	1.00	4.60	3.12	0.47
Organizational citizenship	225	1.00	4.56	3.43	0.42

Table 2: Relationship between teachers' perceptions of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship

	Organizational commitment total score	Affective commitment total score	Continuance commitment total score
Organizational citizenship scale total score	0.33**	0.27**	0.36**

**p<0.01

variance in organizational citizenship perception originates from organizational commitment perception when the determination coefficient ($r^2=0.10$) is taken into consideration.

There is also a general moderate level, positive and significant relationship [$r=0.36$, $p<0.01$] between teachers' perceptions of organizational citizenship and continuance commitment. Therefore, it can be said that positive continuance commitment perceptions increase as positive organizational citizenship perceptions increase. It can also be said that 12% of the variance in organizational citizenship perception originates from continuance commitment perception when the determination coefficient ($r^2=0.12$) is taken into consideration.

There is a positive and significant relationship [$r=0.27$, $p<0.01$] between teachers' perceptions of organizational citizenship and affective commitment. Therefore, it can be said that positive affective commitment perceptions increase as positive organizational citizenship perceptions increase. It can also be said that 7% of the variance in organizational citizenship perception originates from affective commitment perception when the determination coefficient ($r^2=0.07$) is taken into consideration. This variance rate is low and it can be stated that the possibility of performing organizational citizenship behavior for individuals with high affective commitment levels are high since affective commitment is related to strong belief and acceptance for organizational objectives. According to Organ, performing organizational citizenship behavior is highly related to individuals' perceptions of commitment [44]. Individuals' perceptions of commitment as an intention, attitude or motivational interaction increase the possibility to perform organizational citizenship behavior.

In some studies in the literature [7, 45], it was determined that organizational commitment was one of the premises to organizational citizenship behavior. However, there was not found any relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in some other studies [10, 46, 47]. Generally, moderate or low level relationships were determined in this study.

CONCLUSION

In this study, the relationships between organizational citizenship and organizational commitment were tried to be determined according to primary school teachers' perceptions. In this context, the

participants' perceptions of organizational citizenship and organizational commitment were determined in the first place. It can be said that primary school teachers' perceptions of organizational citizenship and organizational commitment were moderate level. In addition to this, in terms of the relationships between organizational citizenship and organizational commitment, it was determined that there were moderate, positive and significant relationships between these two variables. Although there have been different approaches and research findings on organizational commitment and organizational citizenship, it is more likely for the individuals who have commitment for their organizations to perform organizational citizenship behaviors because individuals' attitudes affect their behaviors. Thus, positive attitudes are expected to result in positive behaviors. These positive behaviors will also improve the performance of workers and bring out positive results for the organization. Therefore, it is quite important for an organization to be aware of the factors that will affect its workers' commitment to the organization. This subject is even more important for education organizations for education organizations are the places where extra role behaviors of workers are much more required. Any extra behavior the workers in the education organizations will perform will result as a contribution to education in return. Considering the research findings, it can be pointed out that commitment levels of education workers should be increased since the frequency of performing extra role behaviors will increase as commitment level increases.

REFERENCES

1. Smith, C.A., D.W. Organ and J.P. Near, 1983. Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68 (44): 653-663.
2. Organ, D.W., 1988. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington Books.
3. Bateman, T.S. and D.W. Organ, 1983. Job Satisfaction and Good Soldier: The Relationship between Affect and Employee Citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4): 587-595.
4. Podsakoff, P.M., S.B. Mackenzie and W.H. Hommer, 1996. Transformational Leader Behaviors and Substitutes for Leadership as Determinants of Employee Satisfaction, Commitment, Trust and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22(2): 259-298.

5. Williams, S., R. Pitre and M. Zainuba, 2002. Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Intentions: Fair Rewards versus Treatment. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142 (1): 33-44.
6. Organ, D.W. and A. Lingl, 1995. Personality, Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 135 (3): 339-350.
7. Schappe, S.P., 1998. The Influence of Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Fairness Perceptions on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *The Journal of Psychology*, 132 (3): 277-290.
8. Karrasch, A., 2003. Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Commitment. *Military Psychology*, 15 (3): 225-236.
9. Finegan, E.J., 2000. The Impact of Person and Organizational Values on Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73 (2): 149-169.
10. Williams, L.J. and S.E. Anderson, 1991. Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and In-Role Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17 (3): 601-617.
11. O'Reilly, C.A. and J. Chatman, 1986. Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects of Compliance, Identification and Internalization on Prosocial Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71 (3): 492-499.
12. Williams, L.J., 1988. Affective and non-affective components of job satisfaction and organizational commitments as determinants of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors, PhD thesis, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.
13. Witt, L.A., 1991. Exchange Ideology as a Moderator of Job Attitudes-Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Relationship. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 21 (18): 1490-1501.
14. Organ, D.W. and K.A. Ryan, 1995. Meta-Analytic Review of Attitudinal and Dispositional Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48 (4): 775-782.
15. Ensher, E.A., E.J. Grant-Vallone and S.I. Donaldson, 2001. Effects of Perceived Discrimination on Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Grievances. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(1):53-72.
16. Potter, L.W., R.M. Steers, R.T. Mowday and P.V. Boulian, 1974. Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Turnover among Psychiatric Technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59 (5): 603-609.
17. Angle, H.L. and J.L. Perry, 1981. An Empirical Assessment of Organizational Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26 (1): 1-13.
18. Gautam, T., R. Van Dick, U. Wagner, N. Upadhyay and A.J. Davis, 2005. Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Commitment in Nepal. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 8(3): 305-314.
19. Nguni, S., P. Slegers and E. Denessen, 2006. Transformational and Transactional Leadership Effects on Teachers' Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Primary Schools: The Tanzanian Case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17 (2): 145-177.
20. Luthans, F., 1995. *Organizational Behavior*. McGraw-Hill Inc.
21. Mowday, R.T., R.M. Steers and L.W. Porter, 1979. The Measurement of Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14 (2): 224-247.
22. Mowday, R.T., L.W. Porter and R.M. Steers, 1982. *Employee-Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism and Turnover*. Academic Pres.
23. Nystedt, L., A. Sjöberg and G. Hagglund, 1999. Discriminant Validaiton of Measures of Organizational Commitment, Job Involvement and Job Satisfaction among Swedish Army Officers. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 40 (1): 49-55.
24. Kacmar, K.M., S.C. Dawn and A.B. Robert, 1999. Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Commitment: A Comparison of Two Scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 59 (6): 976-994.
25. Allen, N.J. and J.P. Meyer, 1990. The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63 (1): 1-18.
26. Çetin, M.Ö., 2004. *Organizational Culture and Organizational Commitment*. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
27. Balay, R., 2000. *Organizational Commitment of Administrators and Teachers*. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
28. Wasti, A.S., 2000. *Leadership and Applied of Human Resources*. Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.
29. Dunham, R.B., J.A. Grube and M.B. Castaneda, 1994. Organizational Commitment: The Utility of an Integrative Definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79 (3): 370-380.
30. Balcı, A., 2003. *Organizational Socialization: Theory, Strategy and, Tactics*. Pegem A Yayıncılık.

31. Katz, D. and R.L. Kahn, 1977. *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. TODAIE Yayınları.
32. Kamer, M., 2001. Organizational trust, organizational commitment and their effects on organizational citizenship behaviors, M.S. thesis, Marmara University, Turkey.
33. Altunkese, T.N., 2002. A Study of relationship between psychological climate, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in a public organization, M.S. thesis, Osmangazi University, Turkey.
34. Koçakçıoğlu, R., 2002. The relationship of organizational commitment and work rewards with organizational citizenship behavior, M.S. Thesis, Marmara University, Turkey.
35. Loğa, A., 2003. The effect of demographic characteristic of personnel in organizational identification, organizational commitment and, organizational citizenship behaviors: A research in military organizations, M.S. thesis, Başkent University, Turkey.
36. Dilek, H., 2005. The effect of leadership styles and perceptions of organizational justice in organizational commitment, job satisfaction and, organizational citizenship, PhD thesis, Gebze Institute of High Technology, Turkey.
37. Modway, R.T., L.W. Porter, R.M. Steers and P.V. Boulian, 1974. Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Turnover among Psychiatric Technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59 (5): 603-609.
38. Özden, Y., 1997. Organizational Commitment of Teachers: Are there Relationship with Behaviors of Administrators?. *Milli Eğitim*, 135: 35-41.
39. Turan, S., 1998. Organizational climate and organizational commitment in human organizations, PhD thesis, The Ohio University. Ohio.
40. Mercan, M., 2006. Organizational commitment organizational alienation and organizational citizenship behavior of teachers, M.S. thesis, Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University, Turkey.
41. Yaylacı, A.F., 2004. Public basic education school teachers and managers organization citizenship behaviors, PhD thesis, Ankara University, Turkey.
42. Keskin, S., 2005. Work values and organizational citizenship behavior of teachers, M.S. thesis, Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University, Turkey.
43. Kaynak, S., 2007. Teachers' personal traits and organizational citizenship behavior, M.S. thesis, Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University, Turkey.
44. Farh, J., P.M. Podsakoff and D.W. Organ, 1990. Accounting for Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Leader Fairness and Task Scope Versus Satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 16 (4): 705-722.
45. Dyne, L.V., L.L. Cummings and J.M. Parks, 1995. Extra-role behaviors: in pursuit of construct and definitional clarity. In *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Eds., Staw, L.L. and L. L. Cummings. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 215-285.
46. Tansky, J.W., 1993. Justice And Organizational Citizenship Behavior: What Is The Relationship?. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6 (3): 195-207.
47. DeLoria, J.E., 2001. A comparative study of employee commitment: core and contract employees in a federal, PhD thesis, Virginia University.