



The Relationship between Primary School Teachers' Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Counter-productive Work Behaviors*

Burcu AKKAYA¹

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 18 Jun., 2019

Received in revised form: 22 Sept. 2019

Accepted: 14 Oct. 2019

DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2019.84.1

Keywords

Counter-productive work behaviors, organizational citizenship, extra-role behavior.

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The present study aims to investigate the level of teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors and counter-productive work behaviors (CWBs) based on public primary school administrators' and teachers' perceptions and the relationship between these two variables.

Research Methods: This study was conducted in a correlational survey model. The sample of this study was formed in the 2018-2019 academic year, consisted of public primary school administrators and teachers who worked in nine different districts

of Ankara. This study employed the stratified sampling method. The data were collected using the Counter-productive Work Behavior Scale and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale. In the data analysis, arithmetic means, standard deviation and multilinear regression analysis were used.

Findings: The findings showed that teachers rarely exhibited counter-productive work behaviors. The most frequently exhibited behaviors were identified as 'withdrawal' and 'abuse toward others', and the least frequently exhibited behavior was identified as 'theft'. The most important predictor of the sub-dimensions of CWBs was the courtesy sub-dimension of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs).

Implications for Research and Practice: The results revealed that teachers who exhibit CWBs also show passive behaviors more frequently and avoid active aggressive behaviors that require one-to-one interaction. The behaviors included that the courtesy dimension had a preventing or reducing effect on CWBs. Thus, teachers should be encouraged to follow the rules of courtesy, and the teachers who deliver successful performance should be rewarded to highlight the issue.

© 2019 Ani Publishing Ltd. All rights reserved

* This article has been produced from the PhD thesis supervised by Professor Dr. Yasemin Kepenekçi at the Department of Education Management and Policy, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Ankara University.

¹ PhD Candidate, Ankara University, akkaya.eyt@gmail.com TURKEY ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4571-9065>

Introduction

The behaviors exhibited by the employee in the organization can affect both the other employees, thus the whole organization. Formal role behaviors exhibited by employees have a key role in organizations' viability (Barksdale & Werner, 2001). These behaviors are defined as the set of behaviors identified by the administration, included in the punishment and rewards system (Barksdale & Werner, 2001) and required to be performed by employees (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997) emphasized that while employees' behaviors are considered in the context of formal role behavior in some cases, they may also be considered as extra-role behaviors (Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995). All kinds of volitional behaviors that are not required to be exhibited by employees are defined as extra-role behavior. Extra-role behavior consists of two dimensions, including counter-productive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior (Miles, Borman, Spector & Fox, 2002).

Counter-productive Work Behaviors (CWBs)

Counter-productive Work Behaviors (henceforth referred to as CWBs) consist of acts that are engaged by employees to abuse the organization or its members due to negative situations experienced within the organization (Spector & Fox, 2010). Volitional behaviors which are exhibited with the intention to harm (Dalal, 2005), jeopardize the well-being of the organization and employees, reduce job performance, violate organizational norms through acts as aggression/theft/not performing at work (Gualandri, 2012) are defined as CWBs. In the literature, CWBs were discussed as behaviors related to aggression, abusing production, sabotage, theft, withdrawal and retaliation (Ozdevecioglu, 2003; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Spector, 2011). The aggressiveness of the employee or a reaction to unfair practices experienced within an organization forms the basis of these behaviors (Spector, Fox, & Domagalski, 2006; Spector, Fox, Penney, et al., 2006).

Several research studies reported that CWBs result in consequences that pose direct or indirect threats to the viability of an organization. These threats include the abuse of organizational structure, resources and employees (Spector & Fox, 2002), deviation from organizational purposes (Mount, Ilies, & Johnson, 2006), decrease in organizational activity, financial loss of the organization (Dunlop & Lee, 2004) and deterioration of organizational ethical climate (Kidwell Jr & Kochanowski, 2005).

CWBs Dimensions

In the literature, CWBs were categorized in different ways. Buss (1961) analyzed CWBs in the context of three main dimensions, including 'physical-verbal', 'active-passive' and 'direct-indirect', and of eight sub-dimensions that were built by crossing these main dimensions. Baron and Neuman (1996) accepted the categorization of Buss and expanded them by adding the effect/danger ratio and overt/covert dimensions. Gruys (1999) assessed counter-productive work behavior under 11 categories without any forming any categories: (1) Theft and related behavior; (2) destruction of property; (3) misuse of information; (4) misuse of time and resources; (5) unsafe behavior; (6)

poor attendance; (7) poor quality work; (8) alcohol use; (9) drug use; (10) inappropriate verbal actions; and (11) inappropriate physical actions. Although the way of categorization varied, CWBs can be elucidated in the scope of two main dimensions of 'individual- targeted' and 'organization-targeted'. Thus, the model of Spector, Fox, Penney, et al. (2006), which analyzed CWBs within these two dimensions, has been widely accepted in the literature. The model of Spector et al. also formed the basis of this study.

Spector et al. (2006) addressed CWBs within two main groups: 'individual-targeted' and 'organization-targeted'. In this context, the researchers argued that CWBs could be explored under two main dimensions and five sub-dimensions, including (i) abuse toward others, (ii) production deviance, (iii) sabotage, (iv) theft and (v) withdrawal.

Behaviors that aim the direct abuse of the employee/employees present CWBs that are 'individual- targeted'. This main dimension consists of "**abuse toward others**". According to Spector, Fox, Penney, et al. (2006), behaviors examined under this dimension include threatening words and actions, insulting, ignoring and using physical violence. On the other hand, behaviors that aim the direct abuse of the organization present CWBs that are 'organization-targeted'. The direct target of such kind of behaviors is the organization, yet employees CWBs behaviors targeted toward individuals also make a direct and negative effect on the organization. This main dimension includes the sub-dimensions of production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal.

Production deviance is defined as deliberate failure or mistake of the employee to harm the organization (Spector, Fox, Penney et al., 2006). In other words, production deviance is described as a negative impact on the quality of a provided product/service due to employee's neglect of duty.

The concept of **sabotage** implies deliberate defacement or destruction of physical property belonging to the organization (Spector, Fox, Penney et al., 2006). This dimension includes volitional behaviors exhibited by the employee to damage an organization's property, equipment, image and reputation (Giacalone & Rosenfeld, 1987). **Theft** is the act of stealing by employees. Employees may engage in this behavior to harm the organization due to financial needs, lack of work satisfaction, or low perception of organizational justice (Spector, Fox, Penney, et al., 2006). **Withdrawal** is the inadequate active participation of the employee in the activities of an organization (Shore & Shore, 1995). Withdrawal behaviors include being absent from work, arriving late, or leaving early and taking longer breaks (Spector, Fox, Penney, et al., 2006).

Relevant studies reported that such kinds of behaviors cause pecuniary and non-pecuniary damages for individuals and organizations. For instance, Fox and Stallworth (2004) found that 74.8% of the participants had severe intentions to leave employment, and 66% of them suffered from headaches, stomachache and chest pain for five years. The findings demonstrated that CWBs caused both psychological and physiological damage to individuals. However, the psychological impacts of CWBs

are not limited to those noted above. The findings in the literature have shown that in organizations where such behaviors are exhibited by employees, it is possible to observe experiencing low self-esteem and self-efficacy (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002; Duffy, Ganster, Shaw, Johnson, & Pagon, 2006; Low, Radhakrishnan, Schneider, & Rounds, 2007), extreme anger (Aquino, Douglas, & Martinko, 2004; Spector, Fox, & Domagalski, 2006), depression and high levels of anxiety (Berry, Carpenter, & Barratt, 2012; Duffy et al., 2006) and stress (Berry et al., 2012).

CWBs in Schools

CWBs can also be exhibited by teachers and administrators in educational institutions, such as schools. As Dogruoz and Ozdemir (2018) assumed, the existing findings in the literature have shown that teachers and administrators exhibit CWBs, such as damaging the property of the school, harassment, psychological mobbing and absence from work, and these behaviors have become more common in schools. According to Unal (2012), CWBs exhibited by teachers in schools include threatening, being disrespectful, sending off students out of the classroom, threatening students with expelling from school, misinforming parents and being impolite, being late to the lecture, violation of rules and consumption of alcohol at work.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs)

The concept of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (henceforth referred to as OCBs) was mentioned by Bateman and Organ (1983) for the first time. The researchers assumed that it is appropriate to include the type of extra-role behaviors that do not harm an organization in the context of OCBs. Organ (1988) emphasized that the scope of organizational citizenship consisted of behaviors that are 'beyond extra-role behaviors' and defined organizational citizenship behavior as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization". OCBs consist of volitional behaviors of the employee that directly support the efficient functioning of an organization (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994).

Dimensions of OCBs

The study conducted by Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) categorized organizational citizenship for the first time. The researchers categorized OCBs into two main dimensions: altruism (generosity) and general compliance. Altruism includes direct and intentional behaviors that are exhibited to help others in the case of face-to-face situations, such as providing guidance or assistance. The general compliance dimension consists of impersonal behaviors that make an indirect impact on employees or employers and these behaviors are related to the concept of conscientiousness.

Farh, Earley and Lin (1997) revealed that organizational citizenship behavior consists of identification, protecting company resources, altruism toward colleagues, interpersonal harmony and conscientiousness. Podsakoff et al. (2000) analyzed organizational citizenship behavior under seven dimensions as follows: (i) altruism,

(ii) sportsmanship, (iii) organizational loyalty, (iv) organizational compliance (v) individual initiative, (vi) civic virtue and (vii) self-improvement.

The categorization of Organ (1988) has been widely accepted in the literature given that the researcher defined the concept of organizational citizenship for the first time. The researcher analyzed organizational citizenship behavior under five dimensions: altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, civic courtesy and sportsmanship. This study is also based on the categorization of Organ (1988), and these dimensions are explained below.

Altruism

In general terms, altruism, which means generosity, is defined as “deliberate, conscious, well-intended and voluntary helping behavior of the employee directed toward other employees concerning work-related issues.” Smith, Organ ve Near’a (1983).

Courtesy

The courtesy dimension implies being thoughtful and controlled before exhibiting a behavior (Allison, Voss, & Dryer, 2001). This dimension includes interpersonal behaviors of employees in an organization, such as establishing healthy communication, informing and reminding colleagues, and showing respect.

Conscientiousness

The conscientiousness dimension consists of volitional behaviors of employees that go beyond the designated tasks (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Continuing to be engaged at work, using the work time efficiently and following the rules of the organization are among the behaviors included in this dimension (Barksdale & Werner, 2001), such as going beyond the minimum role requirement in one’s work

Civic Virtue

According to Organ (1988), civic virtue is the employee’s interest in the activities of the organization and active and responsible involvement in organizational processes. According to Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994), such kind of involvement encompasses the employee's behaviors, such as feeling responsible for the problems that occur within the organization, actively participating in solution processes and attending meetings and decision making processes.

Sportsmanship

Sportsmanship consists of the employee’s efforts to develop positive attitudes toward the organization under difficult circumstances (Sezgin, 2005), willingness to solve the problems that are occurring within the organization (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1993) and avoiding behaviors that will give rise to distress (Organ, 1988).

In the context of schools, OCBs can be addressed as behaviors that make positive contributions to the functioning of the school and the education process. DiPaola and

Hoy (2005) listed the OCBs that teachers exhibit to contribute to the success of students and the school as follows:

- helping new colleagues,
- making innovative suggestions regarding the functioning of the school,
- volunteering to attend extracurricular activities,
- sparing time for students on their own time,
- staying after school to continue working,
- taking care of students voluntarily,
- attending work consistently,
- making efficient use of their time while at school,
- working productively with their colleagues,
- showing performance beyond requirements.

In light of this conceptual framework, it can be asserted that OCBs may bring about the opposite of impacts made by CWBs.

The primary aim of this paper is to explore the relationship between teachers' OCBs and CWBs based on public primary school administrators' and teachers' perceptions. In line with this general objective, this study sought to answer the following specific research questions:

1. What is the extent of perceptions of administrators and teachers on teachers' CWBs concerning the dimensions;
 - a) Abuse toward others
 - b) Abuse toward administrative functioning
 - c) Sabotage
 - d) Theft
 - e) Withdrawal
 - f) Abuse toward school image
 - g) Abuse toward schooling

2. What is the extent of perceptions of administrators and teachers on teachers' organizational citizenship behavior concerning the dimensions;
 - a) Altruism,
 - b) Conscientiousness,
 - c) Sportsmanship,
 - d) Courtesy,
 - e) Civic Virtue.

3. Are the sub-dimensions of the organizational citizenship behavior significant predictors of CWBs based on administrators' and teachers' perceptions?

Method

Research Design

The main objective of this study was to establish the level of OCBs and CWBs based on public primary school administrators' and teachers' perceptions, and the relationship between these two variables. Therefore, this study was conducted in a correlational survey model. The correlational survey is a research model to determine the existence of covariance or its level between two or more variables (Karasar, 2015, 81).

Research Sample

The sample of this study was formed in the 2018-2019 academic year, consisted of public primary school administrators and teachers who worked in nine different districts of Ankara. This study employed the stratified sampling method to take samples from this population. Each of the administrators and teachers who worked in the primary schools located in these nine districts was considered as a sub-population, and samples were taken from these groups. The sample size of this study was calculated using Cochran's formula (1962, cited in Balci, 2004, 95), and the tolerance level was accepted as 0.05, and confidence level was accepted as 1.96. All in all, 360 school administrators and 430 teachers participated in this study.

Research Instruments and Procedure

The research data were collected using the "Counter-productive Work Behavior Scale (CWB-S)" developed by the researcher and "Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (OCB-S)" developed by Basim and Sesen (2006).

CWB Scale

A pre-implementation was performed to examine the construct validity and reliability of the CWB Scale. The pre-implementation data were collected from 413 participants, including 331 teachers and 82 administrators who worked in official primary and secondary schools located in Ankara province. The exploratory factor analysis method (EFA) was used to control the construct validity of the scale. Also, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was performed to control the appropriateness of the data structure concerning sample size for the factor analysis. The KMO value was found as 0.96, and the sample size was found highly appropriate for exploratory factor analysis. The chi-square value obtained from Bartlett's test for sphericity yielded a significant result, and it was reported that the data were produced by a multivariate normal distribution ($\chi^2(1711) = 21800.176; p < 0.01$).

To identify the number of factors in the exploratory factor analysis process, the variance ratios explained by eigenvalues were considered, varimax rotation technique was applied, and the acceptance level for factor load values was found as 0.45. As a result of the exploratory factor analysis, a total of 59 items were distributed among seven sub-dimensions, and these seven dimensions explained the 67.92% of the total variance. The categorizations included in the literature were considered while naming the sub-dimensions. The dimensions of CWBs were analyzed under seven sub-dimensions: (i) abuse toward others, (ii) abuse toward administrative functioning, (iii) sabotage, (iv) theft, (v) withdrawal, (vi) abuse toward school image and (vii) abuse toward schooling.

The total item correlation values and Chronbach's Alpha values were calculated for the reliability analysis of the items. The total correlation values were found above 0.50 for all items, and Cronbach's Alpha values changed between 0.86 and 0.95.

OCB Scale

The Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale, which was adapted to Turkish by Basim ve Sesen (2006), was used to identify participants' perceptions towards organizational citizenship behavior. The scale consists of five dimensions as follows: Altruism, Courtesy, Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship, and Civic Virtue. A first-level confirmatory factor analysis was performed to control whether the structure of the scale was maintained for teachers and administrators who work in educational institutions. In the examination of analysis findings, t-values, error variances, p significance values, chi-square/ degrees of freedom, (X^2/df) ratio and RMSEA values and the fit indices, including GFI, AGFI, RMR, NNFI, CFI were assessed, and the findings provided below were reached.

The findings showed that each of the t-values of the observed variables was above 2.58, between 9.96 and 22.51, and were significant at $p < 0.01$. The error variances included in the standardized solution part showed that most of the items produced considerably low results between 0.20 - 0.40 and were at the acceptance level. The indicators were decided to be kept in the model.

The ratio of the Chi/square (X^2) value (538.50), which is one of the most common cohesion criteria for confirmatory factor analysis, to the degree of freedom (140) was found as 3.85. The value of this ratio between 3 and 5 corresponds to a medium level cohesion (Sumer, 2000). RMSEA value was found as 0.076 and indicated a good fit (Cokluk, Sekercioglu, Buyukozturk, 2010). The GFI value was reported as 0.88, and AGFI value was reported as 0.84, and it was found at the adequate cohesion level. The standardized RMR value was found as 0.037. This value indicates a perfect fit under 0.05 (Brown 2006, cited in Cokluk, Sekercioglu, Buyukozturk, 2010). Therefore, it can be seen that the RMR value showed a perfect fit. Both of the NNFI and CFI values were found as 0.98. NNFI and CFI indexes above 0.95 indicate a perfect fit (Sumer, 2000). In this framework, the level of fit indices of the confirmatory factor analysis can be assumed at an adequate level.

Within the scope of the reliability analysis, the item-total correlation values of the scale were found above 0.40 for all items, and the Cronbach's Alpha values varied between 0.87 and 0.89.

Data Analysis

The SPSS and Lisrel package programs were used in the data analysis. Descriptive statistics, including arithmetic, mean and standard deviation, and parametric statistics technique, linear regression analysis, were employed in the data analysis process. In multilinear regression analysis, multivariate normality, linearity and multicollinearity conditions were controlled. Thus, histogram, scatter plot, the relationship between the independent variables, tolerance and VIF values were examined. The findings demonstrated that histograms showed a normal distribution curve for all variables; in the scatter plot the dots gathered around the zero lines to a large extent (Cokluk, Sekercioglu, & Buyukozturk, 2010, p. 18), and the conditions of normality and linearity of the relationship were met.

Results

Perceptions of teachers and administrators towards CWBs were analyzed according to the arithmetic mean and standards deviation values and the findings are presented in Table 1.

Table 1.

Arithmetic Mean and Standards Deviation Values of CWB Sub-dimensions

Sub-dimension	Teacher		Administrator	
	\bar{X}	<i>SD</i>	\bar{X}	<i>SD</i>
Abuse toward others	1.75	0.79	1.74	0.73
Abuse toward administrative functioning	1.44	0.61	1.61	0.69
Sabotage	1.17	0.42	1.36	0.60
Theft	1.03	0.23	1.04	0.23
Withdrawal	1.76	0.72	1.94	0.89
Abuse toward school image	1.18	0.44	1.28	0.53
Abuse toward schooling	1.26	0.53	1.44	0.65

According to the CWB sub-dimensions, the perceptions of participants towards CWBs displayed in Table 1 were found considerably positive. In all sub-dimensions, the majority of the participants thought that teachers "never" exhibited the relevant CWBs. Also, according to the participants' perceptions, the most frequently exhibited CWBs occurred in the 'Withdrawal' and 'Abuse toward others' sub-dimensions. The behaviors included in these dimensions mostly emerged in the form of passive

behaviors, such as gossiping or ignoring that do not involve face-to-face interactions or reactions.

The least frequent CWBs were included in the 'Theft' sub-dimension. Besides, the teachers and administrators thought that teachers seldomly exhibit the behaviors included in the 'Theft' sub-dimension. On the other hand, the teachers and administrators believed that teachers rarely exhibit behaviors included in the 'Withdrawal' sub-dimension more than others, such as unwillingness to stay after school to continue working, avoid to take a risk and reluctance to participate in decision-making processes. On this matter, administrators' perceptions were more negative in comparison to the teachers' perceptions. Furthermore, standard deviation values that were found below 1 in all dimensions for teachers and administrators showed that both groups had a consensus and similar perceptions in all dimensions.

Perceptions of teachers and administrators toward OCBs were analyzed according to the arithmetic mean and standards deviation values and the findings are presented in Table 2.

Table 2.

Arithmetic Mean and Standards Deviation Values of OCB Sub-dimensions

Sub-Dimension	Teacher		Administrator	
	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD
Altruism	4.10	0.65	4.06	0.81
Conscientiousness	3.92	0.82	3.93	0.98
Sportsmanship	3.97	0.92	3.85	0.99
Courtesy	4.40	0.70	4.25	0.79
Civic Virtue	4.03	0.78	4.02	0.88

Table 2 presented that teachers and administrators generally had positive perceptions of OCBs. In both groups, participants thought that teachers exhibited OCBs included in the 'Courtesy' sub-dimension most frequently, and behaviors included in the 'Conscientiousness' least frequently. It was observed that administrators and teachers had similar perceptions of OCBs in the school. The standard deviation values were also found below 1 and the perception did not vary extensively. According to the standard deviation values, the variability of perceptions emerged in the 'Courtesy' sub-dimension both for the teachers ($SD=0.92$) and for the administrators ($SD=0.99$).

Analysis of the Prediction Status of CWBs by OCBs

Under this title, the results and interpretation of multilinear regression analysis concerning the prediction status of teachers' CWBs by the sub-dimensions of OCBs were presented. The abbreviations given below were used to provide convenience for writing a regression equation developed as a result of the regression analysis.

ATO : Abuse toward others	ATS : Abuse toward schooling
ATAF : Abuse toward administrative functioning	ALT : Altruism
SAB : Sabotage	CON : Conscientiousness
TH : Theft	SPO : Sportsmanship
WD : Withdrawal	COU : Courtesy
ATSI : Abuse toward school image	CIV : Civic Virtue

The multilinear regression analysis results that examined the prediction status of counter-productive work behavior sub-dimension 'Abuse toward others', which is among teachers' CWBs, by the sub-dimensions of OCBs were presented in Table 3.

Table 3.

Multilinear Regression Analysis Results on the Prediction Status of 'Abuse toward Others' Sub-dimension by the Sub-dimensions of OCBs

<i>Variable</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SH</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Binary r</i>	<i>Partial r</i>
Constant	4.64	0.13		35.47	0.00		
Altruism	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.17	0.87	-0.50	0.01
Conscientiousness	0.00	0.05	-0.01	-0.09	0.93	-0.51	0.00
Sportsmanship	-0.05	0.03	-0.06	-1.64	0.10	-0.45	-0.06
Courtesy	-0.52	0.04	-0.51	-11.66	0.00	-0.63	-0.38
Civic Virtue	-0.12	0.06	-0.12	-1.83	0.07	-0.53	-0.07
R = 0.64	R ² = 0.42		F _(5, 784) = 111.15		p = 0.00		
ATO = 4.64 + 0.01xALT + 0.00xCON - 0.05xSPO - 0.52xCOU - 0.12 xCIV							

Table 3 presents that there was a significant and medium level ($R=0.64$) relationship between the 'Abuse toward Others' sub-dimension and the sub-dimensions of OCBs. These five predictor variables explained the 42% ($R^2 = 0.42$) of the total variance in the 'Abuse toward Others' sub-dimension. Based on the status of this relationship, the findings showed that the sub-dimensions of OCBs predicted the 'Abuse toward Others' sub-dimension at a significant level ($F_{(5, 784)} = 111.15$; $p < 0.05$), and the regression equation provided in the table was obtained. According to the t-values, the 'Courtesy' sub-dimension predicted the 'Abuse toward Others' sub-

dimension at a significant level ($p < 0.05$). A negative and significant relationship was found between the 'Courtesy' and 'Abuse toward Others' sub-dimensions.

The multilinear regression analysis results that examined the prediction status of 'Abuse toward Administrative Functioning' sub-dimension of CWBs by the sub-dimensions of OCBs are presented in Table 4.

Table 4.

Multilinear Regression Analysis Results on the Prediction Status of 'Abuse toward Administrative Functioning' Sub-dimension by the Sub-dimensions of OCBs

<i>Variable</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SH</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Binary r</i>	<i>Partial r</i>
Constant	4.03	0.11		36.13	0.00		
Altruism	-0.01	0.04	-0.01	-0.14	0.89	-0.53	0.00
Conscientiousness	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.23	0.82	-0.54	0.01
Sportsmanship	-0.02	0.03	-0.03	-0.92	0.36	-0.45	-0.03
Courtesy	-0.38	0.04	-0.44	-10.07	0.00	-0.63	-0.34
Civic Virtue	-0.19	0.05	-0.24	-3.58	0.00	-0.57	-0.13
R = 0.65	R ² = 0.42	F _(5, 784) = 115.35		p = 0.00			

$$\text{ATAF} = 4.03 - 0.01 \times \text{ALT} + 0.01 \times \text{CON} - 0.02 \times \text{SPO} - 0.38 \times \text{COU} - 0.19 \times \text{CIV}$$

The data provided in Table 4 presents that there was a significant and medium level ($R = 0.65$) relationship between the sub-dimensions of OCBs and 'Abuse toward Administrative Functioning' sub-dimension. These five predictor variables explained 42% ($R^2 = 0.42$) of the total variance in the 'Abuse toward Administrative Functioning' sub-dimension. Based on the status of this relationship, the findings showed that the sub-dimensions of OCBs predicted the abuse toward administrative functioning sub-dimension at a significant level ($F_{(5, 784)} = 115.35$; $p < 0.05$), and the regression equation provided in the table was obtained. According to the t-values, the 'Courtesy' and 'Civic Virtue' sub-dimensions predicted the 'Abuse toward Administrative Functioning' sub-dimension at a significant level ($p < 0.05$). A negative, medium level and significant relationship were found between the 'Courtesy' and 'Civic Virtue' sub-dimensions and the 'Abuse toward Administrative Functioning' sub-dimension.

The multilinear regression analysis results that examined the prediction status of the 'Sabotage' sub-dimension of CWBs by the sub-dimensions of OCBs are presented in Table 5.

Table 5.

Multilinear Regression Analysis Results on the Prediction Status of 'Sabotage' Sub-dimension by the Sub-dimensions of OCBs

<i>Variable</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SH</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Binary r</i>	<i>Partial r</i>
Constant	2.91	0.10		29.85	0.00		
Altruism	-0.04	0.04	-0.05	-0.97	0.33	-0.45	-0.03
Conscientiousness	-0.07	0.04	-0.12	-1.88	0.06	-0.47	-0.07
Sportsmanship	-0.02	0.02	-0.04	-1.03	0.30	-0.39	-0.04
Courtesy	-0.24	0.03	-0.35	-7.20	0.00	-0.52	-0.25
Civic Virtue	-0.02	0.05	-0.03	-0.46	0.65	-0.46	-0.02
R = 0.54	R ² = 0.30		F _(5, 784) = 65.53		p = 0.00		
SAB = 2.91 - 0.04xALT - 0.07xCON - 0.02xSPO - 0.24xCOU - 0.02xCIV							

The data provided in Table 5 present that there was a significant and medium level ($R=0.54$) relationship between the sub-dimensions of OCBs 'Sabotage' sub-dimension. These five predictor variables explained 30% ($R^2 = 0.30$) of the total variance in the 'Sabotage' sub-dimension. Based on the status of this relationship, the findings showed that the sub-dimensions of OCBs predicted the 'Sabotage' sub-dimension at a significant level ($F_{(5, 784)} = 65.53; p < 0.05$), and the regression equation provided in the table was obtained. According to the t-values, the 'Courtesy' sub-dimension predicted the 'Sabotage' sub-dimension at a significant level ($p < 0.05$). A negative and significant relationship was found between the 'Courtesy' sub-dimension and the 'Sabotage' sub-dimension.

The multilinear regression analysis results that examined the prediction status of the 'Theft' sub-dimension of CWBs by the sub-dimensions of OCBs are presented in Table 6.

Table 6.

Multilinear Regression Analysis Results on the Prediction Status of 'Theft' Sub-dimension by the Sub-dimensions of OCBs

<i>Variable</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SH</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Binary r</i>	<i>Partial r</i>
Constant	1.32	0.05		25.73	0.00		
Altruism	-0.02	0.02	-0.07	-1.13	0.26	-0.17	-0.04
Conscientiousness	-0.02	0.02	-0.06	-0.77	0.44	-0.16	-0.03
Sportsmanship	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.15	0.88	-0.12	0.01
Courtesy	-0.05	0.02	-0.15	-2.67	0.01	-0.20	-0.09
Civic Virtue	0.02	0.02	0.06	0.70	0.48	-0.15	0.03
R = 0.20	R ² = 0.04		F _(5, 784) = 6.65		p = 0.00		
TH = 1.32 - 0.02xALT - 0.02xCON + 0.00xSPO - 0.05xCOU + 0.02xCIV							

The data provided in Table 6 presented that there was a significant yet low level ($R=0.20$) relationship between the sub-dimensions of OCBs 'Theft' sub-dimension. These five predictor variables explained 4% ($R^2 = 0.04$) of the total variance in the 'Theft' sub-dimension. Based on the status of this relationship, the findings showed that the sub-dimensions of OCBs predicted the 'Theft' sub-dimension at a significant level ($F_{(5, 784)} = 6.65$; $p<0.05$) and the regression equation provided in the table was obtained. According to the t-values, the 'Courtesy' sub-dimension predicted the 'Theft' sub-dimension at a significant level ($p<0.05$). A negative and significant relationship was found between the 'Courtesy' sub-dimension and the 'Theft' sub-dimension.

The multilinear regression analysis results that examined the prediction status of the 'Withdrawal' sub-dimension of CWBs by the sub-dimensions of OCBs are presented in Table 7.

Table 7.

Multilinear Regression Analysis Results on the Prediction Status of 'Withdrawal' Sub-dimension by the Sub-dimensions of OCBs

Variable	B	SH	β	t	p	Binary r	Partial r
Constant	4.96	0.13		38.61	0.00		
Altruism	0.08	0.05	0.07	1.46	0.15	-0.55	0.05
Conscientiousness	-0.22	0.05	-0.25	-4.46	0.00	-0.65	-0.16
Sportsmanship	-0.01	0.03	-0.01	-0.21	0.83	-0.48	-0.01
Courtesy	-0.39	0.04	-0.36	-8.83	0.00	-0.64	-0.30
Civic Virtue	-0.21	0.06	-0.21	-3.38	0.00	-0.64	-0.12
R = 0.70	R ² = 0.50		F _(5, 784) = 154.18		p = 0.00		
WD = 4.96 + 0.08xALT - 0.22xCON - 0.01xSPO - 0.39xCOU - 0.21xCIV							

The data provided in Table 7 presented that there was a significant and high level ($R=0.70$) relationship between the sub-dimensions of OCBs 'Withdrawal' sub-dimension. These five predictor variables explained 50% ($R^2 = 0.50$) of the total variance in the 'Withdrawal' sub-dimension. Based on the status of this relationship, the findings showed that the sub-dimensions of OCBs predicted the 'Withdrawal' sub-dimension at a significant level ($F_{(5, 784)} = 154.18$; $p<0.05$) and the regression equation provided in the table was obtained. According to the t-values, the 'Conscientiousness', 'Courtesy' and 'Civic Virtue' sub-dimensions predicted the 'Withdrawal' sub-dimension at a significant level ($p<0.05$). A negative and significant relationship was found between the 'Conscientiousness', 'Courtesy' and 'Civic Virtue' sub-dimensions and the "Withdrawal" sub-dimension.

The multilinear regression analysis results that examined the prediction status of the 'Abuse toward School Image' sub-dimension of CWBs by the sub-dimensions of OCBs are presented in Table 8.

Table 8.

Multilinear Regression Analysis Results Concerning the Prediction Status of 'Abuse toward School Image' Sub-dimension by the Sub-dimensions of OCBs

<i>Variable</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SH</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Binary r</i>	<i>Partial r</i>
Constant	2.94	0.09		34.19	0.00		
Altruism	-0.01	0.03	-0.02	-0.38	0.70	-0.49	-0.01
Conscientiousness	-0.07	0.03	-0.13	-2.13	0.03	-0.52	-0.08
Sportsmanship	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.67	0.50	-0.39	0.02
Courtesy	-0.28	0.03	-0.44	-9.64	0.00	-0.59	-0.33
Civic Virtue	-0.05	0.04	-0.09	-1.26	0.21	-0.52	-0.05
R = 0.61	R ² = 0.37		F _(5, 784) = 93.21		p = 0.00		
ATSI = 2.94 - 0.01xALT - 0.07xCON + 0.01xSPO - 0.28xCOU - 0.05xCIV							

The data provided in Table 8 presented that there was a significant and medium level ($R=0.61$) relationship between the sub-dimensions of OCBs 'Abuse toward School Image' sub-dimension. These five predictor variables explained 37% ($R^2 = 0.37$) of the total variance in the 'Abuse toward School Image' sub-dimension. Based on the status of this relationship, the findings showed that the sub-dimensions of OCBs predicted the 'Abuse toward School Image' sub-dimension at a significant level ($F_{(5, 784)} = 93.21$; $p<0.05$) and the regression equation provided in the table was obtained. According to the t-values, the 'Conscientiousness' and 'Courtesy' sub-dimensions predicted the 'Abuse toward School Image' sub-dimension at a significant level ($p<0.05$). A negative and significant relationship was found between the 'Conscientiousness' and 'Courtesy' sub-dimensions and the 'Abuse toward School Image' sub-dimension.

The multilinear regression analysis results that examined the prediction status of the 'Abuse toward Schooling' sub-dimension of CWBs by the sub-dimensions of OCBs are presented in Table 9.

Table 9.

Multilinear Regression Analysis Results on the Prediction Status of 'Abuse toward Schooling' Sub-dimension by the Sub-dimensions of OCBs

<i>Variable</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SH</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Binary r</i>	<i>Partial r</i>
Constant	3.62	0.10		36.02	0.00		
Altruism	-0.04	0.04	-0.05	-1.10	0.27	-0.54	-0.04
Conscientiousness	-0.12	0.04	-0.18	-2.95	0.00	-0.57	-0.10
Sportsmanship	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.80	0.42	-0.43	0.03
Courtesy	-0.34	0.03	-0.43	-9.92	0.00	-0.63	-0.33
Civic Virtue	-0.06	0.05	-0.08	-1.23	0.22	-0.57	-0.04
R = 0.66	R ² = 0.43	F _(5, 784) = 119.82		p = 0.00			
ATS = 3.62 - 0.04xALT - 0.12xCON + 0.02xSPO - 0.34xCOU - 0.06xCIV							

The data provided in Table 9 presented that there was a significant and medium level ($R=0.66$) relationship between the sub-dimensions of OCBs 'Abuse toward Schooling' sub-dimension. These five predictor variables explained 43% ($R^2 = 0.43$) of the total variance in the 'Abuse toward Schooling' sub-dimension. Based on the status of this relationship, the findings showed that the sub-dimensions of OCBs predicted the 'Abuse toward Schooling' sub-dimension at a significant level ($F_{(5, 784)} = 119.82$; $p < 0.05$) and the regression equation provided in the table was obtained. According to the t-values, the 'Conscientiousness' and 'Courtesy' sub-dimensions predicted the 'Abuse toward Schooling' sub-dimension at a significant level ($p < 0.05$). A negative and significant relationship was found between the "Conscientiousness" and 'Courtesy' sub-dimensions and the 'Abuse toward Schooling' sub-dimension.

All of the regression tables displayed that, according to the standardized regression coefficients (β), the most important predictor of all sub-dimensions of CWBs was the 'Courtesy' sub-dimension of the OCBs.

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

This study aims to establish the level of teachers' OCBs and CWBs based on public primary school administrators' and teachers' perceptions, and the relationship between these two variables. OCBs and CWBs constitute the two different aspects of extra-role behaviors in organizations. While the first aspect represents positive behaviors exhibited to be useful to the organization and make a contribution, the second aspect represents negative behaviors exhibited with an intention to harm the organization. OCBs may make important contributions to the functioning of the school, and on the other hand, CWBs may abuse the functioning of the school to a significant extent. From this point of view, the question of whether OCBs have an effect

on CWBs was considered as a significant question to be analyzed. This study employed the correlational survey model, and the data collected from the participants via scales were analyzed using the multilinear regression analysis method.

The research findings showed that CWBs are not frequently exhibited in schools. Although these behaviors rarely occurred, the most common behaviors included withdrawal and abuse toward others. The CWBs exhibited by teachers mostly included passive behaviors that do not require face-to-face interaction between individuals, such as not staying after school to continue working, gossiping and ignoring. Behaviors, such as theft, putting pressure on others and mocking, were not commonly observed in schools. These findings of the study are in line with Greenberg and Barling's (1999) research, while they differ from Bulbul's (2013) research. In their research on the aggressive behaviors of employees, Greenberg and Barling (1999) found that participants used psychological violence against their colleagues (82%), subordinates (74%) and superiors (76%) at least once and that the most common behavior in this type of violence was gossip. Bulbul (2013), on the other hand, stated that the most commonly observed behaviors among violent behaviors were verbal harassment behaviors. A similar finding was obtained in the study of Verona, Reed, Curtin and Pole (2007), which discussed CWBs in two dimensions: explicit and implicit. In this study, implicit behaviors were reported to be more frequent than explicit behaviors. Considering that implicit behaviors are passive behaviors, it can be said that the findings of Verona et al. (2007) are in the same line with this research findings. Teachers who exhibit CWBs mostly prefer to exhibit passive behaviors; a possible explanation for this situation might be that such kind of direct, obvious and active behaviors exhibited in organizations may constitute an offense within the regulations and there is a high probability to be penalized.

OCBs were frequently exhibited in schools. In the study of Yaylaci (2004), teachers and administrators stated that their colleagues generally exhibited OCBs. Also, in many studies about organizational citizenship behaviors, this kind of behavior of employees was examined. For example, in the research conducted by İşbaşı (2001) in the field of tourism, Loga (2003), in the military field and Unal (2003) in the field of education, the findings showed that the employees exhibited high levels of OCBs. Therefore, it is possible to say that the findings of this study are consistent with the above-mentioned studies. In addition, the results of this research support many studies conducted in the field of education. For example, Bas and Sentürk (2011), Bogler and Somech (2005), Cetin, Yesilbag and Akdag Cetin, Yesilbag, and Akdag (2003), Karaman, Yucel and Donder (2008), Nguni, Slegers and Denessen (2006) found that these behaviors were frequently exhibited by teachers in schools.

Research shows that female teachers in Turkey, compared to men, exhibit more OCBs. On the other hand, Aytac, Elma, and Cinkir (2019) have conducted a meta-analysis of the research on teachers' OCB and found that gender caused a minor difference in teachers' perceptions. These researchers have stated that not using the gender variable in future studies may be on the agenda.

According to the results of the research, most common behaviors, such as respecting the rights of others and not causing problems, are the most common OCBs. Courtesy behaviors, such as showing respect to others and avoiding problems were among the most common behaviors. Similarly, while OCBs were frequently exhibited in schools, conscientiousness behaviors, such as spending extra time and helping others, were relatively rare. Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994) defined courtesy as foresightful gestures that express kindness towards others. The focus of the courtesy behaviors is not the organization but the employees. Therefore, Turnipseed and Murkison (2000) indicated that such kinds of behaviors have a direct impact on employees and indirect impact on the organization. According to the researchers, the positive impact on the employees affects the organizational climate, and accordingly, this situation positively affects the organizational outcome and productivity. In this respect, courtesy behaviors that are exhibited frequently can make positive contributions to the school climate.

The findings showed that OCBs under the courtesy dimension significantly predicted the CVBs sub-dimension 'Abuse toward others'. The 'Courtesy' sub-dimension mostly consists of proactive behaviors, such as showing respect to others (Schnake, Cochran, & Dumler, 1995), protecting one's rights (Cilla, 2011) and warning others toward hazards (Deluga, 1994). In other words, behaviors related to taking precautions exhibited to avoid problems in the workplace are associated with courtesy. An employee who exhibits such kinds of behaviors is highly-likely to avoid behaviors of abusing others. The findings of the study also show similarities with the study conducted by Dunlop and Lee (2004). The researchers examined CWBs under two dimensions: 'individual-targeted' and 'organization-targeted'. In other words, they named the 'abuse toward others' dimension as 'CWB toward an individual'. The relevant study reported a negative and significant relationship between CWB toward an individual and OCBs.

The findings showed that there was a negative and significant relationship between the 'Courtesy' sub-dimension and 'Abuse toward Administrative Functioning' sub-dimension. 'Courtesy' represented the most important predictor of this sub-dimension. As mentioned previously, courtesy is associated with behaviors of preventing/avoiding problems, and therefore, it was expected to find a negative relationship with abuse toward administrative functioning behaviors. Civic virtue includes behaviors, such as being interested/sensitive towards experiences that occur within organizational processes and active participation in these processes (Organ, 1988). Examples of these behaviors include participation in problem-solving processes, work-related meetings, and administrative decision-making processes (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994). It can be seen that 'Civic Virtue' sub-dimension includes active participation in administrative processes, and in a way, these behaviors can also be described as supporting administrative functioning behaviors. Therefore, it can be assumed that an employee who exhibits civic virtue behaviors would avoid abuse toward administrative functioning behaviors. In this context, the findings of this study are consistent with the literature.

The findings of the study showed that the 'Courtesy' sub-dimension significantly predicted the 'Sabotage' sub-dimension. This finding indicated that the tendency of an employee -who exhibits courtesy behaviors, that include controlled (Allison et al., 2001) and proactive behaviors to avoid problems in the workplace (Cilla, 2011) to exhibit sabotage behaviors would be low, and this finding was also in line with the literature. Moreover, the findings of this study are consistent with Hafidz, Hoesni and Fatimah's (2012) findings to a certain extent. The aforementioned researchers also reported a negative and significant relationship between the sabotage sub-dimension and OCBs. The same study revealed that there was a negative and significant relationship between courtesy sub-dimension and CWBs.

The most important predictor of the 'Theft' sub-dimension was also the 'Courtesy' sub-dimension. This suggests that an employee who exhibits proactive behaviors to make positive contributions to the organization would also avoid 'Theft' behaviors targeted at the organization and employees. The findings of this study are in agreement with the findings of Hafidz et al. (2012). The researchers showed that there was a negative and significant relationship between both 'Theft' and OCBs and between 'Courtesy' and CWBs.

The findings showed that 'Conscientiousness', 'Courtesy' and 'Civic Virtue' dimensions significantly predicted the 'Withdrawal' sub-dimension. These results indicate that withdrawal behaviors will decrease with an increase in conscientiousness, courtesy and civic virtue behaviors. Conscientiousness is associated with avoiding violation of established rules in an organization and acting in compliance with work ethics. The examples of behaviors in this sub-dimension include complying with the work schedule, using the work time properly and effectively, and continuing to work (Barksdale & Werner, 2001). As presented, these behaviors are situated in the negative direction to the behaviors included in the 'Withdrawal' sub-dimension of CWBs, such as absence in work, non-compliance with working time and spending time for other activities during working. The same situation is also relevant for 'Courtesy' and 'Civic Virtue' sub-dimensions. Thus an employee who puts an effort to prevent problems and avoid creating problems is expected to have a low tendency to exhibit withdrawal behaviors. It can be argued that civic virtue behavior that includes active participation in the organization is the opposite of the withdrawal behavior that indicates self-isolation behaviors. Thus, it is possible to conclude that the findings of the study are consistent with the literature.

The conscientiousness and courtesy sub-dimensions significantly predicted the 'Abuse toward School Image' sub-dimension. The findings showed that an increase in conscientiousness and courtesy behaviors lead to a decrease in abuse toward school image sub-dimension behaviors. The 'Conscientiousness' sub-dimension represents the behaviors that are exhibited to protect and improve the pecuniary and non-pecuniary assets of the organization. Therefore a teacher who exhibits such behaviors is expected to avoid behaviors that may abuse the school image. Furthermore, courtesy is a sub-dimension that includes the controlled behavior of employees. A self-controlled employee is also expected to avoid exhibiting behaviors that may abuse the school image.

The 'Conscientiousness' and 'Courtesy' sub-dimensions were important predictors of the 'Abuse toward Schooling' sub-dimension. The 'Abuse toward Schooling' sub-dimension includes adverse behaviors, such as establishing negative communication with parents, refusing to cooperate with parents and informing them about the performance of the student. Thus, a teacher who exhibits conscientiousness and courtesy sub-dimensions is also expected to avoid 'Abuse toward Schooling' behaviors.

Although CWBs are not observed in schools very frequently, enhancing control mechanisms and disincentives would assist in improving the current situation. Furthermore, given the negative impacts of courtesy behaviors on CWBs, employees should be encouraged to follow the rules of courtesy in interpersonal relationships, and the issue should be highlighted by rewarding teachers who show successful performance.

Future studies on the current topic are needed to explore the relationship between CWBs in schools and various variables, including organizational commitment, organizational climate, personality types and leadership styles adopted by administrators. By this means, theoretical foundations towards preventing CWBs in schools will be enhanced and provide guidance to practitioners.

References

- Allison, B. J., Voss, R. S., & Dryer, S. (2001). Student classroom and career success: The role of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Education for Business*, 76(5), 282-288.
- Aquino, K., Douglas, S., & Martinko, M. J. (2004). Overt anger in response to victimization: Attributional style and organizational norms as moderators. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 9(2), 152-164.
- Aytac, T., Elma, C., & Cinkir, S. (2019). Effect of gender on teachers' organizational citizenship behavior: A meta-analysis. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 14(3).
- Balci, A. (2004). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma: Yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler*. Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Barksdale, K., & Werner, J. M. (2001). Managerial ratings of in-role behaviors, organizational citizenship behaviors, and overall performance: Testing different models of their relationship. *Journal of Business Research*, 51(2), 145-155.
- Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression*, 22(3), 161-173.

- Bas, G., & Senturk, C. (2011). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel vatandaşlık ve örgütsel güven algıları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 17(1), 29-62.
- Basim, H. N., & Sesen, H. (2006). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ölçeği uyarlama ve karşılaştırma çalışması. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 61(4), 83-101.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". *Academy of management journal*, 26(4), 587-595.
- Berry, C. M., Carpenter, N. C., & Barratt, C. L. (2012). Do other-reports of counterproductive work behavior provide an incremental contribution over self-reports? A meta-analytic comparison. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(3), 613-636.
- Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2005). Organizational citizenship behavior in school: How does it relate to participation in decision making? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(5), 420-438.
- Bulbul, G. (2013). *Havayolu taşımacılığında üretkenlik karşıtı davranışlar ve kabin görevlilerinin algısı üzerine bir araştırma*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- Buss, A. H. (1961). *The psychology of aggression*. NewYork: Wiley.
- Cetin, M., Yesilbag, Y., & Akdag, B. (2003). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı. *M.Ü. Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 17, 39-54.
- Cilla, M. J. (2011). *Exploring the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational climates for creativity*. (Master's thesis). San José State University The Faculty of the Department of Psychology, San Jose.
- Cokluk, O., Sekercioglu, G., & Buyukozturk, S. (2010). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik: SPSS ve LISREL uygulamaları*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241-1255.
- Deluga, R. J. (1994). Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67(4), 315-326.
- DiPaola, M. F., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). Organizational citizenship of faculty and achievement of high school students. *The high school journal*, 88(3), 35-44.
- Dogruoz, E., & Ozdemir, M. (2018). Eğitim örgütlerinde üretim karşıtı iş davranışları ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi. *İlköğretim Online*, 17(1), 396-413.
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of management journal*, 45(2), 331-351.

- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., Shaw, J. D., Johnson, J. L., & Pagon, M. (2006). The social context of undermining behavior at work. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 101(1), 105-126.
- Dunlop, P. D., & Lee, K. (2004). Workplace deviance, organizational citizenship behavior, and business unit performance: The bad apples do spoil the whole barrel. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 67-80.
- Farh, J.-L., Earley, P. C., & Lin, S.-C. (1997). Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative science quarterly*, 42(3), 421-444.
- Fox, S., & Stallworth, L. E. (2004). Racial/ethnic bullying: Exploring links between bullying and racism in the US workplace. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 66(3), 438-456.
- Giocalone, R. A., & Rosenfeld, P. (1987). Reasons for employee sabotage in the workplace. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1(4), 367-378.
- Greenberg, L., & Barling, J. (1999). Predicting employee aggression against coworkers, subordinates and supervisors: The roles of person behaviors and perceived workplace factors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 897-913.
- Gruys, M. L. (1999). *The dimensionality of deviant employee behavior in the workplace*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Minnesota University Industrial Relations Center, Minneapolis.
- Gualandri, M. (2012). *Counterproductive work behaviors and moral disengagement*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Sapienza University of Rome, Roma.
- Hafidz, S. W. M., Hoesni, S. M., & Fatimah, O. (2012). The relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Asian Social Science*, 8(9), 32-37.
- Isbaşı, J. O. (2001). Çalışanların yöneticilerine duydukları güvenin ve örgütsel adaletle ilişkili algılamalarının vatandaşlık davranışının oluşumundaki rolü. *Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(1), 51-73.
- Karaman, K., Yucel, C., & Donder, H. (2008). Öğretmen görüşlerine göre, okullardaki bürokrasi ile örgütsel vatandaşlık arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 53, 49-74.
- Kidwell Jr, R. E., & Kochanowski, S. M. (2005). The morality of employee theft: Teaching about ethics and deviant behavior in the workplace. *Journal of management education*, 29(1), 135-152.
- Loga, A. (2003). *Çalışanların demografik özelliklerinin örgütsel özdeşim, örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışına etkileri: Askeri birimlerde bir araştırma*. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Başkent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

- Low, K. D., Radhakrishnan, P., Schneider, K. T., & Rounds, J. (2007). The experiences of bystanders of workplace ethnic harassment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37*(10), 2261-2297.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance. *Journal of marketing, 57*(1), 70-80.
- Miles, D. E., Borman, W. E., Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). Building an integrative model of extra role work behaviors: A comparison of counterproductive work behavior with organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*(1-2), 51-57.
- Mount, M., Ilies, R., & Johnson, E. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology, 59*(3), 591-622.
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P., & Denessen, E. (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.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington-MA, England: Lexington Books.
- Ozdevecioglu, M. (2003). Algılanan örgütsel adaletin bireylerarası saldırgan davranışlar üzerindeki etkilerinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Erciyes üniversitesi iktisadi ve idari bilimler fakültesi dergisi, 21*, 77-96.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of marketing research, 31*(3), 351-363.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestion for future research. *Human performance, 10*(2), 133-151.
- Podsakoff, P. M., 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.
- Schnake, M., Cochran, D., & Dumler, M. (1995). Encouraging organizational citizenship: The effects of job satisfaction, perceived equity and leadership. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 7*(2), 209-221.
- Sezgin, F. (2005). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları: Kavramsal bir çözümleme ve okul açısından bazı çıkarımlar. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 25*(1), 317-339.

- Shore, L. M., & Shore, T. H. (1995). Perceived organizational support and organizational justice. *Organizational politics, justice, and support: Managing the social climate of the workplace*, 149, 164.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 434-443.
- Smith, C., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653-663.
- Spector, P. E. (2011). The relationship of personality to counterproductive work behavior (CWB): An integration of perspectives. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(4), 342-352.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 1-24.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2010). Counterproductive work behavior and organisational citizenship behavior: Are they opposite forms of active behavior? *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 59(1), 21-39.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., & Domagalski, T. (2006). Emotions, violence and counterproductive work behavior. In E. K. Kelloway, J. Barling, & J. Hurrell (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace violence* (pp. 29-46). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of vocational behavior*, 68(3), 446-460.
- Sumer, N. (2000). Yapısal eşitlik modelleri: Temel kavramlar ve örnek uygulamalar. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 3(6), 49-74.
- Turnipseed, D., & Murkison, G. (2000). Good soldiers and their syndrome: Organizational citizenship behavior and the work environment. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 2(2), 281-302.
- Unal, A. (2012). Deviant teacher behaviors and their influence on school rules and interpersonal relationships at school. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 49, 1-20.
- Unal, Z. (2003). *Öğretmenlerde iş doyum ve örgütsel vatandaşlık*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyon.
- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & Parks, J. M. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). *Research in Organizational Behavior: An Annual Series of Analytical Essays and Critical Reviews*, 17, 215-285.

- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of management journal*, 41(1), 108-119.
- Verona, E., Reed, A., Curtin, J. J., & Pole, M. (2007). Gender differences in emotional and overt/covert aggressive responses to stress. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression*, 33(3), 261-271.
- Yaylaci, A. F. (2004). *İlköğretim okulları yönetici ve öğretmenlerinin örgütsel yurttaşlık davranışları*. (Doktora tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

İlkokul Öğretmenlerinin Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışları ile Üretkenlik Karşıtı İş Davranışları Arasındaki İlişki

Atf:

- Akkaya, B. (2019). The relationship between primary school teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors and counter-productive work behaviors. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 84, 1-28, DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2019.84.1

Özet

Problem Durumu: Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları ve üretkenlik karşıtı iş davranışları örgütlerde rol fazlası davranışların iki farklı yönünü oluşturmaktadır. Üretkenlik karşıtı iş davranışı (ÜKİD) işgörenlerin örgüt içinde yaşadıkları olumsuz durumlar nedeniyle örgüte ve üyelerine zarar verme amacıyla yaptıkları davranışlar olarak tanımlanmaktadır (Spector & Fox, 2010). Örgütün ve işgörenlerin sağlığını tehlikeye atan, iş performansını düşüren, saldırganlık/hırsızlık/iş yapmama gibi örgütsel normları ihlal edici nitelikteki (Gualandri, 2012) ve zarar verme niyeti içeren (Dalal, 2005) gönüllü davranışlar ÜKİD olarak isimlendirilmektedir. Spector ve diğerleri (2006) ÜKİD kapsamına giren davranışların bireye yönelik ve örgüte yönelik üretkenlik karşıtı iş davranışları olmak üzere iki ana boyut altında (i) başkalarına zarar verme, (ii) üretime zarar verme, (iii) kundaklama, (iv) çalma ve (v) geri çekilme olmak üzere beş alt boyutta incelenebileceğini belirtmişlerdir. Eğitim örgütleri olan okullarda da öğretmenler ve yöneticiler arasında ÜKİD sergilenmektedir. Doğruöz ve Özdemir'in (2018) de belirttiği gibi, alanyazında öğretmen ve yöneticilerin okulun sahip olduğu maddi varlıklara zarar verme, taciz, hırsızlık, psikolojik yıldırma, işe devamsızlık gibi üretkenlik karşıtı iş davranışları sergilediklerine ve bu davranışların okullarda giderek yaygınlaştığına dair bulgulara rastlamak mümkündür. Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları ise "rol davranışlarından öte" davranışlardan oluşmakta ve "resmi ödül sistemi tarafından doğrudan veya açıkça tanımlanmayan ve örgütün etkin işleyişini teşvikeden isteğe bağlı bireysel davranışlar" olarak tanımlanmaktadır (Organ, 1988). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları, işgörenin örgütün etkin işleyişini doğrudan

destekleyici nitelik taşıyan isteğe bağlı davranışlarından oluşmaktadır (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994). Organ (1988) örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışını diğergamlık, nezaket, vicdanlılık, sivil erdem ve centilmenlik olarak beş boyutta incelemiştir. Bu araştırmada Organ'ın (1988) boyutlandırması temel alınmıştır. Okullarda örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının okulun işleyişine nitelikli katkılar sunarken, üretkenlik karşıtı iş davranışlarının ciddi boyutta zararlar verebileceği düşünülmektedir. Buradan hareketle örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının üretkenlik karşıtı iş davranışları üzerinde etkisinin olup olmadığı araştırılmaya değer bir konu olarak görülmüştür.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Bu araştırmanın amacı, kamu ilkokullarında görev yapan yönetici ve öğretmenlerin algılarına göre, öğretmenlerin sergiledikleri örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları ile üretkenlik karşıtı iş davranışları arasındaki ilişkiyi ortaya koymaktır. Bu genel amaç doğrultusunda aşağıdaki sorulara yanıt aranmıştır:

- 1) Okul yöneticilerinin ve sınıf öğretmenlerinin, öğretmenlerin sergilediği üretkenlik karşıtı iş davranışlarına ilişkin algıları; (i) başkalarına zarar verme, (ii) yönetsel işleyişe zarar verme, (iii) kundaklama, (iv) çalma, (v) geri çekilme, (vi) okulun imajına zarar verme ve (vii) eğitim-öğretime zarar verme boyutlarında ne düzeydedir?
- 2) Okul yöneticilerinin ve sınıf öğretmenlerinin, öğretmenlerin sergilediği örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına ilişkin algıları; (i) diğergamlık, (ii) vicdanlılık, (iii) centilmenlik, (iv) nezaket ve (v) sivil erdem boyutlarında ne düzeydedir?
- 3) Okul yöneticilerinin ve sınıf öğretmenlerinin algılarına göre örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışının alt boyutları üretkenlik karşıtı iş davranışlarının anlamlı bir yordayıcısı mıdır?

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Araştırma, ilişkisel tarama modelindedir. Araştırmanın örneklemini 2018-2019 eğitim-öğretim yılında Ankara'nın dokuz ilçesindeki kamu ilkokullarında görev yapan okul yöneticileri ve öğretmenlerden tabakalı örnekleme yöntemiyle alınmış ve buna bağlı olarak araştırmaya 360 okul yöneticisi ve 430 öğretmen katılmıştır. Veriler, araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilen Üretkenlik Karşıtı İş Davranışı Ölçeği ve Basım ve Şeşen (2006) tarafından geliştirilen Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışları Ölçeği ile toplanmıştır. ÜKİD Ölçeği'nin geliştirilmesi için ön uygulama yapılmıştır. Ön uygulama verileri Ankara ilinde resmi ilkokul ve ortaokullarda görev yapan 331'i öğretmen ve 82'si yönetici olmak üzere toplam 413 katılımcıdan toplanmıştır. Ölçeğin yapı geçerliğinin kontrolü için Açıklayıcı Faktör Analizi (AFA) yapılmıştır. Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışları Ölçeğinin yapısını eğitim kurumlarında çalışan öğretmen ve yöneticilerde de koruyup korumadığını test etmek amacıyla birinci düzey doğrulayıcı faktör analizi yapılmış ve uyum indekslerinin yeterli düzeyde olduğu görülmüştür. Verilerin analizinde aritmetik ortalama, standart sapma ve çoklu doğrusal regresyon analizi kullanılmıştır.

Araştırmanın Bulguları: Katılımcı algılarına göre okullarda öğretmenler, üretkenlik karşıtı iş davranışlarını neredeyse hiç sergilememektedir. Nadiren yaşanan durumlarda ise en çok geri çekilme ve başkalarına zarar verme, en az ise çalma boyutundaki davranışlar sergilenmektedir. Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının

okullarda sıklıkla sergilendiği, bunların içinde en sık sergilenen davranışların ise nezaket alt boyutundakiler olduğu belirlenmiştir. Örgütsel vatandaşlığın nezaket alt boyutu ÜKİD'in tüm alt boyutlarının anlamlı bir yordayıcısıdır. Bunun yanında ÖVD'nin vicdanlılık boyutu, ÜKİD'in kundaklama, geri çekilme, okulun imajına zarar verme ve eğitim öğretime zarar verme boyutlarının; sivil erdem boyutu ise yönetsel işleyişe zarar verme ve geri çekilme boyutlarının anlamlı birer yordayıcısıdır. ÜKİD'in en önemli yordayıcısı ÖVD'nin nezaket alt boyutu olmuştur.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri: Araştırma bulgularına dayalı olarak okullarda üretkenlik karşıtı iş davranışlarının çok yaygın olmadığı sonucuna varılmıştır. Bu davranışlar seyrek olarak yaşanmakla birlikte, görece en sık, geri çekilme ve başkalarına zarar verme davranışları ile karşılaşmaktadır. ÜKİD sergileyen öğretmenler ağırlıklı olarak kişilerle yüz yüze etkileşimi gerektirmeyen okulda mesai dışında zaman geçirmeme, dedikodu, yok sayma gibi pasif davranışlar sergilemektedir. Okullarda çalma, baskı uygulama, alay etme gibi somut ve birebir etkileşimi gerektiren davranışlarla pek karşılaşmamaktadır. Okullarda örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları oldukça yaygın olarak yaşanmaktadır. Bu davranışlar arasında başkalarının haklarına saygı duyma, sorun çıkarmama gibi nezaket davranışları en yaygın davranışlardır. Yine yaygın olarak yaşanmakla birlikte okul için ekstra zaman harcama, başkalarının işlerine yardım etme gibi vicdanlılık davranışları görece seyrek yaşanmaktadır. Okullarda nezaket, vicdanlılık ve sivil erdem boyutunda yer alan örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının ÜKİD davranışlarını önleyici veya azaltıcı etki yaptığı söylenebilir. Bu nedenle öğretmenlerin okuldaki ilişkilerinde nezaket kurallarına uymaları, yeri geldiğinde meslektaşlarına yardım etmeleri, okulun sorunlarının çözümünde aktif rol almaları teşvik edilmeli, bu konuda başarılı öğretmenler ödüllendirilerek konuya dikkat çekilmelidir. Okullarda ÜKİD'in örgütsel bağlılık, örgüt kültürü, örgüt iklimi, kişilik tipleri, yöneticilerin benimsediği liderlik tipleri gibi başka değişkenlerle ilişkileri de araştırma konusu edilmeli ve okullarda ÜKİD'in önlenmesine yönelik kuramsal temeller sağlanmalıdır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Üretkenlik karşıtı iş davranışı, örgütsel vatandaşlık, rol fazlası davranışlar.