Research Paper / Araştırma Makalesi

The Effects of Organizational Democracy on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors[1]

Mustafa Fedai ÇAVUŞ[2] & Mehmet BİÇER[3]

Abstract

The main purpose of this research is to test the effects of employees' perceptions of organizational democracy on their organizational citizenship behaviors. Accordingly, a research was conducted on 257 white-collar employee samples in enterprises operating in various sectors in Adana and Hatay provinces. Reliability tests of measures were carried out and the relations between concepts were examined with correlation and regression analysis. The results of the analysis revealed that there is a positive relationship between organizational democracy and organizational citizenship. Additionally, it has been determined that the components of organizational democracy have positive or negative effects on organizational citizenship behavior in general.

Key Words: Organizational Democracy, Organizational Citizenship, Corporate Performance

Örgütsel Demokrasinin Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışları Üzerindeki Etkileri

Öz

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı çalışanların örgütsel demokrasi algılarının örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları üzerindeki etkilerini test etmektir. Bu doğrultuda, Adana ve Hatay illerinde çeşitli sektörlerde faaliyet gösteren işletmelerdeki 257 beyaz yakalı çalışan örneklemi üzerinde bir araştırma gerçekleştirilmiştir. Ölçüm araçlarının güvenilirlik testleri yapılarak korelasyon ve regresyon analizleri ile ilişkiler incelenmiştir. Analiz sonuçları, örgütsel demokrasi ile örgütsel vatandaşlık arasında pozitif yönlü bir ilişki olduğunu göstermiştir. Aynı zamanda, örgütsel demokrasi bileşenlerinin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları üzerinde genel olarak pozitif veya negatif yönlü anlamlı etkiler yarattıkları da tespit edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Örgütsel Demokrasi, Örgütsel Vatandaşlık, Kurumsal Performans

---

[2] Prof. Dr. - Osmaniye Korkut Ata Üniversitesi / Kırgızistan-Türkiye Manas Üniversitesi, mfcavus@osmaniye.edu.tr
    ORCID: 0000-0002-2515-5805

[3] Dr. Öğr. Üyesi -Türkiye-Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi Turizm ve Otelcilik Meslek Yüksekokulu, mehmetbicer@kilis.edu.tr
    ORCID: 0000-0002-8868-4667

Introduction

On the basis of the concept of democracy, we come across as a form of government dominated by the nation (Duverger, 1993; Powley, Fry, Barrett, & Bright, 2004). In terms of organizations, this concept indicates that the employees or members of the organization have a voice in the management of the organization and in all stages of organizational affairs (Harrison, & Freeman, 2004). Forcadell (2005) argued that the application of the democratic organizational management philosophy on an organizational basis contributes to the organization's success. He has also stated that the idea of democratic management is also an indispensable element in terms of making the understanding of innovation dominant in organizations. Rizvi (2005) on the other hand, argues that organizational democracy brings together managerial factors such as mutual communication between the members of the organization and the management level, having a say in the decision-making process, the protection of individual rights and the transfer of thoughts to the other side freely. In this direction; It can be said that it is an indispensable element of organizational democracy that the opinions of the employees are directly or indirectly related to the members of the organization and that these views are taken into consideration by the management level in the management of the organization. For this reason, the concept of organizational democracy is closely related to the satisfaction of the members of the organization as they participate in the decisions regarding the organization. It is also important in terms of ensuring that the corporate performance increases in the future periods by contributing to the establishment of the sense of belonging.

Briefly, expressed in the form of belonging anywhere, the concept of citizenship is closely related to the rights and responsibilities created by the belonging to the individual (Graham, 1991). Organizational citizenship behavior patterns are generally expressed as behaviors that do not adhere to top management instructions and create value for the organization (Basım, & Şeşen, 2006). Organizational citizenship behaviors are included in the literature as supporting the goals that the organization wants to achieve, emphasizing cooperation among members of the organization and focusing on organizational goals rather than individual goals (Bateman, & Organ, 1983; Organ, & Ryan, 1995; Smith, Organ, & Near 1983). As with the concept of organizational democracy, organizational citizenship also contributes to increasing the organizational effectiveness (Walz, & Niehoff, 2000), enabling economic profitability to be sustained (Lin, Lyau, Tsai, Chen, & Chiu, 2010) and has positive influences on job satisfaction of members of the organization (Demirel, & Özçınar, 2009; Sezgin, 2005). As a result, organizational citizenship is the act of ensuring intra-organizational coordination that enables organizations to carry out their activities efficiently, eliminating possible problems during the execution of the activities, and that is effective in developing the skills of the organization members (Basım, & Şeşen, 2006). In this regard, it is possible to say that organizational citizenship has an active part in gaining competitive advantage over other organizational structures, developing the concept of organizational learning and increasing the loyalty levels of the members of the organization.

Conceptual Framework

Organizational Democracy

Organizational democracy, which is generally considered as a form of government, is called OD. The concept of OD has a very broad unity of meaning. The existence of various concepts used instead of OD is remarkable in the literature. These concepts are specified as employee participation, decision making, self-management, workplace democracy and employee control (McGregor, 2005; Unterrainer, Palgi, Weber, Iwonowa, & Oesterreich, 2011; Weber, Unterrainer, & Schmid, 2009; Verdorfer Weber, Unterrainer, & Seyr, 2012). OD is an approach that transfers the social responsibility obligations of organizations throughout the organization and regulates the job definitions in the organization (Tutar, & Sadykova, 2014). From this point of view, it is possible to say that OD is a structure that enables the understanding that respects the rights and interests of the members of the organization to affect all levels of the organization.

OD includes supporting the members of the organization in all matters, increasing their participation in organizational management and consequently maximizing employee performance. This participation indicates the existence of a democratic environment that is more permanent than a situation that arises depending on conditions (Weber et al. 2009). According to Forcadell (2005), OD is an administrative concept that aims to collect social, economic, ecological and personal goals in the same organization, aiming to create added value for the organization in future periods. The main objective of OD is to prevent unlimited and arbitrary use of the decision making process for the organization by those involved

in the management level of the organization. In fact, the basis of democratic understanding lies in bringing together the objectives of the organization's management level and the wishes of members of the organization (Fenwick, 2005).

OD is a structure that allows for a continuous exchange of information between employees and managers across the organization (Stohl, & Cheney, 2001). Mutual exchange of information provides advantages such as the continuous review of the organization's policies by the stakeholders in the decision-making process of the organizations and the possible problems that may arise due to the decisions taken by the organization's management level. In terms of the sustainability of OD, the existence of an environment that is not criticized and the organizational climate is important for organizations. In this way, it is ensured that personal goals are included in the process of decision-making and the rights of the organization are prevented from the arbitrary of the organization management (McPhee, 1988). Tutar and Sadykova (2014) stated that with the democratic climate, the demands of the members of the organization and their opposite views can be used as an input element in duration of decision-making and all stakeholders can also be undertaken in decisions that affect the future of the organization.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The concept of organizational citizenship is defined as the individual behavior of the volunteer basis, which helps all the units in the organization to operate efficiently (Organ, 1988). Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is also expressed as the positive behaviors exhibited by the members of the organization without the instruction of the top management, in other words, which the employees themselves decide whether or not to display the behaviors (George, 1992; Hunt, 1999).

OCB is a natural consequence of the willingness to help a colleague or organization throughout the organization, depending on the organization's social status or personality characteristics (Organ, 1990). OCBs are the forms of behavior that other members of the organization do not prefer to do, even though they have the right to do any organization members, such as finding flaws, revealing their negative feelings, talking about unimportant problems, and having discussion with other insiders of the organization (Bateman, & Organ, 1983; Bishop, Scott, & Burrugh, 2000). The essence of OCB consists of the behaviors of the employees such as participating in social activities, being innovative, completing the given tasks on time and supporting the members of the organization. In addition, the behavior of protecting the organization from possible problems that it may encounter, developing the skills of the members of the organization, establishing a socially active communication network (Turnipseed, 1996) are closely related to OCB. OCB is classified in two different ways in the literature (Baron, 2000; Farh, Early, & Lin, 1997). In the first, OCB is classified as contributing across the organization and actively participating in organizational activities. The second classification is related to avoiding situations that may negatively affect the organization. OCB that emerges in the form of contributing to the whole of the organization requires that members of the organization actively engage in organizational activities. Avoiding situations that may adversely affect the organization can be expressed as avoiding all actions and discourses that will harm the whole organization (Bolino, Bloodgood, & Turnley, 2002).

It has been suggested in the literature that organizational behavior consists of various dimensions. These can be categorized as individual effort, sincere behavior, personal initiative, helping individuals, loyalty. It is stated that these behaviors are based on informal rules and displayed by individuals in a certain order (Williams, & Anderson, 1991). Graham (1991) argued that OCB consists of three dimensions: organizational participation, organizational loyalty and organizational obedience. Organizational participation is about having information about the factors that may affect the overall organization, supporting the members of the organization in the personal control phase and encouraging the other organization members to take useful actions for the organization. Organizational loyalty is related to the higher level of efforts of the members of the organization to ensure the continuity of their own assets. Organizational obedience is related to individuals who have a sense of responsibility to recognize authority and to adapt (Graham, 1991, p. 258-262). Although there are many studies on OCB dimensions, it is seen that there is no consensus on the components in the literature. However, it was determined that the OCB dimensions-altruism, conscientiousness, civic virtue, courtesy and sportsmanship- included in the study of Organ (1988) are taken as basis in many studies (Deluga, 1994; Moorman, 1991; Niehoff, & Moorman, 1993; Tansky, 1993; Witt, 1991).

Organizational Democracy and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The join of employees in organizational determinations and their involvement in the forthcoming durations will enhance their favorable manners towards the organization. Joining the decision-making process affects how employees evaluate the equity and integrity of the operations, methods and transactions (Folger, 1977). The members of the democratic organizational constitutions will feel themselves as a component of the organization. In this case, organizational citizenship behavior of employees will be supported by keeping organizational interests above their own interests (Boxall, & Purcell, 2011).

It is stated that the democratic management approach that is settled throughout the organization affects the social climate of the organization and creates positive changes in the behaviors of the organization members. The increase in the behaviors originating from the democratic atmosphere in organization supports the development of the behaviors related to organizational citizenship and increases the organizational commitment (Geçkil, 2013). When employees notice that they are proceeded fairly, they see their citizenship behavior as a great way of repayment and gratitude to their organizations (Konovsky, & Pugh, 1994). Additionally, the chance to make advices and proposals, comments and criticize procedures and transactions indicates that administration esteems the benefits and claims of staff members and is willing to consider employees' offers and complaints. The positive and quality relations between managers and subordinates in a democratic working environment are directly related to organizational citizenship (Deluga, 1995; Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997).

The relationship between OCB and OD is generally under the influence of various factors. These factors are expressed as the characteristics of individuals, interpersonal relationships, the cultural structure of the organization and organizational trust (Karaaslan, Özler, & Kulaklıoğlu, 2009). In the literature it is mentioned that there are a considerable relations between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational democracy. Accordingly, it is possible to say that and OCB can be improved by becoming ten OD practices widespread across the organization. In addition, this situation may increase the overall performance of the organization (Geçkil, 2013). Overall, organizational citizenship allows employees to feel more responsible in their work. Because, organizational citizenship enables employees to own more both their organizations and their jobs (Harrison, & Edward, 2004) and therefore will be more willing to exhibit citizenship behavior.

Research Method

It is purposed to determine the effects of employees' perceptions of organizational democracy on organizational citizenship behaviors in this study in which organizational democracy elements are associated with organizational citizenship behaviors. This research on white-collar private sector employees is thought to provide meaningful and useful support for private sector employees and management at all levels as well as their contributions to academic fields. Before data analysis, data cleaning and control was carried out. It was checked whether there was any missing value or not; and finally no lost value was found. Afterwards, the findings were evaluated by supporting the research with reliability, correlation and regression analysis.

Population and Sampling

The data needed to examine the impacts of employees' perceptions of organizational democracy on organizational citizenship behaviors were tried to obtain a survey method from firs- hand data collection techniques. For this reason, 5 Likert type scale questionnaire consisting of 57 items regarding the perceptions of organizational democracy, organizational citizenship behaviors and also demographic properties of the participants was prepared. White-collar private sector employees working in enterprises operating in Adana and Hatay provinces consists the sample of the research. With a simple sampling method, a survey questionnaire was sent to 345 participants in total working in various sectors. Data of 257 participants from the questionnaires returned were included in the analysis of the study.

40.9% of the participants are women (n=105) and 59.01% are men (n=152). The majority of the participants are in the 29-35 age range (n=126) with a high rate of 49%. The participants in the 36-42 age range (n=81) supported the research with a rate of 31.5%. 27.2% of the participants are graduates from college (n=70), 46.7% from university (n=120) and 22.2% have master degree or doctorate (n=57). While 34.6% (n=89) of the participants have 7-10 years of experience in their organizations, 27.2% (n=70) have 10-15 years and 23% (n=59) have 4-6 years of experience.

Measures

Organizational democracy scale: The Organizational Democracy Scale (ODS) developed by Geçkil and Tikici in 2015 was preferred in this study in order to test employees' perceptions of organizational democracy. The scale consisting of 28 items in total and was designed as 5 sub-dimensions with 5-point Likert type. Scale consists of participation-criticism (8 items), transparency (6 items), justice (5 items), equality (6 items) and accountability (3 items) subscales. Geçkil and Tikici (2015) stated that the Cronbach Alpha value of this scale was 0.95. 5-point Likert scale from 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree was used to indicate the attitudes of the participants towards the expressions on the organizational democracy scale.

Organizational citizenship scale: In order to test the organizational citizenship behaviors of the participants, the Organizational Citizenship Scale which was originally formed by Dennis W. Organ (1988) and developed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) was used in this research. The scale consists of 24 expressions in total and has 5 sub-dimensions; alturism (5 items), conscientiousness (5 items), sportmanship (5 items), courtesy (5 items) and civic virtue (4 items). Podsakoff et al. tested that the sub-dimensions of the scale had Cronbach Alpha value between 0.70 and 0.85. 5-point Likert scale from 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree was used to indicate the attitudes of the participants towards the expressions on the organizational citizenship behavior scale.

Reliability Statistics

In order to state the internal consistency of the measurement tools used in the research, reliability analysis was performed with Cronbach's Alpha method. Cronbach's Alpha value for the organizational democracy scale was determined to be 0.845. Cronbach's Alpha values of participation-criticism, transparency, justice and accountability subscales are respectively; $\alpha=0.957$, $\alpha=0.948$, $\alpha=0.923$, $\alpha=0.417$ and $\alpha=0.927$. Since the reliability value of the equality sub-dimension is low ($\alpha=0.417$), it was not included in the analyzes. According to alpha values, internal consistencies for other components are reliable ($\alpha> 0.70$) (Nunnaly, 1978).

Cronbach's Alfa for the organizational citizenship scale was determined to be 0.868. Cronbach's Alpha values of altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civil virtue subscales are respectively; $\alpha = 0.920$, $\alpha = 0.827$, $\alpha = 0.847$, $\alpha = 0.845$ and $\alpha = 0.945$. Internal consistencies for all sub-dimensions according to alpha values are reliable ($\alpha> 0.70$) (Nunnaly, 1978).

Results

Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis results revealed the existence of statistically significant relationships between the sub-dimensions of OD and all components of OCB at the level of 0.01 significance. Correlation coefficients of the sub-dimensions in Table 1. indicated that all components of OD were expressively and positively related to all sub-dimensions of OCB, except for the component of sportsmanship (-0.458; -0.390; -0.468; -0.424; p <0.01). In general, as the level of positive perception created by the democratic management approaches of organizations increases throughout the organization, the same level of positive developments can be observed in the employees' behavior towards seeing themselves as a part of the organization unconditionally.

Table 1. *Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations*

	Ort.	St. Sap	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 Participation-Criticism	3,42	,902	1	,865**	,838**	,835**	,431**	,496**	-,458**	,432**	,676**
2 Transparency	3,52	,987		1	,860**	,861**	,357**	,442**	-,390**	,414**	,620**
3 Justice	3,20	1,068			1	,866**	,369**	,438**	-,468**	,454**	,674**
4 Accountability	3,18	1,080				1	,364**	,435**	-,424**	,487**	,614**
5 Altruism	3,90	,764					1	,677**	-,517**	,622**	,601**
6 Conscientiousness	3,89	,785						1	-,514**	,599**	,674**
7 Sportsmanship	3,23	,933							1	-,519**	-,572**
8 Courtesy	3,91	,716								1	,567**
9 Civil Virtue	3,63	1,016									1

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Analysis

According the indications in Table 2., F values of all regression models created in the analyzes is being valid at the level of 0.000 significance presents that the research model is valid and significant. Consequently, organizational democracy is a meaningful explanatory of organizational citizenship behaviors. Considering the corrected R2 values, it is understood that the organizational democracy components explain approximately 19% of the changes in the altruism, 19% of the conscientiousness, 25% of the sportsmanship, 25% of the courtesy, and 50% of the civil virtue. The significance levels of p <0.01 indicate the significance of all regression models established in the analyzes. On the other hand, the standardized beta coefficients in the table show that organizational democracy dimensions have positive and negative directions and generally significant effects on organizational citizenship behaviors. Participation-criticism affects employees' altruism, conscientiousness and civil virtue behaviors positively and affects sportsmanship behaviors negatively. The perception of justice creates negative effects on sportsmanship behaviors and positive effects on civil virtue behaviors. In addition, courtesy is affected positively by accountability.

Table 2. *Regression Analysis Findings*

Model	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	St. Beta	R²	F		Sig.
1	Participation-Criticism Transparency Justice Accountability	Alturism	,450 -,115 ,063 -,033	,188	14,575	,000	,000 ,404 ,604 ,801
2	Participation-Criticism Şeffaflık Justice Accountability	Conscientiousness	,418 ,001 ,052 ,040	,248	20,736	,000	,001 ,995 ,678 ,753
3	Participation-Criticism Transparency Justice Accountability	Sportsmanship	-,325 ,249 -,367 -,049	,244	20,348	,000	,007 ,061 ,004 ,700
4	Participation-Criticism Transparency Justice Accountability	Courtesy	,093 -,140 ,150 ,400	,245	20,495	,000	,441 ,291 ,295 ,002
5	Participation-Criticism Transparency Justice Accountability	Civil Virtue	,416 -,064 ,409 -,032	,497	62,349	,000	,000 ,554 ,000 ,756

Discussion and Conclusion

It was basically intended to analyze the effects of employees' perceptions of organizational democracy on organizational citizenship behaviors in this research. For this purpose, correlations and simple regression analyzes were performed to test the relationships among the variables and their components. The outcomes of correlation analysis put forth that there are positive and statistically significant relationships between sub-dimensions of both OD and OCB. The correlation between the variables reveals that the perception of OD creates positive contributions in OCB. More clearly, as the level of positive perception created by democratic management practices increases, there will be positive changes in the behavior of employees, depending on the fact that they feel part of the organization unconditionally.

According to regression analyses, the values of F are valid at the level of sig. 0.000 indicates the validity and significant of the research model and also reveals that organizational democracy is a meaningful descriptor of OCBs. Additionally it has been understood that the dimensions of OD have generally significant, positive or negative effects on OCBs. While participation-criticism has positive effects on the altruism, conscience and civil virtue behaviors of employees. However it has and negative effects on sportsmanship behaviors.

The perception of justice has negative effects on sportsmanship behavior, but it has positive effects on civil virtue behaviors. Accountability has also been tested to only affect courtesy behaviors positively. In the context of these statistics, it can be express that the positive organizational citizenship behaviors of

the employees also stem from the perceptions of organizational democracy. The studies conducted by Geçkil and Tikici (2016) on hospital employees and Barutçu (2019) on private bank employees supports the findings of this research. In their study, where they found significant relationships between concepts, Geçkil and Tikici (2016) and Barutçu (2019) stated that the perception of OD positively affected OCB. Additionally, Ahmed, Adeel, Ali and Rehman (2018) tried to identify the effects of organizational democracy on commitment, citizenship, and turnover intentions under the mediator role of organizational justice in their research model. The authors found that democratization in the workplace increased employee commitment, citizenship behaviors and reduced the turnover intentions.

The level of organizational citizenship can also be increased as a result of the fact that the members of the organization feel themselves as citizens of the organization and have sense of belonging. However, in order to realize this situation, the steps that will reveal or strengthen the perception of democracy in the minds of the members of the organization must be taken by the management level. It can be inferred from this study that organizational democracy is an considerable factor that can be utilized by managers to encourage the positive behaviors of staff members and improve the sense of belonging and citizenship they feel against their organizations, which will positively affect organizational performance.

This study, which intends to subscribe to the literature in both theoretical and practical terms, contains some limitations as in every study. It has been observed that individuals who share the same working environment tend to give similar answers to questionnaire expressions. In addition, the fact that the practice was carried out only on white-collar employees prevented the issue from being handled comparatively in terms of blue and white-collar employees. Some suggestions are made with this study, which is thought to provide support for similar studies and studies to be conducted in the future. It is recommended to keep the field of application wider, not to limit the sample to only white-collar workers, to include data that will allow comparative evaluations, to diversify research with different variables, and to use different research, sampling and analysis methods.

Ethical Declaration

During the writing process of the study titled *"The Effects of Organizational Democracy on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors",* scientific rules, ethics and citation rules were followed; no falsification was made on the collected data and this study was not sent to any other academic publication for evaluation. Since the data of this study were collected before 01.01.2020, the decision of the ethics committee is not obligatory.

References

Ahmed, K., Adeel, A., Ali, R., & Rehman, R. U. (2018). Organizational democracy and employee outcomes: The mediating role of organizational justice. *Business Strategy And Development, 2*(3), 204-2019. doi: 10.1002/bsd2.55

Baron, J. (2000). *Thinking and deciding.*(3th. Ed.). London: Cambridge University Press.

Basım, H., & Şeşen, H. (2006). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ölçeği uyarlama ve karşılaştırma çalışması. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi, 61*(4), 83-101. Erişim adresi: https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ausbf/issue/3215/44758

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. doi: 10.2307/255908

Bishop J. W., Scott K. D., & Burrughs S. M. (2000). Support, commitment, and employee outcomes in a team environment. *Journal of Management, 26*(6), 1113-1132. doi: 10.1177/014920630002600603

Bolino, M. C., Bloodgood, J. M., & Turnley, W. H. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *The Academy of Management Review, 27*(4), 505-522.doi: 10.5465/AMR.2002.7566023

Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2011). *Strategy and human resource management*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Deluga, R. J. (1994). Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 67*(4), 315-326. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8325.1994.tb00570.x

Deluga, R. J. (1995). The relationship between attributional charismatic leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25*(18), 1652-1669. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1995.tb02638.x

Demirel, Y., & Özçınar, M. F. (2009). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışının iş tatmini üzerine etkisi: Farklı sektörlere yönelik bir araştırma. *İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 23*(1), 129-145. Erişim adresi: https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/atauniiibd/issue/2695/35488

Duverger, M. (1993). Siyasi rejimler. İkinci Baskı. (Çev:Yaşar Gürbüz). Ankara: Remzi Kitabevi.

Fahr, 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*, 421-44. doi: 10.2307/2393733

Fenwick, T. (2005). Conceptions of critical HRD: Dilemmas for theory and practice. *Human Resource Development International, 8*(2), 225-238. doi: 10.1080/13678860500100541

Folger, R., (1977). Distributive and procedural justice: Combined impact of "voice" and improvement on experienced inequity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*(2), 108-119. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.35.2.108

Forcadell, F. J. (2005). Democracy, cooperation and business success: The case of Modragon Corporacion Cooperativa. *Journal of Business Ethics, 56*, 255-274. doi: 10.1007/s10551-004-5094-5

Geçkil, T. (2013). Örgütsel demokrasi ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki: TRB1 bölgesindeki üniversite hastanelerinde bir uygulama (Doktora Tezi). Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sivas.

Geçkil, T., & Tikici, M. (2015). Örgütsel demokrasi ölçeği geliştirme çalışması. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi, 48*(4), 41-77. Erişim adresi: https://toad.halileksi.net/olcek/orgutsel-demokrasi-olcegi

Geçkil, T., & Tikici, M. (2016). Hospital employees' organizational democracy perceptions and its effects on organizational citizenship behaviors. *Asian Pacific Journal Of Health Sciences, 3*(2), 123-13. doi: 10.21276/apjhs.2016.3.2.23

Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 4*(4), 249-270. doi: 10.1007/BF01385031

George, J. M. (1992). The role of personality in organizational life: Issues and evidence. *Journal of Management, 18*, 185-213. doi: 10.1177/014920639201800201

Harrison, J. S., & Freeman, R. E. (2004). Is organizational democracy worth the effort? *Academy of Mangement Perspectives, 18*(3), 49-53. doi: 10.5465/AME.2004.14776168

Hunt, C. (1999). Candlesticks and faces: Aspects of lifelong learning. *Studies in the Education of Adults, 31*(2), 197-209. doi: 10.1080/02660830.1999.11661412

Karaaslan, A., Özler, D. E., & Kulaklıoğlu, A. S. (2009). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ve bilgi paylaşımı arasındaki ilişkiye yönelik bir araştırma. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 11*(2), 135-160. Erişim adresi: https://iibfdergi.aku.edu.tr/pdf/11_2/7.pdf

Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D., (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *The Academy of Management Journal, 37*(3), 656-669. doi: 10.2307/256704

Lin, C. P., Lyau, N. M., Tsai, Y. H., Chen, W.Y., & Chiu, C. K. (2010). Modeling corporate citizenship and its relationship with organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics, 95*, 357-372. doi: 10.1007/s10551-010-0364-x

McGregor, N. L. (2005). *The contribution of workplace democracy to organizational change* (Doctoral Dissertation). Walden University. Minneapolis, Minnesota

McPhee, R. D. (1988). Vertical communication chains: Toward an integrated approach. *Management Communication Quarterly, 1*, 455-493. doi: 10.1177/0893318988001004002

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(6), 845-855. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.76.6.845

Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Academy of Management Journal, 36*(3), 527-556. doi: 10.2307/256591

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizen ship behavior. In B. M. Staw, & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 43-72). Greenwich: JAI Press.

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*(4), 775-802. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors, and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satsifaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly, 1*(2), 107-142. doi: 10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7

Powley, E. H., Fry, R. E., Barrett, F. J., & Bright, D. S. (2004). Dialogic democracy meets command and control: Transformation through the appreciative ınquiry summit. *Academy of Management Executive, 18*(3), 67-80. doi: 10.5465/ame.2004.14776170

Rizvi, F. (2005). In defence of organizational democracy. In Smyth, J. (Ed.), *Critical Perspectives on Educational Leadership*, (pp.138-155). Routledge, London: Psychology Press

Sezgin, F. (2005). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları: Kavramsal bir çözümleme ve okul açısından bazı çıkarımlar. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 25*(1), 317-339. Erişim adresi: http://www.gefad.gazi.edu.tr/tr/pub/issue/6757/90884

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*(4), 653-663. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653

Stohl, C., & Cheney, G. (2001). Participatory processes/paradoxical practices: Communication and the dilemmas of organizational democracy. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*(3), 349-407. doi: 10.1177/0893318901143001

Tansky, J. W. (1993). Justice and organizational citizenship behavior: What is the relationship? *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 6*(3), 195-207. doi: 10.1007/BF01419444

Turnipseed, D. L. (1996). Organization citizenship behaviour: An examination of the influence of the workplace. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 17*(2), 42-47. doi: 10.1108/01437739610111222

Tutar, H,. & Sadykova, G. (2014). Örgütsel demokrasi ve örgütsel muhalefet arasındaki ilişki üzerine bir inceleme. *Journal of Business Science, 2*(1), 1-6. doi: 10.22139/ibd.26606

Unterrainer, C., Palgi, M., Weber, W. G., Iwonowa, A., & Oesterreich, R. (2011). Structurally anchored organizational democracy: Does it reach the employee? *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 10*(3), 118-132. doi: 10.1027/1866-5888/a000038

Verdorfer, A. P., Weber, W. G., Unterrainer, C., & Seyr, S. (2012). The relationship between organizational democracy and socio-moral climate: exploring effects of the ethical context in organizations. *Economic and Industrial Democracy, 34*(3),423-449. doi: 10.1177/0143831X12450054

Walz, S. M., & Niehoff, B. P. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: Their relationship to organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 24*(3), 301-319. doi: 10.1177/109634800002400301

Weber, W. G., Unterrainer, C., & Schmid, B. E. (2009). The influence of organizational democracy on employees' socio-moral climate and prosocial behavioral orientations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30*(8), 1127-1149. . doi: 10.1002/job.615

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17*(3), 601-617. doi: 10.1177/014920639101700305

Witt, L. A. (1991). Exchange ideology as a moderator of job attitudes: Organizational citizenship behaviors relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21*(18), 1490-1501. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1991.tb00483.x

TÜRKÇE GENİŞ ÖZET

Genel olarak bir yönetim biçimi şeklinde değerlendirilmekte olan demokrasinin örgütsel bazda uygulanmasına örgütsel demokrasi adı verilmektedir. Çok geniş bir anlam bütünlüğüne sahip olan örgütsel demokrasi kavramının yerine alanyazında kullanılagelen muhtelif kavramların varlığı dikkat çekmektedir. Bu kavramlar: (i) işgören katılımı, (ii) karar vermeye katılım, (iii) kendi kendini yönetme, (iv) işyeri demokrasisi ve (vi) çalışan kontrolü olarak kategorize edilebilir (McGregor, 2005; Verdorfer, Weber, Unterrainer ve Seyr, 2012; Weber, Schmid, Unterrainer, 2009; Unterrainer, Palgi, Weber, Iwonow ve Oesterreich, 2011). Örgütsel demokrasi kavramı, örgütsel faaliyetlere yönelik alınan kararlarda sorumluluğun çalışanlar arasında paylaştırılması ve stratejik açıdan çalışanların tüm süreçlere dâhil edilmesi anlamını taşımaktadır (Drucker, 1999). Ayrıca örgütsel demokrasi, örgütlerin sosyal sorumluluk yükümlülüklerini örgüt geneline aktaran ve örgüte ait görev tanımlarına düzenleme getiren bir yaklaşımdır (Tutar ve Sadykova, 2014). Örgütsel vatandaşlık kavramı, örgütte yer alan tüm birimlerin verimli biçimde faaliyetlerini sürdürmesine yardımcı olan ve temelinde gönüllülük esasının birey davranışı olarak tanımlanmıştır (Organ, 1988). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranış kalıpları genel olarak üst yönetimin talimatına bağlı olmayan ve örgüt için değer yaratıcı davranışlar olarak ifade edilmektedir (Basım ve Şeşen, 2006). Örgütsel vatandaşlık kavramının örgütsel demokrasi kavramında olduğu gibi örgütsel etkinliğin artırılmasına katkıda bulunduğu (Walz ve Niehoff, 2000), ekonomik açıdan sürdürülebilir karlılığa imkân tanıdığı (Lin, Lyau, Tsai, Chen ve Chiu, 2010) ve ayrıca örgüt üyelerinin iş tatmini üzerinde de olumlu etkisinin olduğu (Sezgin, 2005; Demirel ve Özçınar, 2009) görülmektedir. Örgütsel demokrasinin örgüt genelinde yerleşik bir anlayış haline gelmesiyle birlikte bu durumun örgütün sosyal iklimini etkilediği ve örgüt üyelerinin davranışlarında da olumlu değişimler yarattığı ifade edilmektedir. Demokratik ortamdan kaynaklı davranışların artış göstermesi örgütsel vatandaşlığa ilişkin davranışlarında gelişmesine destek olmakta ve örgütsel bağlılığı artırmaktadır (Geçkil, 2013). Örgütsel vatandaşlık ve örgütsel demokrasi arasındaki ilişki genel olarak çeşitli faktörlerin etkisi altındadır. Bu faktörler bireylerin özellikleri, kişilerarası ilişkiler, örgütün kültürel yapısı ve örgütsel güven şeklinde ifade edilmektedir (Karaaslan, Özler ve Kulaklıoğlu, 2009).

Örgütsel demokrasi unsurları ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının ilişkilendirildiği bu çalışmada, çalışanların örgütsel demokrasi algılarının örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları üzerindeki etkilerini belirlemek amaçlanmaktadır. Değişkenler arası ilişkileri incelemek amacıyla istatistiki analizlerde kullanılan veriler, çeşitli sektörlerde çalışan toplam 257 beyaz yakalı çalışandan, kolayda örneklem yöntemi ve anket tekniği ile elde edilmiştir. Katılımcılardan sağlanan bu verilerde kayıp değer olup olmadığını kontrol etmek amacıyla, öncelikle veri temizliği ve kontrolü yapılmış ve nihayetinde kayıp değere rastlanmamıştır. Daha sonra güvenilirlik, korelasyon ve regresyon analizleriyle araştırma desteklenmiş olup, bulgular değerlendirilmiştir.

Korelasyon analizi sonuçları, örgütsel demokrasi alt boyutları ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasında pozitif yönlü ve istatistiki olarak anlamlı ilişkiler olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu bağlamda, organizasyonların demokratik yönetim anlayışlarının örgüt genelinde yaratmış olduğu olumlu algı düzeyi arttıkça, çalışanların kayıtsız şartsız kendilerini örgütün bir parçası olarak görme yönündeki davranışlarında da olumlu yönde değişimler görülebilir. Regresyon analiz sonuçları, kurulan araştırma modelinin anlamlı

olduğunu ve örgütsel demokrasi algısının örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının anlamlı bir açıklayıcısı olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Bunula birlikte, örgütsel demokrasi boyutlarının örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları üzerinde genel olarak anlamlı, olumlu veya olumsuz etkilere sahip olduğu anlaşılmıştır. Katılım-eleştiri boyutu çalışanların özgecilik, vicdanlılık ve sivil erdem davranışları üzerinde olumlu, centilmenlik davranışlarında ise olumsuz etkilere sahiptir. Adalet boyutu centilmenlik davranışlarında olumsuz etkiler yaratırken; sivil erdem davranışlarında ise olumlu etkiler yaratmaktadır. Hesap verebilirlik boyutunun ise sadece nezaket davranışlarını olumlu yönde etkilediği test edilmiştir. Bu istatistikler bağlamında, çalışanların örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının belirli oranlarda örgütsel demokrasi algılarından kaynakladığını söyleyebiliriz.

Bu çalışma ile hem teorik hem de pratik anlamda alan yazına katkı sağlamak hedeflenmiş olup; her çalışmada olduğu gibi bu çalışma da bazı kısıtlar içermektedir. Aynı çalışma ortamını paylaşan bireylerin anket ifadelerine benzer cevaplar verme eğiliminde oldukları görülmüştür. Ayrıca, uygulamanın sadece beyaz yakalı çalışanlar üzerinde yapılması, mavi ve beyaz yakalı çalışanlar bakımından konunun karşılaştırmalı olarak ele alınmasına engel teşkil etmiştir. Gelecek dönemlerde yapılacak olan benzer çalışma ve araştırmalara destek sağlayacağı düşünülen bu çalışma ile birtakım önerilerde bulunulmaktadır. Uygulama alanının daha geniş tutulması, örneklemin sadece beyaz yakalı çalışanlarla sınırlanmaması, karşılaştırmalı değerlendirmelere imkân sağlayacak verilere yer verilmesi, farklı değişkenlerle araştırmaların çeşitlendirilmesi, farklı araştırma, örnekleme ve analiz yöntemlerinin kullanılması önerilmektedir.

Beyaz yakalı özel sektör çalışanları üzerinde gerçekleştirilen bu çalışmanın, akademik yazına sunacağı teorik ve pratik katkıların yanı sıra farklı özel sektör çalışanları için de anlamlı ve yararlı destekler sunacağı düşünülmektedir.