Eurasian Journal of Educational Research 85 (2020) 185-204

Eurasian Journal of Educational Research
www.ejer.com.tr

Correlations between Teachers' Personality, Psychological Safety Perception and Teacher Voice*

Seyda BAS[1], Erkan TABANCALI[2]

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received: 31 July 2018
Received in revised form: 22 July 2019
Accepted: 11 Jan. 2020
DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2020.85.9

Keywords
Upward communication, educational organization, employee input, human resources

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to determine the level of the teacher's voice, and to examine the relationships between voice, five-factor personality traits and psychological safety.
Research Method: The study was conducted with a correlational survey model. The sample of the study consisted of 475 teachers in public primary schools. Three instruments were applied in the study; Employee Voice Scale, Quick Big Five Personality Test, and Psychological Safety Scale.
Findings: Results showed that the level of teacher's voice was at level "Often", and there were significant and positive correlations between agreeableness, extraversion, emotional stability and openness to experience, and teacher's voice; and also between psychological safety and teacher's voice; and lastly, between psychological safety and agreeableness and emotional stability.
Implications for Research and Practice: Significant and positive relationships were found between teacher voice, and psychological safety and personality while the strength of the relationships was low. Therefore, future studies might focus on other individual and organizational factors related to the teacher's voice.

*This study was partly presented at the 5rd International Eurasian Educational Research Congress in Antalya, 02 May – 05 May, 2018

[1] Yildiz Technical University, e-mail: bas.seyda@gmail.com, TURKEY, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1218-6327
[2] Yildiz Technical University, e-mail: tabanca@yildiz.edu.tr, TURKEY, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7536-2696

Introduction

As traditional management thinking and practice have evolved over the last century, superior-subordinate communication types, management styles, mutual sharing and achievement become important in institutional structures for employees and employers in terms of organizational structures, motivations, and sustainability. In this respect, the decision-making process, production and development of strategies are not carried out only by the employers, but with the participation of employees. Employee input is an essential information source to take precaution for potential problems or to improve organizations. It is also important for employees to be able to voice their ideas, opinions, suggestions, and criticisms about work-related issues. In the literature, employee voice is defined as employees' voicing personal ideas and opinions on work-related matters and their involvement levels in organizational decision-making processes to improve the workplace (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Folger & Martin, 1986). Morrison (2011) states that employee voice involves improving an organization, resolving an organizational or business-related problem, opposing injustice or mismanagement, providing feedback on an important strategic issue or expressing different opinions arising from the perspectives of individuals. The results of studies on organizational effects of employee voice show that employees' voluntary contributions to the organization with ideas and information on learning and improvement prevent problems arising from not having enough knowledge of top-management (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008). From an individual perspective, individual reduces stress by increasing auto-control and job motivation (Parker, 1993), and their belief that problems can be solved positively affects their attitudes towards their jobs (Morrison & Milliken, 2000) when they are able to express problems and concerns about the work comfortably. These results indicate that employee voice is an important concept for both individuals and organizations.

On the other hand, employees might not share their opinions in their workplace. Employees avoid explaining their ideas for certain reasons (Morrison & Milliken, 2000), and silence of the employees can be negative in terms of organizational performance (Edmondson & Roloff, 2009). Furthermore, their health might be affected both psychologically and physically when they cannot talk about the problems related to their jobs (Cortina & Magley, 2003), and these adverse effects may threaten organizational performance. Thus, it is stated that employee voice making superior-subordinate communication possible within the organization is important to develop an organizational decision making and a good error detection system. The presence of employee voice seems positive for organizations while the lack of it might be harmful to organizations and employees.

For educational organizations, voice predicts the autonomy of teachers and students as it is a form of communication that reflects a democratic culture in the organizational structure. In this respect; knowledge, opinions, suggestions, criticisms and observations of teachers as employees of educational organizations are valuable resources for democratic organizational culture. Furthermore, sharing existing information is as important as a source of information within an organization; however, it is often difficult to share information in organizations (Yeniceri & Demirel,

2007). Since knowledge-sharing is significant for both improving the organization and resolving existing problems, the lack of knowledge-sharing and communication problems may threaten educational organizations and teachers as employees from many aspects. When teachers are not able to voice work-related opinions or information to the management, managers might be too late to solve the organizational problems, teachers might become demotivated and dissatisfied; thus, the educational quality and performance of schools might diminish. Since employee voice prevents these adverse situations, it is an organizationally desired behavior. Employees also have their own individual aims. For organizational performance, harmony between individual and organizational aims is important. According to the study conducted by Dundar and Tabancali (2012), teachers with experience of 1-5 years cannot adapt to their workplace. It is very common that teachers lose their teaching motivations in a few years, which has a negative impact on the success of the schools. The solution to deal with these problems may be a successful communication with the school administrations by making them aware of ideas, opinions, suggestions and desires of the teachers. Therefore, voice can be very effective to tackle these problems; thus, to find out to what extent the teachers' voice, and which factors are related to teacher's voices are vital issues for school administrations.

As it is seen, voice is vital for the sustainability and success of schools, so factors related to voice become an important field for researchers. Employees' beliefs about the efficacy of their voicing and concerns about risk due to voicing are critical to whether they voice (Morrison, 2011). Employees search for some contextual cues to decide on how proper to the voice in that organization (Dutton, Ashford, Lawrence & Miner-Rubino, 2002). For the development and sustainability of organizations, factors affecting voice are important. In the related literature, there are some studies that examine mechanisms enhancing or alleviating voice (Ashford & LeCroy, 2009; Detert & Burris, 2007; Dutton, Ashford, Lawrence & Miner-Rubino, 2002; LePine & Van Dyne, 2001; Milliken, Morrison & Hewlin, 2003; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Morrison, 2011; Near & Miceli, 2008; Stamper & Van Dyne, 2001; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008). Still, employee voice concept seems ignored compared to other related concepts such as employee participation since it does not symbolize the exact outcomes such as influence or power-sharing (Wilkinson, Gollan, Kalfa & Xu, 2018). According to voice literature, the preliminary motive for voice is assumed to improve the performance of organizations or to provide collective benefits (Ashford & LeCroy, 2009). According to Morrison (2011), the factors related to voice are categorized as individual and contextual factors. Individual factors are summarized as the personality of employees, and attitude towards their duties; and contextual factors are summarized as organizational structure, organizational culture, and collective beliefs. While there are some studies examining factors related to voice, there are few studies examining teacher voice in school settings. However, it is a must to examine the teacher's voice, and related factors to voice to understand the nature of voice at schools to be able to develop the success of schools so that education improves. The aim of this study is to contribute to existing literature, to attract attention to teacher voice concept, and to fill the research gap by providing a better understanding of teacher voice concept. Therefore, the present study aims to find out the level of teachers' perceptions of voice

and whether there is a significant relationship between teacher voice, and personality and psychological safety. The research questions of the study are as follows:

1. What is the level of teacher voice?
2. Is there a correlation between psychological safety and teacher voice?
3. Is there a correlation between five factor personality traits and teacher voice?
4. Is there a correlation between psychological safety and five factor personality traits?

Method

Research Design

The study is a quantitative study based on the relational survey model. It examines the relationship between two or more different variables (Creswell, 2014). The variables examined in the study are employee voice, psychological safety and personality.

Research Sample

The study was carried out on the European side of Istanbul in the Fall and Spring semesters of the 2017-2018 academic year. The statistics of the National Ministry of Education shows that there are 22.272 teachers working in public primary schools (Istanbul Provincial Directorate of National Education, 2017). It is assumed that 377 teachers with a 95% confidence level represent the population stated above (Cingi, 2009). For this reason, 475 teachers were selected through simple random sampling from teachers in public primary schools in 25 districts on the European Side of İstanbul. Before the study was applied, the teachers were informed about the purposes of the study, and only volunteer teachers took part in the study.

77.1% of the participants were female while the rest 22.9% were male. As for their education level, 88.2% of the participants held a bachelor's degree, 11.4% master's degree, and 0.4% doctorate degree. Concerning their years of teaching, 28.2% of the participants had a working experience of 1-5 years, 22.1% 6-10 years, 20% 11-15 years, 12.6% 16-20 years, and 16.2% 21 years or more than 21 years. In terms of their years of working at the current school, 23,6% worked for less than 1 year, 52,8% for 1-5 years, 15,4% for 6-10 years, and 8,2% for 10 years or more than 10 years at the current school.

Research Instruments and Procedures

The quantitative data gathered through three different instruments, which were Employee Voice Scale, Quick Big Five Personality Test and Psychological Safety Scale. Employee voice was measured using The Employee Voice Scale developed by Van Dyne and LePine (1998). The scale was adapted to the Turkish language by Cetin and Cakmakci (2012). The scale consisted of six items, and the participants responded to a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 "never" to 5 "always".

Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis was used to test the structural validity of the scale (Cetin & Cakmakci, 2012). To determine the construct validity of the scale, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were employed, and the analyses revealed only one factor. The factor loadings of the items were found above 0.70. The variance explained was 62%. The reliability coefficient was calculated as 0.874, and item-total correlations were above 0.56. These values show that the scale is acceptable, and the scale will provide valid and reliable results (Cetin & Cakmakci, 2012). When the reliability coefficients of the six-item Employee Voices Scale were examined, Cronbach's Alpha value of the general scale perceptions was calculated as 0.883. In the social sciences, it represents valuable, moderate security between 0.60 and 0.80 (Kalayci, 2009). Accordingly, the calculated reliability value indicates that the scale is reliable.

Five-Factor Personality Model is a quantitative way to assess personality traits, and the model is seen as a highly accepted way to assess personality by the researchers. It is conceptualized as five personality traits which are extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability, conscientiousness and openness to experience and those five personality traits represent personality at the highest extent in organizations (Goldberg, 1993). By using five-factor personality traits, The Quick Big Five Personality Test was developed by Vermulst and Gerris (2005; as cited in Morsunbul, 2014). The scale was adapted to the Turkish language by Morsunbul (2014). It consists of 30 items with five dimensions which are extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability, conscientiousness and openness to experience. The participants responded to a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 "Very untrue of me" to 7 "Very true of me".

Confirmatory Factor Analysis was used to test the structural validity of the scale (Morsunbul, 2014). $\chi 2$ /sd ratio was calculated as 3.76 with DFA and the proposed model is compatible with the data according to these values. The Goodness of fit index was 0.91 and the comparative fit index value was 0.92; the Normed Fit Index was 0.91; the Not-Normed Fit Index was calculated as 0.91 and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation was 0.08. These values show that the five dimensions of the scale which are agreeableness, extraversion, conscientiousness, emotional stability and openness to experience are acceptable and the scale will provide valid and reliable results (Morsunbul, 2014). Cronbach's Alpha value for each dimension was measured. 0.60-0.80 values show considerable reliability, and values which are 0.80 and above show high reliability in social sciences (Kalayci, 2009). Cronbach's Alpha value of Extraversion was 0,825, Cronbach's Alpha value of agreeableness was 0,740, Cronbach's Alpha value of emotional stability was 0,792, Cronbach's Alpha value of conscientiousness was 0,792 and Cronbach's Alpha value of openness to experience was 0,759. These values show that the test is reliable.

Psychological safety was measured using Psychological Safety Scale developed by Edmondson (1999; as cited in Yener, 2015). The scale was adapted to the Turkish language by Yener (2015). It consists of 7 items with two dimensions which are toleration and initiative. The participants responded to a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 "Strongly disagree" to 5 "Strongly agree".

Confirmatory Factor Analysis was used to test the factor structure of the scale (Yener, 2015). $\chi 2$ /sd ratio was calculated as 2.80 with DFA and the proposed model was compatible with the data according to these values. The Goodness of fit index was 0.95 and the comparative fit index value was 0.95; the Normed Fit Index was 0.92 and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation was 0.10 (Yener, 2015). These values show that the scale is acceptable, and the scale provides valid and reliable results. Cronbach's Alpha value for each dimension was measured; Cronbach's Alpha value of toleration was 0,607 and Cronbach's Alpha value of initiative was 0,684. Generally, Cronbach's Alpha value of studies was supposed to be above 0.70. However, according to Kalayci (2009), in social sciences, 0.40-0.60 values show low reliability, 0.60-0.80 values show considerable reliability, and values which are 0.80 and above show high reliability. These values show that the scale is reliable.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed with SPSS 21 packet program. Since the population of the study was more than 30, Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality analysis was applied to determine whether the distribution of the data displayed normality. Pearson correlation analysis was used to analyze the relationship and the degree of relationship. Cronbach Alpha value test was used to evaluate the reliability of the scale (Kalayci, 2009).

Table 1

Normal Distribution Test Results

Scale	Statistic	df	p	Skewness	Kurtosis	Mean	Median
Psychological Safety	0,077	475	0,00	-0,480	0,346	3,40	3,42
Quick Big Five Personality Test	0,034	475	0,20	-0,022	-0,397	5,27	5,30
Employee Voice	0,105	475	0,00	-0,712	0,271	3,96	4,00

According to the results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality analysis, it was decided that the distribution of the data did not deteriorate from the normality although the data did not display normal distribution ($p < 0.05$), since the kurtosis and skewness were between ± 2.0 (George & Mallery, 2010), the mean and the media were close to each other, and the number of participants was above 30 due to the central limit theorem. As a result, it was decided to use parametric analyses.

It is stated that if the p-value is less than 0.05, it is interpreted that results are statistically significant. If the p-value is greater than 0.05, results are interpreted as statistically insignificant. If r value is between 0.70 and 1.00, it presents a high level of relationship. If the r-value is between 0.70 and 0.30, it presents a moderate relationship. If it is between 0.30 and 0.00, it presents a low relationship (Buyukozturk, Kilic Cakmak, Akgun, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2012).

Results

This part includes the analysis of the level of teacher voice and correlations between the variables. To find out the level of teacher's voice, mean and standard deviation values for each item are analyzed, described and explained in Table 2.

Table 2

The Level of Teacher Voice

Items		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	$\bar{x}$	s.s
1. I make suggestions about issues concerning the institution I work for.	n	13	54	131	136	141	3,71	1,09
	%	2,74	11,37	27,58	28,68	29,68		
5. I try to contribute to issues that may affect the quality of the work environment.	n	4	21	52	208	190	4,18	0,85
	%	0,84	4,42	10,95	43,79	40,00		
							Mean = 3,97	

The level of the teacher's voice was at level "Often" ($\bar{x}$=3.97). The item with the highest mean the participants perceived was "I try to contribute to the issues that may affect the quality of my work environment." ($\bar{x}$= 4.18) while the item with the lowest mean was "I make suggestions about issues concerning the institution I work for." ($\bar{x}$= 3.71).

To find out the level of teachers' psychological safety perception, mean values for each dimension are analyzed, described and explained in Table 3.

Table 3

Mean Values for two Dimensions of Psychological Safety

Dimensions	$\bar{x}$
Toleration	3,48
Initiative	3,34
	Mean = 3,41

When the level of teachers' psychological safety perception was examined; it was determined that the level of perception on the dimension of toleration was at the level of "Agree" ($\bar{x}$=3.48). Teachers' level of perception on the dimension of the initiative was found to be "Neither agree nor disagree" ($\bar{x}$= 3.34). It was determined that their perception of psychological safety was at the level of "Agree" ($\bar{x}$= 3.41).

Table 4 shows the relationship between psychological safety, the dimensions of psychological safety and teacher voice.

Table 4

Correlation between Psychological Safety and Teacher Voice

	Teacher Voice	Toleration	Initiative	Psychological Safety
Teacher Voice	1	,180**	,275**	,261**
		,000	,000	,000
Toleration		1	,584**	,863**
			,000	,000
Initiative			1	,914**
				,000
Psychological Safety				1

It was observed that there was a positive and low correlation between psychological safety and teacher voice ($p<0.01$, p= 0,000, r=0,261). As for its dimensions, similarly, it was observed that there was positive correlations between toleration and teacher voice ($p<0.01$, p= 0,000, r=0,180), and between initiative and teacher voice ($p<0.01$, p= 0,000, r=0,275) while the strength of the relationships was low.

Table 5 shows the mean values for each dimension to find out the level of teachers' five-factor personality traits perception.

Table 5

Mean Values for five Dimensions of Personality

Dimensions	$\bar{x}$
Agreeableness	6,05
Extraversion	4,75
Conscientiousness	5,35
Emotional stability	4,70
Openness to experience	5,50

When the levels of teachers' personality perception were examined; it was determined that the level of perception on the dimension of agreeableness was "Very true of me" ($\bar{x}$=6.05). Teachers' level of perception on the dimension of extraversion was found to be "Somewhat true of me" ($\bar{x}$=4.75). It was determined that their perception to the dimension of responsibility was "Very true of me" ($\bar{x}$=5.35). It was

determined that their perception of the dimension of emotional balance was at the level of "Somewhat true of me" ($\bar{x}$=4.70). Their perception of the dimension of openness to experience was found to be "True of me" ($\bar{x}$=5.50).

As can be seen in Table 6, significant correlations were found between some personality traits and the teacher's voice.

Table 6

Correlations between Five-Factor Personality Traits and Teacher Voice

	Teacher voice	Agreeableness	Extraversion	Conscientiousness	Emotional stability	Openness to experience	Personality
Teacher voice	1	,309**	,295**	,089	,172**	,338**	,358**
		,000	,000	,050	,000	,000	,000
Agreeableness		1	,235**	,277**	,233**	,487**	,622**
			,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
Extraversion			1	,028	,477**	,493**	,677**
				,548	,000	,000	,000
Conscientiousness				1	,152**	,136**	,546**
					,001	,003	,000
Emotional stability					1	,250**	,690**
						,000	,000
Openness to experience						1	,681**
							,000
Personality							1

There were positive correlations between agreeableness and teacher voice (p<0.01, p= 0,000, r=0,309), between extraversion and teacher voice (p<0.01, p= 0,000, r=0,295), between emotional stability and teacher voice (p<0.01, p= 0,000, r=0,172), and lastly, between openness to experience and teacher voice (p<0.01, p= 0,000, r=0,338). The strength of all the correlations was low.

Significant correlations were found between psychological safety and some personality traits in Table 7.

Table 7

Correlation between Psychological Safety and Five-Factor Personality Traits

	Toleration	Initiative	Psychological safety	Agreeableness	Extraversion	Conscientiousness	Emotional stability	Openness to experience	Personality
Toleration	1	,584**	,863**	,075	,063	-,010	,167**	-,012	,092*
		,000	,000	,104	,170	,822	,000	,795	,045
Initiative			,914**	,149**	,065	,009	,201**	,058	,144**
			,000	,001	,159	,840	,000	,207	,002
Psychological safety			1	,130**	,072	,000	,208**	,030	,135**
				,004	,118	,993	,000	,515	,003
Agreeableness				1	,235**	,277**	,233**	,487**	,622**
					,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
Extraversion					1	,028	,477**	,493**	,677**
						,548	,000	,000	,000
Conscientiousness						1	,152**	,136**	,546**
							,001	,003	,000
Emotional stability							1	,250**	,690**
								,000	,000
Openness to experience								1	,681**
									,000
Personality									1

Agreeableness was positively correlated with psychological safety ($p<0.01$, $p= 0,000$, $r=0,130$). Emotional stability was positively correlated with psychological safety ($p<0.01$, $p= 0,000$, $r=0,208$). The strength of both correlations was low. It was found that there was no significant relationship between psychological safety and extraversion, conscientiousness and openness to experience.

When it comes to the dimensions of psychological safety, similar correlations were found. There were positive correlations between initiative and agreeableness ($p<0.01$, $p= 0,000$, $r=0,149$), and between initiative and emotional stability ($p<0.01$, $p= 0,000$, $r=0,201$) while the strength of the relationships was low. It was found that there was no significant relationship between toleration and five-factor personality traits.

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

The study was conducted to determine the level of the teacher's voice. It also examined the relationships between voice, five-factor personality traits and psychological safety. This section includes a discussion of the findings.

The first aim of this study was to determine the level of employee voice of teachers. The level of the voice of teachers was found as "Often", which is consistent with related research (Cetin, 2013, Bulut & Bayramlik, 2015; Sagnak, 2017). Since teachers are the most important source to express possible problems to school management (Smylie, 1992), teacher participation can be a way to create a culture of innovation and a prerequisite for improvement of school (Detert & Edmondson, 2006), and institutions encouraging, and rewarding employee voice is close to achieving their organizational aims (Honingh & Hooge, 2014); thus, teachers' high perceptions towards voice seem a positive development for schools. Furthermore, according to Ashford and LeCroy, (2009), the main motive for employee voice is the desire to develop organizational performance and collective benefit. Based on the finding that teachers often voice their ideas, opinions and suggestions, teachers in Turkey seem willing to develop the performance of schools they work.

The second aim was to examine the relationship between psychological safety and voice. The results showed that there was a significant and positive relationship between two variables, which seems consistent with the related literature. Kahn (1990) states psychological safety diminishes the perception of risk of employees because of voicing, and, similarly, Eggers (2011) states that psychological safety climate encourages employees to say their opinions or ideas to the top management by taking a calculated risk so that organizational learning and changing stage start. The literature on employee voice shows that concerns about the risk on negative effects of their voice have a significant effect on their decision to voice (Morrison, 2011). Expectancy Theory assumes that individuals decide how to act by making predictions on the future and evaluating the social systems they are in (Vroom, 1964 as cited in Hoy & Miskel, 2015). A high level of psychological safety might make the evaluation of social systems more positive, and it might raise the possibility of the employee to voice. Thus, schools with a high level of psychological safety encourage teachers to voice, which affects schools positively.

Relationships among colleagues matter when it comes to a psychologically safe climate. Kahn (1990) found that psychological safety enhances when interpersonal relationships are supportive and reassuring, and Hoy and Miskel (2015) state that the climate of schools is mainly about collective beliefs of teachers, and perception of social

support helping to speak up their opinions freely is effective to deal with problems involving schools. Teachers with a higher level of psychological safety might feel that their relationships with their colleagues are more positive, and they have social support. Thus, their risk perception as a result of voicing might decrease, and they might have a more positive attitude towards speaking up. However, they avoid expressing themselves in their workplace when they do not feel free and safe (Cheng, Chang, Kuo & Lu, 2014). For example, according to the study conducted Prouska and Psychogios (2018), an economic crisis as in Greece which threatens job safety might avoid voicing since they are afraid of futility or danger of voicing, and the researchers found out economic context matters for voicing when it is thought negative psychological and economic effects resulted from negative economic context such as a long-term crisis. As for Turkey, teachers have a public employee status (Buyukgoze, 2015). Therefore, they might not worry about the negative results of voicing since they already have job security.

The third aim was to examine the relationship between five-factor personality traits and voice. Results show that there is a significant and positive relationship between extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability and openness to experience, and voice, which is compatible with Cetin (2013) examining the teacher's voice. Also, Morrison (2014) and LePine and Van Dyne (2001) suggest that extraversion is a motivating personality trait for voicing, and Nikolau, Vakola and Bourantas (2008) find out that emotional stability is one of the important predictors of voice. Extraverted individuals are more comfortable while communicating with others (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001). Therefore, they might not be afraid of risks as a result of their attempt to challenge the status quo, and they might be willing to voice. Moreover, according to Constructive Communication Theory (CCT), voicing itself is not enough for creating an effect; high communication skills also matter for the efficiency of voice (Ozyilmaz & Taner, 2018). Extraverted people are more prone to have better communication skills (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001). That is why; they might be more inclined to speak up by believing the efficiency of their voicing. Agreeable people are expected to be inclined to maintain the status quo, and to obey the group norms; and thus, they may not be inclined to voice (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), which conflicts with the result of this study. According to Cetin (2013), the Turkish primary school context does not make teachers think their voicing might be harmful to their interpersonal relationships with their colleagues so that they will not avoid challenging the status quo by voicing. The difference in context might explain the relationship between variables.

Individuals low in emotional stability are inclined to feel nervous while they are speaking or stating their opinions about changing while ones high in emotional stability have high-level perceptions of self-trust and efficiency, so they will not be anxious to create a change in their organization (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001). That reasonability could explain the positive relationship between voice and emotional stability. People with openness to experience are inclined to be flexible and creative, and they are ready to change and adapt to different circumstances easily and look at the issues from a different perspective. Therefore, they are willing to voice since they

could come up with solutions to problems of schools, and they could help schools to adapt to changing circumstances.

The fourth aim of the study was to examine the relationship between psychological safety and five-factor personality traits. Emotional stability was found to be positively related to psychological safety, which is consistent with the study of Edmondson and Mogelof (2005). They found out that there is a negative relationship between emotional instability and psychological safety; some employees may be prone to suspect their colleagues and see their workplace hostile since employees with a high level of emotional instability tend to feel negative emotions such as anxiety, inferiority and shame for a longer time. In addition, the results showed that there was a significant and positive relationship between agreeableness and psychological safety. According to McShane and Von Glinow (2011), employees with a high level of agreeableness are more successful at dealing with their problems. Thus, they become more adept at solving the problem when they face with a condition that threatens their psychological safety. In their study, Edmondson and Mogelof (2005) found out that extraversion and openness to experience are correlated with psychological safety while the results of this study do not show a significant relationship between them. These different results might be derived from the contextual differences.

The study showed that teachers working at Turkish public primary schools are often eager to voice their ideas, opinions, and suggestions to the management. Thus, this result seems very positive when thought positive effects of voice such as promoting organizational learning, change and innovation on individuals and organizations. The study proves the importance of individual traits for psychological safety and voice by finding out correlations between some personality traits, psychological safety and teacher's voice. Furthermore, the study shows the significance of context for employee voice. Teachers tend to speak up when the climate of a school is perceived as psychologically safe. Thus, as a practical implication, it is significant that school administrations create a supportive climate for teachers and develop upward communication channels to improve the employee voice at schools. The study supports employee voice literature stating that employees track some contextual clues to voice in the organizations. However, the strength of the correlation between employee voice, and personality and psychological safety is low, which implies that employee voice includes complicated processes, and there are other individuals and organizational factors related to voice.

Lastly, the legal status of teachers seems relevant to the teacher's voice since it determines job security. When a civil servant status of public-school teachers in Turkey is thought, the results might be explicated within Turkish public schools - context. As a theoretical contribution, the study contributes to existing literature and fills the research gap by providing a better understanding of the teacher voice concept.

School administrators might develop upward communication channels to create a psychologically safe climate at school settings so that teacher voice can be encouraged based on the positive relationship between psychological safety and teacher voice found by the study. The same subject might be re-examined at private schools to make

an extensive evaluation of teacher's voices, and results might be compared based on significant relationships between teacher voice, and personality and psychological safety at public schools. Furthermore, the teacher's voice of UN countries might be examined to boost the generalizability of the study when it is thought teachers' different status compared to Turkey. Based on the result of the study that the relationships between the variables are low, which shows there are other factors related to employee voice concept, future studies might focus on other related factors to understand motives behind voicing better. Also, qualitative and quantitative studies examining individual and organizational factors might be carried out to enlighten the psychological mechanisms of voice.

References

Ashford, J. B., & LeCroy, C. (2009). *Human behavior in the social environment: A Multidimensional Perspective*. Toronto: Nelson Education.

Bulut H., & Bayramlik H. (2015). The analysis of employee voice behaviour of teachers: A study in Balikesir state schools. Paper presented at *II. Yuksekogretim Stratejileri ve Kurumsal İsbirligi Sempozyumu (YOSKIS)* (444-449). Mersin: Mersin University.

Buyukgoze, H. (2015). A comparison of the employment of public sector teachers in EU and Turkey. *Journal of Aksaray University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 7*(2), 57-65.

Buyukozturk, S., Kilic Cakmak, E., Akgun, E.A., Karadeniz S., & Demirel, F. (2012). *Scientific Research Methods (11th edition).* Ankara: Pegem Publication.

Cetin, S., & Cakmakci, C. (2012). Adaptation of the employee voice scale into Turkish. *Science Journal of Turkish Military Academy*, *22*(2), 1-19.

Cetin, S. (2013). Impact of teachers' perceptions of organizational support, management openness and personality traits on voice. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *8*(18), 1709-1721.

Cheng, J., Chang, S. C., Kuo, J. H., & Lu, K. M. (2014). Social relations and voice behavior: The mediating role of psychological safety. *Criticism*, *32*, 58.

Cingi, H. (2009). *Ornekleme Kurami (3rd ed.).* Ankara: Bizim Buro Basimevi Yayin Dag. Tic. Ltd. Sirketi.

Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2003). Raising voice, risking retaliation: Events following interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8(4), 247-265.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Arastirma deseni, nitel, nicel ve karma yontem yaklasimlari (2nd ed.) (S.B. Demir Trans.). [Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.].* Ankara: Egiten Kitap.

Detert, J. R., & Edmondson, A. C. (2006). Latent voice episodes: The situation-specific nature of speaking up at work. *Harvard Business School Working Paper, 6-24.*

Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(4), 869-884.

Dundar, T., & Tabancali, E. (2012). The relationship between organizational justice perceptions and job satisfaction levels. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46,* 5777-5781.

Dutton, J. E., Ashford, S. J., Lawrence, K. A., & Miner-Rubino, K. (2002). Red light, green light: Making sense of the organizational context for issue selling. *Organization Science, 13*(4), 355-369.

Edmondson, A., & Mogelof, J. P. (2005). Explaining psychological safety in innovation teams: Organizational culture, team dynamics, or personality*? In Thompson, L. L., & Choi, H. S. (Eds.), Creativity and Innovation in Organizational Teams* (129-156), Psychology Press.

Edmondson, A. C., & Roloff, K. S. (2009). Overcoming barriers to collaboration: Psychological safety and learning in diverse teams. In *Salas, E., Goodwin, G. F., & Burke, C. S. (Eds.), Team effectiveness in complex organizations: Cross-disciplinary perspectives and approaches* (183-208), *34*.

Eggers, J. T. (2011). Psychological safety influences relationship behavior. *Corrections Today*, *73*(1), 60-61.

Folger, R., & Martin, C. (1986). Relative deprivation and referent cognitions: Distributive and Procedural justice effects. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *22*(6), 531-546.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2010). *SPSS for windows step by step: Simple guide and reference 17.0 update,* 10. Boston: Pearson.

Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist,48*, 26-34.

Honingh, M., & Hooge, E. (2014). The effect of school-leader support and participation in decision making on teacher collaboration in Dutch primary and secondary schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 42*(1), 75-98. doi: 10.1177/1741143213499256

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G., (2015). *Egitim yonetimi: Teori, arastirma ve uygulama (7th ed.) [Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice]* (*S. Turan Trans.)* Nobel Yayin Dagitim.

Istanbul Provincial Directorate of National Education (2017). *2016-2017 Istanbul Provincial National Education Statistics*. Retrieved from http://istanbul.meb.gov.tr

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, *33*(4), 692-724.

Kalayci, S. (2009). *SPSS applied multivariate statistical techniques*. Ankara: Dinamik Akademi.

LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (2001). Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential relationships with big five personality characteristics and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(2), 326. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.2.326

McShane, S., & Von Glinow, M. (2011). *M: Organizational behavior (3rd ed.)*. Irwin: McGraw-Hill.

Milliken, F. J., Morrison, E. W., & Hewlin, P. F. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees don't communicate upward and why. *Journal of management studies*, *40*(6), 1453-1476.

Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(4), 706-725.

Morrison, E. W. (2011). Employee voice behavior: Integration and directions for future research. *Academy of Management Annals*, *5*(1), 373-412. doi: 10.5465/19416520.2011.574506.

Morrison, E. W. (2014). Employee voice and silence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1*(1), 173-197. doi: 0.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091328

Morsunbul, U. (2014). The validity and reliability study of the Turkish version of quick big five personality test. *Dusunen Adam The Journal of Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences*, *27*(4), 316-322. doi: 10.5350/DAJPN2014270405

Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (2008). Wrongdoing, whistle-blowing, and retaliation in the US government: What have researchers learned from the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) survey results. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 28*(3), 263-281.

Nikolaou, I., Vakola, M., & Bourantas, D. (2008). Who speaks up at work? Dispositional influences on employees' voice behavior. *Personnel Review*, *37*(6), 666-679. doi: 10.1108/00483480810906892

Ozyilmaz A., & Taner D. (2018): Communication skills shape voice effects in organizations, *The Service Industries Journal*, doi: 10.1080/02642069.2018.1506444

Parker, L. E. (1993). When to fix it and when to leave: Relationships among perceived control, self-efficacy, dissent, and exit. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 949–959.

Prouska, R., & Psychogios, A. G. (2018). Do not say a word! Conceptualizing employee silence in a long-term crisis context. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 29* (5). doi: 10.1080/09585192.2016.1212913

Sagnak, M. (2017). Ethical leadership and teachers' voice behavior: The mediating roles of ethical culture and psychological safety. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *17*(4), 1101-1117. doi: 10.12738/estp.2017.4.0113

Smylie, M. A. (1992). Teacher participation in school decision making: Assessing willingness to participate. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *14*(1), 53-67.

Stamper, C. L., & Dyne, L. V. (2001). Work status and organizational citizenship behavior: A field study of restaurant employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 22*(5), 517-536.

Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. (2008). Employee silence on critical work issues: The cross-level effects of procedural justice climate. *Personnel Psychology*, *61*(1), 37-68. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00105

Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*(1), 108-119.

Wilkinson, A., Gollan, P. J., Kalfa, S., & Xu, Y. (2018). Voices unheard: employee voice in the new century, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 29*(5), 711- 724, doi: 10.1080/09585192.2018.1427347.

Yener, S. (2015). The validity and reliability study of the Turkish version of the psychological safety, *ODU Journal of Social Sciences Research,* 280-305.

Yeniceri, O., & Demirel, Y. (2007). A study on organizational and individual impediments against knowledge sharing in organizations. *Karamanoglu Mehmetbey University Journal of Social and Economic Research, (1*), 221-234.

Öğretmenlerin Kişilik Özellikleri, Psikolojik Güvenlik Algıları ile Öğretmen Sesliliği Arasındaki İlişkiler

Atıf:

Bas, S., & Tabancali, E. (2020). Correlations between teachers' personality, psychological safety perception and teacher voice. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Sciences, 85*, 185-204, DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2020.85.9

Özet

Problem Durumu: Klasik yönetim anlayışının değişim geçirmesiyle, örgütlerde etkileşim, başarma kültürü ve etkileşim önem kazanmıştır. Bununla beraber, örgütlerde karar verme kültürü de evrimleşmeye başlamış ve karar verme sadece yöneticilerin sorumluluğu değil, kurumsal yapıdaki çalışanların sorumluluğu olmaya başlamıştır. Bu nedenle, çalışanların yönetime fikir, düşünce ve önerilerini önermesi anlamına gelen çalışan sesliliği, örgütler açından önemli bir davranış olarak öne çıkmıştır.

Çalışan sesliliği, çalışanların çalıştıkları kurumla ilgili fikir ve görüşlerini yönetime ifade edip örgütsel karar verme süreçlerine katılımlarını ifade etmektedir. Çalışan sesliliği kavramı kurumu geliştirme, kurumsal problem çözme, kurumdaki uygulamaları veya haksızlıkları yönetime iletme gibi boyutlardan oluşmaktadır. Alan yazın incelendiğinde, çalışan sesliliğinin hem bireyin hem örgütün performansını geliştirdiği hem de çalışanlar tarafından gönüllü gerçekleştirilen bir davranış olduğu için örgütsel öğrenmeye katkıda bulunduğu görülmektedir. Benzer olarak, çalışan sesliliğinin düşük olduğu kurumlarda, örgütsel performansın düştüğü ve bireyin psikolojik veya fiziksel sağlığının kötü etkilendiği gözlemlenmektedir.

Görüldüğü gibi, çalışan sesliliği örgütlerin devamlılığı ve başarısı için önemlidir. Bu nedenle, çalışan sesliliği ile ilgili faktörler araştırmacılar için önemli bir çalışma alanı olmuştur. Diğer yandan, bir örgütte çalışan sesliliği davranışının var olması, demokratik kurum kültürünün bir göstergesi olabilir. Eğitim kurumlarında sesliliğin var olması, öğretmenin ve öğrencinin özerk olması ile ilgilidir; ancak bu şekilde eğitim kurumlarının demokratikliğinden bahsedilebilir. Çalışan sesliliği düzeyinin az olduğu okullarda, öğretmenlerin motivasyonu olumsuz etkilenebilir ve kurumdaki problemler zamanında çözülemeyebilir, bu nedenle eğitim ve öğretim kalitesi olumsuz etkilenebilir. Bu nedenle, çalışan sesliliği, eğitim kurumlarında var olması istenilen, önemli bir davranıştır.

Alan yazında seslilik ile ilgili araştırmalar olsa da çok azı okullarda yapılmıştır. Ancak, öğretmen sesliliği ve ilgili faktörleri incelemek, okullardaki seslilik olgusunun anlaşılması ve eğitim-öğretim süreçlerinin geliştirilip eğitimde başarının artması için önemlidir. Bu araştırmanın amacı, öğretmen sesliliği kavramının önemine dikkat çekmek ve öğretmen sesliliğinin daha iyi anlaşılmasının sağlayıp alan yazına katkıda bulunmaktır. Bu yüzden, araştırma öğretmen sesliliği düzeyini ve öğretmenlerin

kişiliği ve psikolojik güvenlik algıları ile öğretmen sesliliği arasındaki ilişkileri incelemektedir.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Araştırmanın amacı, İstanbul Avrupa Yakasındaki resmi ilkokullardaki öğretmen sesliliği algı düzeylerini tespit etmek ve psikolojik güvenlik ve beş faktör kişilik özellikleri ile öğretmen sesliliği arasındaki ilişkileri incelemektir.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Araştırma ilişkisel tarama modeline dayalı nicel bir araştırmadır. Araştırmanın örneklemini, 2017-2018 Eğitim ve Öğretim yılında İstanbul Avrupa Yakasında resmi ilkokullarda çalışan 475 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada Çalışan Sesliliği, Hızlı Beş Büyük Kişilik Testi ve Psikolojik Güvenlik olmak üzere üç ölçek kullanılmıştır. İstatistiksel analiz için SPSS 21 kullanılmıştır.

Araştırmanın Bulguları: Araştırma bulgularına göre, ilkokuldaki öğretmen sesliliği algı düzeyi ortalamanın üstünde ve "Genellikle" seviyesindedir. Uyumluluk, dışadönüklük, duygusal denge ve deneyime açıklık kişilik özellikleri ile öğretmen sesliliği arasında anlamlı ve pozitif bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Psikolojik güvenlik ile duygusal denge ve uyumluluk arasında anlamlı ve pozitif bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Son olarak, psikolojik güvenlik ile öğretmen sesliliği arasında anlamlı ve pozitif bir ilişki bulunmuştur.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri: Araştırma sonucuna göre, ilkokulda öğretmen sesliği algısı "Genellikle" seviyesindedir ve ortalamanın üstündedir. Bu sonuç, Türkiye'deki resmi ilkokullarda çalışan öğretmenlerin fikirlerini, düşüncelerini ve önerilerini idareye sunmaları için istekli olduklarını göstermesi açısından dikkat çekicidir. Çalışan sesliliğinin örgütsel öğrenme, değişimi ve inovasyon ortamlarını geliştirmesi gibi pozitif etkilileri düşünüldüğünde, öğretmen sesliliğinin yüksek olması olumlu bir sonuç olarak görülebilir. Diğer bir bulguya göre, öğretmenler okullarının iklimlerini psikolojik olarak güvenli algıladıklarında, konuşmaya meyilli olurlar. Öğretmenlerin psikolojik güvenlik algıları, kişilik özellikleri ile de ilgilidir, araştırmaya göre, uyumlu ve duygusal olarak dengeli öğretmenler, içlerinde bulunduğu ortamı psikolojik olarak güvenli olarak algılamaya daha çok meyillidir. Ayrıca uyumlu, dışadönük, deneyime açık ve duygusal olarak dengeli olan öğretmenler fikirlerini, düşüncelerini ve önerilerini daha çok seslendirmektedir. Araştırma sonucu bulunan bütün ilişkiler anlamlı ve pozitif olmakla beraber, ayrıca bütün ilişkilerinin düşük seviyede olduğu görülmüştür. Sonuçların da kanıtladığı üzere, kişilik ve psikolojik güvenliğe ek olarak, çalışan sesliliği başka bireysel ve örgütsel faktörleri de ilgili olan karmaşık süreçleri içerek bir davranıştır. Ayrıca, çalışanların örgütlerinde ses vermek için bağlamsal ipuçları takip ettiği ve bazı kişilik özelliklerinin çalışanları ses vermeleri için cesaretlendirdiği veya onların cesaretlerini kırdığını ifade eden ve çalışan sesliliği alan yazınında yer alan çalışmalar, mevcut araştırma tarafından desteklenmiştir. Bu nedenle araştırma sonuçları, öğretmen sesliliğine ışık tutması açısından değerlidir.

Çalışan sesliliği birey ve örgütler açısından karmaşık süreçleri içeren önemli bir örgütsel davranıştır. Bu nedenle, mevcut araştırmanın değişkenleri olan öğretmen sesliliği, psikolojik güvenlik ve kişilik arasındaki ilişki, farklı kademelerdeki özel veya devlet okullarında çalışan öğretmenler üzerinde tekrar araştırılabilir. Ayrıca, seslilik

davranışının arkasında olan psikolojik mekanizmaları daha iyi anlamak için, ses verme ile ilgili olabilecek bireysel veya örgütsel faktörler karma araştırmalarda incelenebilir, hatta gelecek araştırmalar öğretmenlerin seslilik davranışlarının yordayıcılarını araştırarak okul yöneticilerine rehberlik edilmesini sağlayabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dikey iletişim, eğitim örgütü, çalışan donanımı, insan kaynakları yönetimi

Acknowledgement

This study was produced from Seyda BAS's thesis "The Correlation Between Teachers' Personality, Psychological Safety Perception and Teacher Voice", and supported by the Scientific Research Projects Unit of Yildiz Technical University. Project Number: 3366.