

Analysis of the Relationship between Corporate Image and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Context of Configuration Theory: A Case Study in the Organized Industrial Zone

DOI: 10.26466/opus. 914020

*

Özlem Işık*

* Assoc.Prof., Erciyes University, Faculty of Communication, Public Relations and Publicity Department

E-Mail: ogulluoglu@erciyes.edu.tr

ORCID: [0000-0002-1455-3154](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1455-3154)

Abstract

This research aims to study the relationship between corporate image and organizational citizenship behavior in the context of configuration theory. Emphasizing that there are no general rules for businesses with different strategies and structures in different environments, configuration theory suggests that the highest organizational performance can be succeeded through different configurations produced by some methods. In this context, the positive corporate image perceptions of the employees of the organization will be analyzed within the scope of the study, which positively affects the organizational citizenship behavior. For this purpose, a survey was conducted with 53 food company employees operating in the Organized Industrial Zone in Kayseri. The results of the research revealed that employees whose corporate image is perceived positively by internal stakeholders develop a strong organizational citizenship behavior, which is a concrete indicator that organizational performance configurations can be maximized in organizations that basically build a positive image. In addition, the importance of choosing the appropriate configuration between the strategy and structure components of the organizations was once again revealed in this study. In this context, in the first part of the study, configuration theory, in the second part the concept of corporate image, and in the third part, an evaluation will be made in the context of domestic and foreign literature on organizational citizenship behavior. In the research part of the study, 53 food company employees and the effect of corporate image perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior will be analyzed in the context of various configurations.

Keywords: *Configuration Theory, Corporate Image, Organizational Citizenship Behavior*

Kurumsal İmaj ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Arasındaki İlişkinin Konfigürasyon Teorisi Bağlamında Analizi: Organize Sanayi Bölgesinde Bir Uygulama

*

Öz

Bu araştırma, kurumsal imaj ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ilişkisini konfigürasyon teorisi bağlamında araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Farklı ortamlarda, değişik stratejilere ve sistemlere sahip kurumlar için standart kuralların olamayacağını savunan konfigürasyon teorisi, istenen düzeydeki örgüt performansına çeşitli yöntemlerle üretilen konfigürasyonlar aracılığı ile ulaşılabileceğini varsayar. Bu bağlamda çalışmamızda kurum çalışanlarının olumlu kurumsal imaj algılarının örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışına olumlu etki eden konfigürasyonları analiz edilmeye çalışılacaktır. Bu amaçtan hareketle çalışmada Kayseri ilinde Organize Sanayii bölgesinde faaliyet gösteren 53 gıda firması çalışanları ile bir anket çalışması gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırma sonuçları iç paydaşlar tarafından kurumsal imajı olumlu algılayan çalışanların, örgütlerine yönelik güçlü bir örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı geliştirmekte olduklarını ortaya koymuştur. Söz konusu bu durum ayrıca örgütsel performans konfigürasyonlarının olumlu imaja sahip kurumlarda yüksek olabileceğinin de bir göstergesi niteliğindedir. Ayrıca çalışmada örgütlerin strateji ve yapı bileşenleri arasında uygun konfigürasyon seçiminin önemi birkez daha ortaya konmuştur. Bu bağlamda çalışmanın birinci bölümünde konfigürasyon teorisi, ikinci bölümde kurumsal imaj kavramı üçüncü bölümde ise örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışına ilişkin yerli ve yabancı literatüre bağlamında bir değerlendirme yapılacaktır. Çalışmanın araştırma bölümünde ise 53 gıda firması çalışanları ile kurumsal imaj algılarının örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışına olan etkisi çeşitli konfigürasyonlar bağlamında analiz edilecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Konfigürasyon Teorisi, Kurumsal İmaj, Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı

Introduction

Organizations go beyond just prioritizing profit goals and adapt to configurations in which they will perform high by achieving corporate image, social benefit, social responsibility and organizational citizenship behavior. In particular, corporate image and organizational citizenship behavior are the products of the organization's relationship with its internal and external climate. At the same time, there are important organizational outcomes regarding the relations between stakeholders, which are components of the environment, and the organization. Therefore, at this stage, theoretically, the link between corporate image and organizational citizenship behavior is established in the context of configurative theory. This is because configurative theory aims to achieve stable structures that will ensure a high degree of harmony between the employee and the organization in order to achieve organizational goals. In order to achieve these goals and a correct organizational design, it is necessary to develop a strategy in line with the organizational objectives and goals to design configurations suitable for this strategy to be adopted. It is seen as a situation that needs to be emphasized strategically, under which conditions and under which structural features the organizations will need to choose the appropriate configuration. Because the increase in the effectiveness level of the configuration approach for organizations depends on internal consistency and is compatible with the patterns of relevant strategic, structural and contextual factors (Doty et al.,1993, p.1196). For this purpose, in order to solve the conflicts, is it possible to choose an appropriate common configuration depending on the relationships and preferences between the strategy and the building components? In the introduction part, organizational configuration-configuration approach and determining the strategically appropriate configuration are discussed in order to solve the basic challenges of the study. In this section, the concept of organizational citizenship behavior is discussed. Since the main determinant point of the study is to reveal the regulatory effect of configuration theory in the effect of organizational image on organizational citizenship behavior, concepts have been tried to be examined in a theoretical framework together with the interaction between strategy and structure. In the third part of the

study, the role of corporate image in employees' acquisition of organizational citizenship behavior is tried to be evaluated in the context of the results of the research conducted with 53 food company employees.

The Concept of Configuration Theory

With the emergence of industrial economies and globalization, the competitive environment in which organization are located is getting more difficult. In this environment, businesses must have competitive advantage in order to survive. Emphasizing that there are no general rules for businesses with different strategies and structures in different environments, configuration theory has become a remarkable topic in organizational literature both in terms of its increasing importance and the level of influence of organizations in accordance with the ideal organizational literature.

Configurations are expressed as a set of sets that are internally compatible and common to features or relationships (Kabadayı, 2005). Organizations having a specific purpose, focusing on goals and objectives, having a target market, providing resources, the necessity of coordinating organizational design and relations between employees are important factors for the formation of configurations (Miller and Whitney, 1999, p.5). In other words, configurations are groupings formed by the characteristics of organizational strategies, structures and environments.

The strategic management that started with Chandler in the 1960s was the biggest factor in the formation of this idea. The creator of the theory is Mintzberg. In the words of Mintzberg (1993, p.331), the configuration approach is a prerequisite for evaluating all internal (dependent) and external (independent) variables together. Mintzberg explains the point the configuration theory has reached with the "typology approach" conceptually. In the typology of Mintzberg (1993), coordination mechanisms are discussed as follows in terms of the basic parts of the organizational structure - centrality and decentralization dimensions, determining the relationships of power and dependency within the organization and directly affecting decision-making systems:

Coordination Mechanisms: The coordination mechanisms defined by Mintzberg (1993) as "the magic that holds the organization together" fulfill the function of integrating the tasks and activities that differ as a result of specialization and division of labor:

Basic Divisions of the Organization: Among the configuration dimensions defined in Mintzberg's configuration model, the basic parts of the organization, technical structure, support staff, middle level management (middleline) and operating core. It consists of elements. According to this model, the top management, called "managers of managers" (Mintzberg, 1993, p.9), is located at the strategic summit.

Centralization - Decentralization: One of the design parameters of Mintzberg (1979; 1980; 1993), decentralization is associated with the extent to which the decision-making power in the organization is spread to the employees of the organization. In this context, Mintzberg discussed decentralization in four dimensions and determined five different parameters as a result of the dimensioning. Among these dimensions, the vertical decentralization dimension indicates to what extent official power is transferred to the lower layers of the hierarchy, and horizontal decentralization indicates to what extent informal power is spread outside the chain of command, for example, to the core of activity or support units. In addition, Mintzberg classified decentralization as selective and parallel. While the power in dissociative centralization spreads to different places for different decisions, in parallel decentralization, the power required for different decisions is concentrated in the same place (Mintzberg, 1980).

As can be seen in Mintzberg's classification, the configurational theory indicates that the high organizational performance can be succeeded through configurations made by some kinds of different methods and the causal relationships between the factors affecting the organization are not linear; It suggests that environmental and structural conditions exist by interacting in a dynamic process. In other words, according to the configuration approach, while the organization tries to adapt to the external environment, it is also affected by the environment in which its own strategies, structural variables and decision components are located (Miller, 1987, p.691). These environmental and structural conditions contribute to

the formation of technology, strategies and configurations according to Miller (1987, p.686). Miller argues that the level of all contributions made is not the same, because there are some constraints and obligations that the organization has. For example, the uncertainty of the customers' typologies and the unpredictability of their expectations can be described as an "environmental imperative" that organizations may fall under due to the nature and degree of competition. In addition, in the configuration approach, the environment, strategy, technology, structure and processes are transformed into configurations called gestalt, template, first type, generic form, ideal type, states of existence or organization model in a dynamic interaction (Miles et al., 1978; Miller and Friesen, 1978; Miller, 1986; Sarvan et al., 2003; Varoğlu and Canbolat, 2017) and thus tries to explain how the organizational elements in the integrity evolve into configurations by clustering within a certain context (Miller 1986 ; Meyer et al., 1993; Ketchen et al., 1993).

Configuration studies accept that each organizational element such as technology, group, individual and culture are multidimensional in order to understand and explain organizations, and make configurative classifications by associating these dimensions with each other and clustering them (Ketchen et al., 1993). In other words, he claims that the whole cannot be understood by examining the elements that make up the whole under isolated conditions (Meyer et al.,1993; Miller, 1983, p.7; Meyer et al., 1993). In the configuration approach, it is also claimed that the organizational stability and equilibrium state (equilibrium) evolves into a state of equilibrium after being interrupted at certain intervals, assuming that organizations consist of sub-systems that are tightly interconnected (Meyer et al.,1993). Organizational change is described as a radical, transformative, changing of all elements simultaneously and ultimately the transition to a different design in order to adapt to the relevant structural and strategic phases (Varoğlu and Canbolat, 2017). At this point, Murray (1988) emphasizes that the configuration applied by the organization should be controlled by the management team where the ideal configuration is and that the strategic management processes should be adjusted according to the ideal structure; because configurations are not created step by step within a plan; rather it consists of a mix of many factors such as change, experimentation. Therefore, the process should be managed professionally.

At this point, the purpose of a configuration is to develop a cooperation of determined, enthusiastic people and accordingly, seamlessly retain customers who value their services. While providing this situation, the need to determine the organizational design and the relationships between the business members, the determination of organizational goals and the selection of the target market can be listed as the factors required for the emergence of the configuration. (Miller and Whitney, 1999, p.5). At this point, strong influences such as environment, strategy, structure and leadership suggested by the leading paradigms of organizational theory contribute to the formation of configurations (Miller, 1987, p.686).

It can be seen that organizations, whether in a micro or macro context, have the ability to adapt themselves to different situations and change their structures. The critical issue here is which strategies to apply in both adaptation and change of structure. The context of the organization, its relations and interactions with other organizations can play an crucial role in the strategic change of the structure. Generally speaking, accepting organizations as open systems is accepted as the main argument of the configuration approach (Yeloğlu, 2008, p.166).

There is no doubt that configurations add value to the science of organization both on an intellectual and empirical level (Meyer et al.,1993, p.1192). Configuration approach; It can be considered as an important approach that differs from other types in terms of both filling the gap in organizational approaches and exhibiting a descriptive approach that provides predictive and change (Varoğlu and Canbolat, 2017, p.383). This suggests that configurative theory almost identifies communication with other managerial dynamics. Therefore, configurative theory is the penetration of communication-centered understanding (Tuncer, 2019, p.1016).

The Concept of Corporate Image

Organizational image is one of the concepts that emerged in the early 1950s and is among the topics that have attracted attention in marketing, advertising, public relations and management literature. Organizational image, which is the way organizations are perceived by the public, is accepted as an important reference source in people's relationship with the organization. The images of the organizations distinguish them from their

counterparts, and the perceived corporate image represents the whole perception of employees about how those outside the organization see the organization (Tran, 2015, p.91). Especially in recent years, corporate image has become an important element not only for the marketing sector, but also for many corporate governance processes, especially human resources management.

A great deal of researches have been conducted on the concept of image in domestic and foreign literature. In this context, while Dutton and Dukerich (1991) define the corporate image as the belief that how people see the organization from outside Abrat (1989, p.68), on the other hand, rather than his belief in what an organization is; He emphasized that there are beliefs and feelings about the organization that exist in the minds of the members of the organization. Dowling (1993, p.104) defined the corporate image as the sum of the impressions about the organization that exist in people's minds.

From this point of view, organizational image is all the, rational thoughts, impressions, feelings and perceptions of all stakeholders of the organization, in other words, internal and external target audiences. While the internal target group consists of all employees, managers and shareholders within the organization; The external target audience consists of customers, suppliers of raw materials to the organization and competitors, and the press, government and social environment that are not directly linked to the organization (Duimering and Safayeni, 1998, cited in Minister, 2005, p.2).

On the other hand, the contributions that a strong corporate image can provide to institutions can be listed as follows (Marken, 1990, p.; Kandampully and Suhartanto, 2000, p.347).

- It also reflects the reputation and prestige of the business.
- It positively affects the organization's quality, dignity, employee performance and motivation, loyalty and identification.
- It facilitates the understanding by the business stakeholders of the objectives of the business and the strategies to be used to achieve these goals.
- Creates sensitivity among managers regarding the long-term goals of the business, and strengthens internal and external communication.

- It provides customers evaluating the market situation of the business and its position vis-à-vis other businesses, positively influences customer satisfaction and preferences, and increases customer loyalty.

It can be thought that the stronger and more positive an organization has, the more successful and efficient it is. Therefore, importance should be attached to the management of organizational image in order to ensure organizational success.

Elements of Corporate Image: Corporate image is the perception of different people about an organization. These perceptions show how people know the organization based on information obtained from different sources. While some perceptions stem from personal experiences, impressions and sensations towards the organization, others are formed as a result of the marketing and communication activities carried out by the organization in an effort to create an image (Hatch and Schultz, 1997, p.360).

According to Dinkel (1996) organizational image is considered to represent the sum of organizational behavior, organizational appearance and organizational communication.

Organizational Behavior

The activities of the whole or sub-components of the organization and all their interactions with the environment constitute organizational behavior (Çiftçioğlu, 2009, p.46). The concept is the reactions, decisions and behaviors of individuals within the organization coming together. In this respect, organizational behavior draws attention to the expectations and needs of the workers of the organization by dealing with the human dimension of organizational image.

Organizational Appearance

The organizational view can be explained as the visual expression of an organization (Tran et al., 2015, p.92). The organizational view includes the design and management of the organization's appearance in accordance

with the goals of the organizational identity. The general image of the organization and the impression it creates directly affects the organizational image. Organizational view is visual communication from another perspective and organizations can communicate more easily with their target audiences by using visual communication (Tatar, 2007, p.124).

The Concept of Organizational Communication

Organizational communication is a long process that enables the continuous exchange of information and ideas between the various departments and elements that make up the organization and the organization and its environment in order to ensure the functioning of the institutions and to achieve the objectives of the organization (Demirtaş, 2010, p.413). creates the sensitive bond. The more an organization communicates with its target audiences, the more widely it is recognized and perceived positively (Gray and Balmer, 1998). Elements of organizational image will provide the support that the organization needs in achieving the targeted image of the organization and effective image management by guiding the organization in the process of image formation.

Biber (1998, cited: Gürbüz, 2010, p.76-77) states that organizational image management involves a three-step process:

- In the first step, it is necessary to know the image perceptions of the stakeholders of the institution regarding the organization. The first step of organizational image management is determining what kind of image the organization has and revealing the status of the organization accordingly.
- Second, the desired organizational image must be determined. This process requires communication with the stakeholders of the organization. In order to create a good image, the comments of the stakeholders of the organization should be taken. The organization should constantly monitor its stakeholders, be aware of their needs and expectations, and pay attention to receiving timely feedback from them.
- In the third step, in order to achieve the desired image, the organization must first determine its goals and the place where it wants to see itself in the future, and develop strategies accordingly.

In summary, the strong and positive organizational image perceived by the employees acts as a catalyst in the change activities of the organization and accelerates the change. Again, a positive, reliable organizational image acts as a filter that enables organizations to stand out in the market, leaving other organizations behind. The messages conveyed by the organization, which is accepted as reliable and high quality by its target audiences, are also easy to be accepted by customers (Güzelcik, 1999, p.248). Therefore, the main reason underlying image-building efforts is to ensure that organizations can be distinguished from their competitors.

The Concept of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

In management science, organizational behaviors of employees in organizations are divided into two as formal role behaviors and non-order-based and non-formal behaviors that benefit the organization. Formal role behaviors are the behaviors that should be done in line with the needs determined by the management and they form the basis of the organizational order (Başaran, 2008, p.336). Informal behaviors of employees in organizations are "prosocial organizational behavior", "extra role behavior", "organizational citizenship behavior" or "good soldier syndrome" (good soldier syndrome). Prosocial organizational behaviors, besides defined role behaviors, also include extra role behaviors that are not included in formal role definitions (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986). Organizational citizenship behavior is considered to be within the scope of "extra role behaviors" of pro-social organizational behavior (Smith et al., 1983).

Organizational citizenship behavior entered the business management literature for the first time in 1983 and has been one of the most researched topics recently (Bateman and Organ, 1983). The concept is defined as voluntary individual behavior that is not fully and directly taken into account in the reward system, but helps the institution as a whole to fulfill its functions efficiently (Organ, 1988, p.4). In another definition, even though the concept is not clearly or directly recognized by the reward system within the institution, it is the behaviors of individuals on their own initiative, without any written or unwritten coercion, that enable the organization to work effectively. The voluntary occurrence of such behaviors shows that

employees will not be punished if they do not exhibit organizational citizenship behavior (Smith et al.,1983, p.654; Raub, 2008, p.180).

On the other hand, Organ (1988) stated that organizational citizenship behaviors have three characteristics:

1. Organizational citizenship behavior is not directly or indirectly included in the work description of the employee, it is behavior that goes beyond official obligations or job description.
2. Such behavior is at the discretion of the person and is not rewarded when shown and not punished when not shown; volunteering is inherent in behavior.
3. Employees do not receive training to demonstrate organizational citizenship behavior, it is the behavior of the individual and consequently organizational citizenship behavior increases the functionality of the organization as a whole.

There are many direct and indirect positive effects of OCB in terms of both the organization and the individual. For example, OCB increases job satisfaction and increases organizational effectiveness (Podsakoff et al. 2000). Protects the organization from destructive and undesirable behavior; In addition, it improves the skills and abilities of the employees and simultaneously contributes to organizational productivity (Baş and Şentürk, 2011, p.34). So much so that, the more sincere organization employees are connected to their organizations, the more they become a part of their organization, the more sincere and more they tend to make an effort (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

In addition, organizational citizenship behaviors of employees in an organization increase the total performance of the institution (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994). Among the contributions of organizational citizenship behavior to the organization, the job satisfaction of both the beneficiary and the beneficiary within the organization, the increase in their commitment to the workplace and their motivation can be counted. As a result of the work of individuals who have positive feelings for their job and the organization they work with, the productivity of the employees and the management will increase, and thus, the continuity of the organization's performance can be mentioned (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Thanks to OCB, the tendency of the employee to take responsibility and participate

in decisions also increases. Again, in organizations where the level of organizational citizenship behavior is high; There is also a decrease in employees' intention to leave their jobs, absenteeism and turnover rates of the organization (Bogler and Somech, 2005).

In summary, with the acceptance of the fact that "human" is the most valuable resource in organizations, the human dimension has come to the fore in new managerial approaches. Well-motivated, open to development, efficient employee is accepted as a prerequisite for effectiveness for organizations. Unlike other resources, human resources may have the ability to go beyond what is expected of them. This changes the perception that the organization expects only written job descriptions from its employees.

Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: When we look at the history of the classifications related to the concept of organizational citizenship, it is seen that the classifications related to the concept date back to the 1980s. The first classification of organizational citizenship behavior is known as Smith, Organ, and Near's work in 1983 (Kolade et al., 2014, p.38), however, when the literature is examined, theorists working on the concept of OCB have found a different dimensions (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Organ, 1988; Van Dyne et al., 1994; Graham, 1991; Williams and Anderson, 1991; Podsakoff et al., 2000). It is seen that the classifications made under different names actually contain the same or similar behaviors, and the dimensions mostly overlap with each other. The concept of organizational citizenship behavior was used by Bateman and Organ (1983, p.7-13) firstly and has been addressed in 5 dimensions: altruism or altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness and civic virtue and sportsmanship)

Altruism: It refers to helping other people free of charge in problems that arise in the organization regarding work (Podsakof and Mackenzie, 1994: 351). The most characteristic of this kind of behavior is benevolence. Helping an employee to complete his / her job even under extraordinary circumstances, to do the work of the employee on leave due to illness, to guide newcomers to adapt to the job, to support colleagues who have a heavy workload or have accumulated jobs for any reason, It can be given

as an example of such behavior (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Conscientiousness: It is the dimension that expresses that employees exhibit a role behavior beyond the minimum role behavior expected from them, and that they use their continuity to work, regular work, punctuality and rest times (Sökmen and Boylu, 2011). Conscientiousness is also referred to as personal diligence and individual entrepreneurship. It is also defined as the willingness of organization employees to act beyond the lowest role expected of them (Organ, 1990). Examples of this type of behavior in this dimension are attendance, regular work in the workplace, punctuality, making an effort beyond what is expected of them to comply with task deadlines and delivery rules, using rest periods in place and without abuse, and working extra to finish the job. In this dimension, in an advanced sense of duty, the obligations to be fulfilled as per the contract are fulfilled voluntarily, with a performance beyond expectations (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994).

Courtesy: It refers to positive communications between individuals who are mutually-interconnected resulting from the divisions of labor within the organization (Özdevecioğlu, 2003). Kindly informing includes positive behaviors that are important in terms of ensuring coordination in an organization, preventing or reducing conflicts that cause problems, and efficiency of the organization (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994, p.350).

Civil virtue / Organizational Participation: It refers to the active and voluntary participation in the life of the institution (Podsakoff and Mackenzie, 1994, p.351). It is also called civic virtue, organizational virtue, organizational participation. This dimension is derived from the responsibilities of the employees of the organization arising from being citizens of the organization. Civic virtue expresses commitment to the institution as a whole and interest in the organization at a macro level (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Gentlemanliness: It means to tolerate all kinds of negativity that will create tension between individuals within the organization (Özdevecioğlu,

2003). Gentlemen means that the employee avoids negative behaviors that will cause more tension within the institution and they have positive thoughts about their organization despite the negativities. Such behaviors are behaviors that contribute to organizational effectiveness, as they increase employees' ability to cope constructively with problems and their ability to withstand negative situations. Examples of such behaviors include not growing up the problems they encounter unnecessarily, not spending their time complaining about job-related matters or blaming others, avoiding behaviors and attitudes that would lead to discussion (Organ, 1990; Podsakoff and McKenzie, 1994).

As a result, in today's changing and developing business life, extra behaviors are needed for organizational success in addition to the job descriptions included in the job description. The phenomenon of organizational citizenship behavior emerges here. It is stated in the management and strategic management literature that the concept is the most important source of competitive advantages for companies in the management and strategic management literature.

Method

Subject and Purpose of the Research: The "industrial zones", which emerged from the industrialization movement and developed to meet the unplanned, uninfrastructure, labor-intensive and social needs of the employees, have undertaken the task of regulating urbanization and industrialization relations. While in some countries it can successfully fulfill this task, it has failed in some countries. Organized industrial zones in our country have been established as an important element of industrialization in order to increase industrial production, encourage investments and eliminate interregional inequality (Bayülken, 2017).

This study was carried out with 53 food company employees operating in the Organized Industrial Zone in Kayseri province, and it was aimed to examine the relationship between the corporate image of the employees and organizational citizenship behavior in the context of configuration theory.

Today, where competition is increasing, a business with employees with a high level of organizational citizenship gains a competitive advantage and increases its profitability. On the other hand, the image perceptions of employees, who are called internal customers, determine the direction of many organizational outputs in the context of configuration theory. Although there are studies in the literature by researchers such as Miller (1983, 1986) and Li and Li (2008) explaining the sustainable competitive advantage gained by achieving continuous success with configuration theories, these studies seem both inadequate in number and they lack longitudinal analysis studies that will provide the sustainability condition.

Study Nature and Sample: Companies operating in Kayseri Organized Industrial Zone constitute the universe of this research. Related companies are determined from <https://www.kayseriosb.org/tr> web site. In this context, the sectors of companies operating in the Organized Industrial Zone are as follows:

Packaging - Plastic (122), Paint-Chemistry-Cleaning Products (18), Electrical - Electronics (46), Household Goods-Electrical Appliances (24), Food (53), Construction Building Materials (122), Paper-Printing And Advertising (34), Machinery (51), Metal Products (303), Furniture-Wood Products (279), Automotive Sub-Industry (15), Textiles (121).

Following the company information obtained from the website, the sample of the study was determined as employees of 53 food companies. The research has been applied considering the pandemic conditions; Questionnaires were conducted with 187 employees, but 143 questionnaires could be analyzed.

Research Questions

Q1: What is the corporate image perception of the employees?

Q2: Do the demographic characteristics of the employees differ in terms of corporate image dimensions?

Q3: What are the levels of organizational citizenship of the employees towards their organizations?

Q4: Do the demographic characteristics of employees differ in terms of organizational citizenship dimensions?

Q5: Is there a significant relationship between employees' corporate image perceptions and organizational citizenship behavior levels?

Data Collection Tool

A questionnaire form consisting of three parts was used as a data collection tool in the study. In the first part of the data collection tool, there is a personal information form consisting of the participants' gender, marital status, age, education level, and professional seniority information.

In the second part of the questionnaire form, there is the "Corporate Image Scale" developed by Erdoğan vd.(2006) through validity and reliability studies in order to determine the perception of employees regarding the corporate image of the organization they work for. The scale includes 10 items in 7-point Likert type and 2 dimensions (perceived corporate image, structured external corporate image). In this study, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale was 0.82; Cronbach Alpha coefficients of the sub-dimensions were determined as 0.61 and 0.71.

In the third part of the questionnaire form, the "Organizational Citizenship Scale" developed by Podsakoff et al. (2000) and Morrison (1994), adapted to Turkish by Aykol (2009) and Türker (2006) whose reliability and validity studies were carried out, in order to determine the help behaviors (organizational citizenship behaviors) that employees exhibit voluntarily and without expecting any reward in the organization they work, is determined. The scale includes 20 items in five-point Likert type and 5 dimensions (conscientiousness, , courtesy, gentlemanliness, altruism, civil virtue).In this study, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale was 0.93; Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the sub-dimensions were determined as 0.60 / 0.71 / 0.81 / 0.76 and 0.83.

Data Analysis

SPSS 21.0 program was used to analyze the data. Demographic information of the participants is presented in the frequency and percentage table. Skewness was used to test the normality of the scale scores. The fact that the scores obtained from a continuous variable remain within ± 1 limits of the skewness used in the normal distribution feature can be interpreted as

the scores do not show a significant deviation from the normal distribution (Büyüköztürk, 2011) Since the normal distribution of the scores of both scales and sub-dimensions was determined, in the comparison of the scores according to the variables of marital status and gender two independent samples t-test; One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was used to compare age groups, education, and seniority variables. When a significant difference was seen in the ANOVA test, LSD post hoc test was used to determine the difference between groups. To determine the relationship between corporate image and organizational citizenship behavior, from the Pearson correlation test; Regression analysis was used to examine the effect of organizational citizenship behaviors on corporate image. The confidence interval in the analyzes was determined as 95% (significance level $0.05 p < 0.05$).

Descriptive Findings

Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage distribution according to the demographic characteristics of the participants.

Table 1. Distribution of Participants by Demographic Characteristics

Demographic Variable	Groups	N	%
Gender	Female	57	39,9
	Male	86	60,1
Marital Status	Married	65	45,5
	Unmarried	78	54,5
Age Groups (36,11±10,01)	30 yeras ol and below	38	26,6
	31-40 years old	41	28,7
	41 years old and above	64	44,8
Education Level	Primary school	57	39,9
	Intermediate	48	33,6
	University	38	26,6
Professional Seniority	1-5 years	24	16,8
	6-10 years	59	41,3
	11 years and above	60	42,0

39.9% of 143 employees participating in the study are women and 60.1% are men. 45.5% of the participants are married, 54.5% are single. 26.6% of the participants are in the age group of 30 and under, 28.7% are in the 31-40 age group, 44.8% are in the age group of 41 and above. 39.9% of the

participants were primary school graduated, 33.6% high school, 26.6% university level. 45.5% of the participants are married, 54.5% are single. 16.8% of the participants have 1-5 years, 41.3% 6-10 years, 42% 11 years and above professional seniority.

In Table 2, descriptive statistics consisting of average and standard deviation information of scale and sub-dimension scores are mentioned.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Scale and Sub-Dimension Scores

Scale and Bottom Dimension	n	Min.	Max.	\bar{X}	SS	Distortion
Perceived Corporate Image	143	1,40	4,40	2,95	0,74	-0,03
Structured External Corporate Image	143	1,80	4,20	3,06	0,66	-0,09
CORPORATE IMAGE	143	1,90	4,20	3,00	0,64	-0,02
Altruism	143	1,75	4,50	3,50	0,68	-0,54
Scrupulousness	143	2,00	4,50	3,40	0,67	-0,15
Kindness	143	2,50	5,00	3,76	0,79	0,04
Gentelmanliness	143	2,25	4,75	3,63	0,78	-0,06
Civil Virtue	143	2,00	5,00	3,47	0,89	0,03
ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR	143	2,55	4,70	3,55	0,66	0,04

When the scores in Table 2 are examined, the participants' corporate image perception scores (3.00 ± 0.64) are in the "partially agree" range; It was determined that the organizational citizenship behavior scores (3.55 ± 0.66) were in the "I agree" range. In this context, As 1 the question "What are the corporate image perceptions of the employees?" has been answered.

Findings Regarding the Comparison of Corporate Image Scores According to Demographic Variables: Table 3 shows the results of two independent samples t test for the comparison of corporate image scores according to gender.

Perceived corporate image ($t = 5.77$; $p < 0.05$), structured external corporate image ($t = 3.87$; $p < 0.05$) subscale scores and corporate image scale scores ($t = 5.42$; $p < 0.05$) were found to differ significantly according to gender

Table 3. Comparison of Corporate Image Scores by Gender

Corporate Image	Gender	n	\bar{X}	SS	t	p
Perceived Corporate Image	Female	57	3,34	0,63	5,77	0,000
	Male	86	2,69	0,69		
Structured External Corporate Image	Female	57	3,31	0,59	3,87	0,000
	Male	86	2,89	0,66		
CORPORATE IMAGE	Female	57	3,33	0,55	5,42	0,000
	Male	86	2,79	0,60		

Corporate image scale and sub-dimension scores of female participants are significantly higher than the scores of male participants.

Table 4 shows the results of two independent samples t test for the comparison of corporate image scores according to marital status.

Table 4. Comparison of Corporate Image Scores According to Marital Status

Corporate Image	Marital Status	n	\bar{X}	SS	t	p
Perceived Corporate Image	Married	65	3,27	0,69	5,10	0,000
	Single	78	2,68	0,67		
Structured External Corporate Image	Married	65	3,36	0,56	5,36	0,000
	Single	78	2,81	0,65		
CORPORATE IMAGE	Married	65	3,31	0,54	5,88	0,000
	Single	78	2,75	0,60		

Perceived corporate image ($t = 5.10$; $p < 0.05$), structured external corporate image ($t = 5.36$; $p < 0.05$) subscale scores and corporate image scale scores ($t = 5.88$; $p < 0.05$) were found to differ significantly according to marital status

Corporate image scale and sub-dimension scores of married participants are significantly higher than the scores of single participants.

Table 5 includes the results of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for the comparison of the corporate image scores according to the age groups of the participants.

Table 5. Comparison of Corporate Image Scores by Age Groups

Kurumsal İmaj	Age	n	\bar{X}	SS	F	p	Significant difference
Perceived Corporate Image	A-30 Years old and below	38	3,61	0,39	135,86	0,000	A>B,C
	B-31-40 years old	41	3,36	0,54			B>C
	C-41 years old and above	64	2,29	0,38			
Structured External Corporate Image	A-30 Years old and below	38	3,54	0,42	68,80	0,000	A>B,C
	B-31-40 years old	41	3,42	0,46			B>C
	C-41 years old and above	64	2,54	0,51			
CORPORATE IMAGE	A-30 Years old and below	38	3,57	0,30	166,14	0,000	A>B,C
	B-31-40 years old	41	3,39	0,43			B>C
	C-41 years old and above	64	2,42	0,31			

Perceived corporate image ($F = 135.86$; $p < 0.05$), structured external corporate image ($F = 68.80$; $p < 0.05$) subscale scores and corporate image scale scores ($t = 166.41$; $p < 0.05$) was found to differ significantly according to age groups. According to the results of the LSD post hoc test conducted to determine which groups the difference is, the corporate image scale and sub-dimension scores of the participants aged 30 and under are significantly higher than the scores of the participants aged 31 and over. The corporate image scale and sub-dimension scores of the 31-40 age group participants are significantly higher than the scores of the participants aged 41 and over.

Table 6 includes one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test results for the comparison of corporate image scores according to the education level of the participants.

Perceived corporate image ($F = 74.25$; $p < 0.05$), structured external corporate image ($F = 75.36$; $p < 0.05$) subscale scores and corporate image scale scores ($t = 116.91$; $p < 0.05$) was found to differ significantly according to the level of education. According to the results of the LSD post hoc test conducted to determine which groups the difference is, the organizational image scale and sub-dimension scores of the participants studying at the university level are significantly higher than the scores of the participants studying at the primary and high school level. The corporate image scale

and sub-dimension scores of the high school level participants are significantly higher than the scores of the participants studying at the primary education level.

Table 6. Comparison of Corporate Image Scores by Education Level

Corporate Image	Öğrenim Düzeyi	n	\bar{X}	SS	F	p	Significant difference
Perceived Corporate Image	A-Primary School	57	2,33	0,40	74,25	0,000	C>A,B
	B-Intermediate	48	3,18	0,70			B>A
	C-University	38	3,58	0,40			
Structured External Corporate Image	A-Primary School	57	2,48	0,45	75,36	0,000	C>A,B
	B-Intermediate	48	3,35	0,53			B>A
	C-University	38	3,56	0,38			
CORPORATE IMAGE	A-Primary School	57	2,41	0,30	116,91	0,000	C>A,B
	B-Intermediate	48	3,27	0,54			B>A
	C-University	38	3,57	0,28			

Table 7 shows the results of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for comparing the corporate image scores according to the professional seniority of the participants.

Table 7. Comparison of Corporate Image Scores by Professional Seniority

Corporate Image	Professional Seniority	n	\bar{X}	SS	F	p	Significant difference
Perceived Corporate Image	A-30 years old and below	24	3,55	0,36	39,28	0,000	A>B,C
	B-6-10 years old	59	3,21	0,76			B>C
	C-11 years old and above	60	2,45	0,48			
Structured External Corporate Image	A-1-5 years old	24	3,60	0,38	29,50	0,000	A>B,C
	B-6-10 years old	59	3,25	0,62			B>C
	C-11 years old and above	60	2,66	0,56			
CORPORATE IMAGE	A-1-5 years old	24	3,57	0,27	46,54	0,000	A>B,C
	B-6-10 years old	59	3,23	0,62			B>C
	C-11 years old and above	60	2,55	0,42			

Perceived corporate image (F = 39.28; p <0.05), structured external corporate image (F = 29.50; p <0.05) sub-dimension scores and corporate

image scale scores ($t = 46.54$; $p < 0.05$) was found to differ significantly according to professional seniority.

According to the results of the LSD post hoc test performed to determine which groups the difference is, the corporate image scale and sub-dimension scores of the participants with professional seniority of 5 years or less are significantly higher than the scores of the participants with professional seniority of 6 years or more. The corporate image scale and sub-dimension scores of the participants with professional seniority of 6-10 years are significantly higher than the scores of the participants whose professional seniority is 11 years and above.

With these results, S2 developed within the scope of our research, the question: Do the demographic characteristics of the employees differ in terms of corporate image dimensions? has been answered.

Findings Regarding the Comparison of Organizational Citizenship Scores According to Demographic Variables: Table 8 shows the results of two independent samples t test for the comparison of organizational citizenship scores according to gender.

Table 8. Comparison of Organizational Citizenship Scores by Gender

Organizational Citizenship	Gender	n	\bar{X}	SS	t	p
Altruism	Female	57	3,83	0,49	5,24	0,000
	Male	86	3,28	0,70		
Conscientiousness	Female	57	3,69	0,65	4,55	0,000
	Male	86	3,21	0,61		
Kindness	Female	57	4,30	0,64	7,83	0,000
	Male	86	3,41	0,68		
Gentlemanliness	Female	57	4,05	0,71	5,82	0,000
	Male	86	3,35	0,70		
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	Female	57	3,78	0,86	3,58	0,000
	Male	86	3,26	0,85		
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	Female	57	3,93	0,58	6,33	0,000
	Male	86	3,30	0,59		

It has been determined the difference in scores of altruism ($t = 5.24$; $p < 0.05$), conscientiousness ($t = 4.55$; $p < 0.05$), courtesy ($t = 7.83$; $p < 0.05$), gentleman's ($t = 5.82$; $p < 0.05$), civic virtue ($t = 3.58$; $p < 0.05$) subscale scores and

organizational citizenship ($t = 6.33$; $p < 0.05$) according to gender. Organizational citizenship scale and sub-dimension scores of female participants are significantly higher than the scores of male participants.

With these results, S3 developed within the scope of our research: What are the organizational citizenship levels of the employees towards their organizations? has been answered.

Table 9 shows the results of two independent samples t test for the comparison of organizational citizenship scores according to marital status.

Table 9. Comparison of Organizational Citizenship Scores According to Marital Status

Organizational Citizenship	Marital Status	n	\bar{X}	SS	t	p
Altruism	Married	65	3,81	0,53	5,55	0,000
	Single	78	3,24	0,68		
Conscientiousness	Married	65	3,68	0,60	5,02	0,000
	Single	78	3,16	0,63		
	Married	65	4,17	0,74	6,35	0,000
	Single	78	3,42	0,67		
Kindness	Married	65	4,03	0,68	6,26	0,000
	Single	78	3,30	0,71		
Gentelmanlikness	Married	65	3,99	0,80	7,52	0,000
	Single	78	3,04	0,71		
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	Married	65	3,94	0,57	7,51	0,000
	Single	78	3,23	0,55		

It has been determined the difference in scores of altruism ($t = 5.55$; $p < 0.05$), conscientiousness ($t = 5.02$; $p < 0.05$), courtesy ($t = 6.35$; $p < 0.05$), gentleman's ($t = 6.26$; $p < 0.05$), civic virtue ($t = 7.52$; $p < 0.05$) subscale scores and organizational citizenship ($t = 7.51$; $p < 0.05$) according to marital status. The organizational citizenship scale and sub-dimension scores of married participants are significantly higher than the scores of single participants.

Table 10 shows the results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for comparing the organizational citizenship scores according to the age groups of the participants.

Table 10. Comparison of Organizational Citizenship Scores by Age Groups

Organizational Citizenship	Professional Seniority	n	\bar{X}	SS	F	p	Significant difference
Altruism	A-30 years old and below	38	3,97	0,42	37,14	0,000	A>B,C
	B-31-40 years old	41	3,74	0,60			B>C
	C-41 years old and above	64	3,07	0,59			
Conscientiousness	A-30 years old and below	38	3,96	0,35	84,98	0,000	A>B,C
	B-31-40 years old	41	3,72	0,60			B>C
	C-41 years old and above	64	2,86	0,40			
Kindness	A-30 years old and below	38	4,65	0,35	210,52	0,000	A>B,C
	B-31-40 years old	41	4,08	0,49			B>C
	C-41 years old and above	64	3,04	0,36			
Gentlemanliness	A-30 years old and below	38	4,40	0,35	124,91	0,000	A>B,C
	B-31-40 years old	41	3,96	0,63			B>C
	C-41 years old and above	64	2,96	0,42			
Civil Virtue	A-30 years old and below	38	4,22	0,50	106,77	0,000	A>B,C
	B-31-40 years old	41	3,96	0,71			B>C
	C-41 years old and above	64	2,71	0,49			
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	A-30 years old and below	38	4,24	0,25	234,96	0,000	A>B,C
	B-31-40 years old	41	3,89	0,46			B>C
	C-41 years old and above	64	2,93	0,23			

It has been determined the difference in scores of altruism ($F = 37.14$; $p < 0.05$), conscientiousness ($F = 84.98$; $p < 0.05$), courtesy ($F = 210.52$; $p < 0.05$), gentleman's ($F = 124, 91$; $p < 0.05$), civic virtue ($F = 106.77$; $p < 0.05$) subscale scores and organizational citizenship ($F = 234.96$; $p < 0.05$) according to age. According to the results of the LSD post hoc test conducted to determine which groups the difference is, the organizational citizenship scale and sub-dimension scores of the participants aged 30 and under are significantly higher than the scores of the participants aged 31 and over. Organizational citizenship scale and sub-dimension scores of the 31-40 age group participants are significantly higher than the scores of the participants aged 41 and over.

Table 11 shows the results of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for comparing the organizational citizenship scores according to the education level of the participants.

Table 11. Comparison of Organizational Citizenship Scores by Education Level

Organizational Citizenship	Education Level	n	\bar{X}	SS	F	p	Significant difference
Altruşim	A-Primary School	57	3,04	0,60	32,40	0,000	C>A,B
	B-Intermediate	48	3,75	0,57			B>A
	C-University	38	3,88	0,50			
Consciousness	A-Primary School	57	2,82	0,40	79,52	0,000	C>A,B
	B-Intermediate	48	3,63	0,58			B>A
	C-University	38	3,97	0,36			
Kindness	A-Primary School	57	3,11	0,42	85,31	0,000	C>A,B
	B-Intermediate	48	3,91	0,74			B>A
	C-University	38	4,55	0,36			
Gentelmanlik-ness	A-Primary School	57	2,91	0,40	113,79	0,000	C>A,B
	B-Intermediate	48	3,90	0,65			B>A
	C-University	38	4,37	0,33			
Civil Virtue	A-Primary School	57	2,69	0,39	90,94	0,000	C>A,B
	B-Intermediate	48	3,76	0,84			B>A
	C-University	38	4,27	0,44			
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	A-Primary School	57	2,91	0,19	152,99	0,000	C>A,B
	A-Primary School	48	3,79	0,56			B>A
	B-Intermediate	38	4,21	0,27			

The significant difference in scores of altruism ($F = 32.40$; $p < 0.05$), conscientiousness ($F = 79.52$; $p < 0.05$), kindness ($F = 85.31$; $p < 0.05$), gentlemanliness ($F = 113,79$; $p < 0.05$), civil virtue ($F = 90.94$; $p < 0.05$) sub-dimension scores and organizational citizenship scale scores ($F = 152.99$; $p < 0.05$) according to education been found determined. According to the results of the LSD post hoc test conducted to determine which groups the difference is, the organizational citizenship scale and sub-dimension scores of the participants studying at the university level are significantly higher than the scores of the participants studying at the primary and high school level.

The organizational citizenship scale and sub-dimension scores of the high school level participants are significantly higher than the scores of the participants studying at the primary education level.

Table 12 shows the results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for comparing the organizational citizenship scores according to the professional seniority of the participants.

Table 12. Comparison of Organizational Citizenship Scores by Professional Seniority

Organizational Citizenship	Professional Seniority	n	\bar{X}	SS	F	p	Significant difference
Altruism	A-1-5 Years	24	3,91	0,47	14,01	0,000	A>B,C
	B-6-10 years	59	3,64	0,63			B>C
	C-11 years and above	60	3,19	0,67			
Consciousness	A-1-5 years	24	3,98	0,31	38,03	0,000	A>B,C
	B-6-10 years	59	3,61	0,65			B>C
	C-11 years and above	60	2,96	0,50			
Kindness	A-1-5 years	24	4,53	0,43	70,56	0,000	A>B,C
	B-6-10 years	59	4,10	0,69			B>C
	C-11 years and above	60	3,13	0,46			
Gentelmanlik-ness	A-1-5 years	24	4,43	0,30	54,47	0,000	A>B,C
	B-6-10 years	59	3,88	0,73			B>C
	C-11 years and above	60	3,07	0,51			
Civil Virtue	A-1-5 years	24	4,09	0,44	34,08	0,000	A>B,C
	B-6-10 years	59	3,81	0,80			B>C
	C-11 years and above	60	2,88	0,75			
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	A-1-5 years	24	4,19	0,25	61,86	0,000	A>B,C
	B-6-10 years	59	3,81	0,60			B>C
	C-11 years and above	60	3,05	0,42			

The significant differences of altruism ($F = 14.01$; $p < 0.05$), conscientiousness ($F = 38.03$; $p < 0.05$), kindness ($F = 70.56$; $p < 0.05$), gentlemanliness ($F = 54.47$; $p < 0.05$), civil virtue ($F = 34.08$; $p < 0.05$) sub-dimension scores and organizational citizenship scale scores ($F = 61.86$; $p < 0.05$) according to professional seniority has been determined. According to the results of the LSD post hoc test conducted to determine which groups the difference is, the organizational citizenship scale and sub-dimension scores of the participants with professional seniority of 5 years or less are significantly higher than the scores of the participants with professional seniority 6 years and above. The organizational citizenship scale and sub-dimension scores of the participants whose professional seniority is 6-10 years are significantly higher than the scores of the participants whose professional seniority is 11 years and above.

With these results, S4 developed within the scope of our research: Do the demographic characteristics of the employees differ in terms of organizational citizenship dimensions? has been answered.

Findings About the Relationship Between Variable Scores:The results of Pearson correlation analysis regarding the relationship between variable scores are given in Table 13.

Table 13. Correlation Analysis Results Regarding the Relationship Between Variable Scores

Scale and Sub-Dimension	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Perceived Corporate Image	1	0,64**	0,92**	0,59**	0,67**	0,76**	0,75**	0,72**	0,81**
2. Structured External Corporate Image		1	0,90**	0,57**	0,64**	0,65**	0,71**	0,67**	0,75**
3. CORPORATE IMAGE			1	0,64**	0,72**	0,78**	0,80**	0,77**	0,86**
4. Altruism				1	0,50**	0,56**	0,62**	0,58**	0,75**
5.conscientiousness					1	0,72**	0,71**	0,78**	0,86**
6. Kindness						1	0,77**	0,74**	0,89**
7. Gentlemen							1	0,77**	0,90**
8. Civil Virtue								1	0,91**
9.ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR									1

* $p < 0,05$ ** $p < 0,01$

With perceived corporate image scores positive and significant relationship between scores of altruism ($r = 0.59$; $p < 0.05$), conscientiousness ($r = 0.67$; $p < 0.05$), courtesy ($r = 0.76$; $p < 0.05$), gentelmanlikness ($r = 0.75$; $p < 0.05$), civic virtue ($r = 0.72$; $p < 0.05$), and organizational citizenship ($r = 0.81$; $p < 0.05$) has been determined.

Positive and significant relationship between structured external corporate image scores and scores of altruism ($r = 0.57$; $p < 0.05$), conscientiousness ($r = 0.64$; $p < 0.05$), courtesy ($r = 0.65$; $p < 0.05$)gentlemanlikeness ($r = 0.71$; $p < 0.05$), civil virtue ($r = 0.67$; $p < 0.05$), and organizational citizenship ($r = 0.75$; $p < 0.05$) has been determined.

Psitive and significant relationship between corporate image scores and scores of altruism ($r = 0.64$; $p < 0.05$), conscientiousness ($r = 0.72$; $p < 0.05$), courtesy ($r = 0.78$; $p < 0.05$), gentlemen ($r = 0.80$; $p < 0.05$), civic virtue ($r = 0.77$; $p < 0.05$) and organizational citizenship ($r = 0.86$; $p < 0.05$) has been determined.

Table 14 shows the findings of multiple regression analysis regarding the effect of corporate image perception on organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 14. The Effect of Perception of Corporate Image on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Independent Variable	B	SH _B	β	t	p	Tolerance	VIF
Constant	0,889	0,137		6,481	0,000		
Perceived Corporate Image	0,495	0,050	0,555	9,991	0,000	0,586	1,708
Structured External Corporate Image	0,393	0,055	0,396	7,135	0,000	0,586	1,708
$R^2=0,747$		$\Delta R^2=0,744$		$F(2; 140)=207,081$		$p=0,000$	

It was determined that the model of the effect of corporate image perception on organizational citizenship behavior was appropriate ($F(2;140)=207,08$; $p<0,05$), there was no multiple connection problem between variables (Tolerance > 0.20 ; VIF < 10). Corporate image perception explains approximately 74% of the change in organizational citizenship behavior ($\Delta R^2 = 0.744$). According to the standardized regression coefficients (β) in the model and the t test results regarding the significance of the coefficients, the most important effect according to the effects of the independent variables on organizational citizenship behavior is the perceived corporate image perception, respectively ($\beta = 0.56$; $t = 9.99$; $p < 0, 05$) and structured external corporate image perception ($= 0.40$; $t = 7.13$; $p < 0.05$), and the effect of both variables was positive and significant. The change in the corporate image perception of the employees affects the organizational citizens significantly.

With this result, S5, developed within the scope of our study: Is there a significant relationship between employees' corporate image perceptions and organizational citizenship behavior levels? Is being answered.

Conclusion and Evaluation

Configurations are a powerful weapons for organizations. The resources and competencies of a company may not be sufficient for competitive advantage as they can be imitated or acquired by others. On the other hand, a configuration formed by the harmony of variables is more important for an effective competition. Miller said that since the configurations cover the

whole organization, studies should be carried out to include more thematic and systematic views. He stated that quantitative studies should be carried out to reveal the mutual relations between variables and their results should be considered in the context of configurations. In this study, the possible relationship between the concept of corporate image and the concept of organizational citizenship behavior has been investigated in the context of configuration theory. There are various factors affecting the success of businesses in today's business world where intense competition prevails. Organizational image and organizational citizenship behavior, which are among these factors, are among the concepts that are frequently emphasized, add value to institutions and constitute the subject of many scientific studies. Image attraction constitutes an important attraction power. Positive image perception creates satisfaction and even loyalty to both the internal target group and the external target audience (Palacio et al., 2002). The concept of organizational citizenship is an effortful behavior that goes beyond the formal templates of organizations. Even though OCBs are not included in their job descriptions, they are functional for the institution. From this point of view, it is understood that strictly adhering to the official job description is not enough to increase efficiency. Because unexpected and original situations that develop spontaneously and require creativity and a new set of behaviors may arise in organizations. This requires flexibility and extra effort (DiPaola and Hoy, 2011).

The main emphasis of this study is on the argument that organizations can adopt different structural strategies to adapt to environmental changes, based on the main arguments of the configuration approach. So much so that considering human resources as an indicator of corporate performance and investing in factors that will affect this configuration directly affects corporate image positively. However, considering that the missions of blue-collar workers, which constitute the main body of our study, are different from other organizations and that human resources contribute to the image with a more central role than many other factors, even if they aim for profit, the necessity of strengthening organizational citizenship behavior becomes evident.

Although it is claimed that image and organizational citizenship behavior can be improved positively with communication, its connection with managerial conditions and decisions, which are not the subject of

communication, is also revealed. Ultimately, configurative theory also evaluates the external reflection of internal consistency. Therefore, it was revealed in the findings of this research that especially image is in need of a communication-based but multidimensional analysis. Finally, whether the sense of organizational citizenship can be developed through other functional mechanisms is an important research question, and research that can develop an answer to this question can be suggested.

In this context, by making a synthesis between various strategy and structure configurations; Identifying common configurations and trying to examine their interactions is especially important for future studies. When viewed in a micro sense, the managerial skills of the actors in the organization will change the form of the organizational structure. Organization managers' faster scanning of the environment and obtaining more information will also provide them with a competitive advantage. Therefore, the harmony of the organization with both its own components and the environment will be easier. However, as a result of the harmony arising from the interactions between variables and the environment, the performance of the organization will increase and the possibility of competing and having a share in the market will increase accordingly. The organization's adaptation process with the environment can be long or short. In this process, the expectation of the organization to change in line with its own dynamics will also increase.

References

- Abratt, R. (1989), A new approach to the corporate image management process. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 5(1), 63-76.
- Bateman, T. S. and Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: therelationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587-595.
- Baş, G. and Şentürk, C. (2011). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel vatandaşlık ve örgütsel güven algıları. *Kuram Ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 17(1),29-62.
- Başaran, İ. E. (2008). *Örgütsel davranış*. Ankara: Ekinoks Eğitim Danışmanlık.
- Bayülken, Y. (2017). *Organize sanayi bölgeleri, küçük sanayi siteleri ve teknoparklar*. Ankara: Ankamat Matbaacılık.

- Bogler, R. and Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 277-289.
- Brief, A. P. and Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Pro social organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 710-725.
- Dinkel, M. (1996). *Sport sponsoringals marketing-konzept*. Wien:Lang.
- Dipaola, M. and Tschannen-Moran. M. (2011). Organizational citizenship behavior In Schools And its relationships to School Climate. *Journal of Social leadership*,11, 424-447.
- Doty, D.H, Glick, W.H. and Huber G.P. (1993). Fit, equifinality, and organizational effectiveness: A test of two configurational theories. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 36(6),1196-1250.
- Dowling, G. (1993). Developing your company image into a corporate asset. *Long Range Planning*, 26(2), 101-109.
- Dutton J.E. and Dukerich, J.M. (1991). Keeping an eye on the mirror: Image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 34, 517-554.
- Duimering, P. R. and Safayeni, F. (1998). The role of language and formal structure in the construction and maintenance of organizational images. *International Studies Of Management & Organization*, 28(3),57-85.
- Gray, E.R. and Balmer, J.M. (1998). Managing corporate image and corporate reputation. *Long Range Planning*, 31(5), 695-702.
- Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4(4),249-270.
- Gürbüz, S. (2010). Algılanan kurumsal imajın yöneticilerin bazı tutum ve davranışlarına etkisi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 24.
- Güzelcik, E. (1999). *Küreselleşme ve işletmelerde değişen kurum imajı*. İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.
- Hatch, M.J. and Schultz, M. (1997). Relations between organizational culture, identity and image. *European Journal Of Marketing*, 31 (5/6), 356-365.
- Kabadayı, S. (2005). Seeing the elephant! configuration theory-based performance analysis of multiple channel systems. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Newyork: The City University.

- Ketchen, Jr., D. Thomas, J. B. and Snow, C. C. (1993). Organizational configurations and performance: A comparison of theoretical approaches. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 36(6), 1278-1313.
- Kolade, O. J., Oluseye, O.O. and Omotayo, O. A. (2014). Organizational citizenship behavior, hospital corporate Image and performance. *Journal Of Competitiveness*, 6(1), 36-49.
- Marken, G. A. (1990). Corporate image- we all have one, but few work to protect and project it. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 35(1), 21-24.
- Meyer, A. D., Tsu, A. S. and Vehinings, C. R. (1993). Configurational approaches to organizational analysis. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 36(6) 1175-1195.
- Miles, R. E. and Snow, C.C. (1978). *Organizational strategy, structure, and process*. New York: Mcgraw Hill.
- Miller, D. and Whitney, J. O. (1999). Beyond strategy: Configuration as a pillar of competitive advantage. *Business Horizons*, 42(3), 5-17.
- Miller, D. and Friesen, P.H. (1983). Strategy - making and environment the third link. *Strategic Management Journal*, 4, 221-235.
- Miller, D. (1981). Towards A New Contingency Approach: The Search For Organizational Gestalts. *Journal Of Management Studies*, 18(1), 1-26.;
- Miller, D. (1986). Configurations of strategy and structure: Towards a synthesis. *Strategic Management Journal*, 7(3), 233-249.
- Miller, D. (1987), The genesis of Configuration. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4), 686-701.
- Miller, D. and Friesen, P.H. (1978). Archetypes of strategy formulation. *Management Science*, 24, 921-933.
- Mintzberg, H. (1993). *Structure in fives: Designing effective organizations*. Englewood cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations*. NJ: Prentice-Hall. Englewood Cliffs.
- Mintzberg, H. (1980). Structure In 5's: A synthesis of the research on organization design. *Management Science*, 26(3), 322 -341.
- Morrison, E. W. and Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extra-role behaviors to initiate work place change. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 42(4), 403-419.
- Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12, 43-72.

- Organ, D. W. (1988), *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Ma: Lexington books.
- Özdevecioğlu, M. (2003). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ile üniversite öğrencilerinin bazı demografik özellikleri ve akademik başarıları arasındaki ilişkilerin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20, 117-135.
- Palacio, A. B., Meneses, G.D. and Pérez, P. J. P. (2002). The configuration of the university image and its relationship with the satisfaction of students. *Journal Of Educational Administration*, 40(5), 486-505.
- Podsakoff, P. M.,Mackenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B. and Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenshipbehaviors: A criticalreview of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- Podsakoff, P. M. and Mackenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(3), 351- 363.
- Raub, S. (2008). Does bureaucracy kill individual initiative? The impact of structure on organizational citizenship behavior in the hospitality industry. *International Journal Of Hospitality Management*, 27, 179-186.
- Sarvan, F., Arıcı, E. D., Özen, J., Özdemir, B. and Veiciğen, E. T. 2003. Stratejik yönetim okulu: Biçimleşme okulunun bütünleştirici çerçevesi. *Akdeniz İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 6, 73-122.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W. and Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal Of Applied psychology*, 68(4), 653-663.
- Sökmen, A. and Boylu, Y. (2011). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı cinsiyete göre farklılık gösterir mi? Otel işletmeleri açısından bir değerlendirme. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 10(1), 147-163 .
- Tran, M.A., B. Nguyen, T.C. and Melewar, Jim B. (2015). Exploring the corporate image formation process. *Qualitative Marketing Research: An International Journal*, 18(1), 86-114.
- Tuncer, A. (2019). Konfigürasyonel Teori bağlamında kurumsal itibar ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi: Eğitim kurumları üzerinden karşılaştırmalı ampirik bir araştırma. *Erciyes İletişim Dergisi*, 6(2), 1013-1028. DOI: 10.17680/Erciyesiletisim.486754

- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W. and Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 37(4), 765-802.
- Varoğlu, M. A. and Canbolat, E. Ö. (2017). Konfigürasyon Yaklaşımı. H. C. Sözen ve N. Basım (Der.), *Örgüt Kuramları*. İstanbul: Beta.
- Yeloğlu, H.O. (2008). Örgütlerde yapısal-stratejik konfigürasyonlar: Koşul bağımlılık kuramı, Konfigürasyon Yaklaşımı bağlamında örgüt yapıları üzerine önermeler. *Eskişehir Osmangazi üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 3(2), 155-170.
- <https://www.kayso.org.tr/en/834/Kayseri-OSB.html>, Accessed Date: 15.01.2021

Citation Information

Işık, Ö. (2021). Analysis of the relationship between corporate image and organizational citizenship behavior in the context of Configuration Theory: A case study in the organized industrial zone. *OPUS–International Journal of Society Studies*, 18(Yönetim ve Organizasyon Özel Sayısı), 1050-1084. DOI: 10.26466/opus.914020.