



| Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi |

## Teachers Selfishness Level in Educational Organization According to The Perception of Teachers and School Administrators

### Öğretmenlerin ve Okul Yöneticilerinin Algılarına Göre Öğretmenlerin Eğitim Örgütlerinde Bencillik Düzeyi<sup>1</sup>

Naciye ÇALIŞICI ÇELİK<sup>2</sup>, Bilgen KIRAL<sup>3</sup>

#### Keywords

1. selfishness
2. selfishness in education
3. school administrator
4. teacher

#### Anahtar Kelimeler

1. bencillik
2. eğitimde bencillik
3. okul yöneticisi
4. öğretmen

#### Received/Başvuru Tarihi

29.05.2020

#### Accepted / Kabul Tarihi

18.02.2021

#### Abstract

*Purpose:* In this study, it is aimed to determine the level of selfishness that teachers and school administrators, one of the most important stakeholders of educational institutions, observe in teachers.

*Design/Methodology/Approach:* The research was carried out with the descriptive survey model, one of the quantitative research methods. The sample of the research consists of 356 teachers selected with stratified sampling method and 139 school administrators selected with simple random sample. The selfishness scale was used in education, which was used as a data collection tool. The collected data was analyzed with SPSS 22.0 program. Frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean, t-testi, Mann Whitney U test, One Way Anova and Kruskal Wallis test have been used to analyze the data.

*Findings:* As a result, the perceptions of teachers and school administrators about selfishness in teachers; It differs according to the teachers' gender, branch, seniority and educational status, school administrators' working time at the same school, the level of teaching at which both teachers and school administrators work affects.

*Highlights:* According to these results, researchers were suggested to conduct studies that reveal the reasons for the meaningful differences in participants' thoughts, and to conduct various interviews and psychotechnical tests in order to determine the levels of ethical behavior before starting candidate teachers.

#### Öz

*Çalışmanın amacı:* Bu araştırma, eğitim kurumlarının en önemli paydaşlarından olan öğretmenlerin ve okul yöneticilerinin, öğretmenlerde gözlemedikleri bencillik düzeyini tespit etmek amacıyla yapılmıştır.

*Materyal ve Yöntem:* Araştırma, nicel araştırma yöntemlerinden, betimsel tarama modeli ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırmanın örneklemini, tabakalı örnekleme yöntemi ile seçilen 356 öğretmen ve basit tesadüfi örnekleme ile seçilen 139 okul yöneticisi oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada veri toplamak için "Eğitimde Bencillik Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Toplanan veriler SPSS 22.0 programı ile analiz edilmiştir. Verilerin analizinde frekans, yüzde, aritmetik ortalama, t-testi, Mann Whitney U testi, One Way Anova ve Kruskal Wallis testi kullanılmıştır.

*Bulgular:* Sonuç olarak öğretmenlerin ve okul yöneticilerinin öğretmenlerde bencillik ile ilişkin algıları; öğretmenlerin cinsiyet, branş kıdem ve eğitim durumlarına göre okul yöneticilerinin aynı okulda çalışma sürelerine göre hem öğretmenlerin hem de okul yöneticilerinin ise çalıştıkları eğitim kademesine göre farklılaşmaktadır.

*Önemli Vurgular:* Bu sonuçlara göre anlamlı farklılık ortaya çıkan değişkenlere göre katılımcıların farklı düşünme nedenlerinin araştırılması, öğretmenlerin istihdam sürecinde mesleki etik davranış düzeylerini belirlemeye yönelik mülakatlara ve psikoteknik testlere dâhil edilmeleri gibi öneriler sunulmuştur.

<sup>1</sup> This article has been produced from the master's thesis.

<sup>2</sup> **Corresponding Author**, Aydın Adnan Menderes University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Administration, Aydın, TURKEY; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3586-3493>

<sup>3</sup> Aydın Adnan Menderes University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Administration, Aydın, TURKEY; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5352-8552>

## INTRODUCTION

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, changes have been gone through in every sense with the rapid impact of technology on human life. As a result of the changes experienced, the expectations of individuals and societies from school have varied when compared to those in the past (Saavedra & Opfer, 2012). The fact that the students trained at schools are able to adapt to the developing, changing and globalizing world, as well as sustaining their economic, social and cultural well-being depend on the effective and productive functioning of educational organizations (Tabançalı & Koravaz, 2014). For this reason, educational organizations set a number of goals for themselves. Human relations also play an important role as well as the organizational structure in the activities they carry out in order to achieve their predetermined goals. Teachers are among the most strategic elements of the school organization (Bursalıoğlu, 2013). Teachers are expected to perform positive behaviors in their relationships with other colleagues. The failures that teachers experience in their relationships and communication with their colleagues may cause many undesired situations in their personal and professional lives. One of the behaviors experienced in educational organizations that harms the organization is selfishness (Arslan Hendekci & Özen, 2018; Büte, 2011; Gül, 2006). Selfishness is the fact that the individual tries to advance his personal interests to the detriment of other individuals or society with conscious behaviors (Önal, 2018); and that he interprets and manages the events around with egocentric thinking by ignoring others.

It can be said that selfishness harms both individuals and organizations. While behaviors that harm the organization emerge, only the norms of the organization are sometimes violated and negative behaviors can be displayed only because of personal interests at other times. The employees of the organization who aim to benefit themselves can harm their work, the organization's assets, its resources and other employees (Vardi & Wiener, 1996; Vardi & Weitz, 2004). While the members of the organization think that they are working for the benefit of the institution, they may actually violate the organizational values and rules (Kolthoff, 2012). It is known that the common behaviors of the managers such as hiding information from their employees, not sharing the information they have, etc. harm organizations (De Vries, 2007). Selfish managers or employees tend to refuse to share, assuming that they only have their own interests and needs; and act by considering in advance how much they will be affected in the face of events that occur. Besides, they ignore the interests, needs, and desires of others. On the contrary, organizational studies require that sharing and working in cooperation is needed. Therefore, this is the healthiest and most effective way for the organization to achieve its goals (Gül, 2006).

Selfishness harms both the person himself and the society he lives in, and brings himself closer to what is easy and ready. Selfish people wish to own everything they desire in the easiest way, and they think of their instant happiness instead of long-term goals (Tarhan, 2006). The tendency of selfishness, which cannot be controlled properly, is very dangerous and causes the individual to become insensitive to himself and his environment. Selfishness effects a person in such a way that he can ignore social values. A selfish person can easily violate the rights of everyone around him (Kasapoğlu, 2010). It can be said that selfishness is a dangerous situation that only serves one's own self, kills the effort to understand others and the feeling of solidarity, and that is based on individual thinking. Based on all these, the selfishness behaviors that emerge in organizations and damage the employees, the assets of the organization and its resources can be said to possess the dimensions of not sharing the resources owned, keeping one's own benefits ahead, and harming other employees and the organization. These issues that have been mentioned (Çalışıcı Çelik & Kırıl, 2019) are called the dimension of sharing, utilitarianism and harming. The fact that the individual refuses to share with the other person is called "sharing dimension"; the fact that he benefits through exploitation relationships is called "utilitarianism dimension"; and the state of doing evil or harming others for the sake of individual benefits is called "harming dimension" (Çalışıcı Çelik & Kırıl, 2019). These selfishness situations can be experienced in educational organizations as well as in the individuals in other organizations. Together with the fact that the communication styles, behaviors and attitudes of the employees in educational organizations are important, it can be said that the thoughts and feelings of the individuals towards each other should be in accordance with the purpose and benefit of the educational organization. The fact that the employees prioritize their own interests over the benefits of the organization, that is to say, the selfishness of the individuals can lead to the deterioration of organizational climate. Selfishness can be expressed as a negative concept and an unethical behavior that can weaken organizations.

When the studies in the field of organizational behavior were examined, it was found out that there were no researches in the field of educational sciences on selfishness, which is considered among the harmful behaviors to the organization. Regarding selfishness in Turkish literature, it was revealed that the studies were conducted in the field of philosophy (Can, 2018; Ersoy, 2014; Kesikoğlu, 2016), Islamic sciences (Onsekizoğlu, 2004; Özbay, 2018), language and literature (Tanrıkulu, 2008), sociology (Ardıç, 2019), economics (Şen, 2016). In foreign literature, it was observed that there were scientific studies on the concept of selfishness more in psychology and social psychology (Dubois, Rucker & Galinsky, 2015; Rachlin, 2002; Jones, 2005; Whillans, Caruso & Dunn, 2017). In these studies, the concept of selfishness was not examined in terms of educational sciences. For this reason, it is thought that the present study will be the first study to measure the level of selfishness in teachers according to the perceptions of teachers and school administrators, and that it can contribute to the literature in this sense. In addition to this, it is also considered that this study will contribute to educational administrators and to the field of educational administration in terms of revealing the selfishness levels of teachers, together with the participation of teachers and school administrators who have encountered, observed or experienced such selfishness behaviors in educational organizations, and that it will raise awareness about selfishness and guide future studies.

It can be said that not only teachers but also administrators and other employees in the working life should act with the consideration of the aims and interests of the school. Selfishness behaviors that emerge within schools can negatively affect school culture and organizational commitment of the employees, and may lead to a decrease in job performance. In this case, it can be difficult for the organization to achieve its goals. Selfish behaviors and attitudes that emerge in educational environments may affect the organization and society closely as individuals harm themselves. For this reason, it is thought to be extremely significant to be able to control and manage selfishness behaviors emerging within organizations. In accordance with all this information, it can be said that this research is significant and will contribute to the field, and that it will be the first study on selfishness in the field of educational sciences.

### **The Purpose of the Study**

This study was conducted in order to reveal the selfishness levels of the teachers observed by teachers and school administrators working in public schools according to various variables. In accordance with this purpose, the answers for the following questions were sought:

1- What are the perception levels of teachers and school administrators in terms of the selfishness in teachers according to the overall scale and its dimensions?

2- Do the perception levels of teachers and school administrators in terms of the selfishness in teachers show a significant difference according to various variables (gender, marital status, educational status, teaching level, the duty at school, seniority, seniority at the same school, and branch)?

### **METHOD/MATERIALS**

The perception levels of teachers and school administrators in terms of the selfishness in teachers were examined by descriptive survey model based on general survey model, which is one of the quantitative research methods. In descriptive research, it is aimed to identify and present certain situations or phenomena in their "current form", whereas in descriptive survey studies, it is aimed to determine the perceptions, attitudes, behaviors and observations of the sample selected from larger groups in terms of a specific subject (Karasar, 2014).

### **Population and Sample**

The target population of the study was composed of 3108 classroom and branch teachers and 240 school administrators working in the public primary, secondary and high schools of Efeler district in Aydin province in 2019-2020 academic year. By using "The Table of Sample Sizes" (Can, 2019) in the study, first of all, it was determined that 340 teachers would represent the target population with 5% margin of error, which included 3108 teachers; and that 132 school administrators would represent the target population with 5% margin of error, which included 240 school administrators. After that, stratified sampling method was used on the selected sample size. The stratum determined in this study were the school levels in which teachers worked. In the selection of stratified sampling, after the population is divided into sub-populations, the number is determined within the ratio of each sub-population in the target population. Therefore, the representation ability of the selected sample is secured (Can, 2019). In this study, the number 340 determined for teachers was calculated as  $(340 \cdot 26 / 100 = 88)$  teachers for the teachers at primary school level;  $(340 \cdot 34 / 100 = 116)$  teachers for the teachers at secondary school level; and  $(340 \cdot 40 / 100 = 136)$  teachers for the teachers at high school level. By foreseeing the problems that may be encountered in practice, 10% more for both the number of teachers and administrators within the sample were taken and thus, the number of teachers at primary school level was determined as 97, the number of teachers at secondary school level was determined as 128, and the number of teachers at high school level was determined as 150, with a total of 375 teachers to participate in the research; whereas the school administrators and the schools in which the research would be conducted were chosen by using simple random sampling method where each entity in the population has an equal chance of being selected for the sample (Can, 2019). By taking 10% more than 132 school administrators, it was determined that the number of administrators should be 145. Out of 375 scales distributed to teachers, 7 were excluded due to incomplete coding, and 12 were excluded due to being outliers in the normality tests. Besides, out of 145 scales distributed to school administrators, 6 were excluded due to being outliers in the normality tests. Therefore, the analyses were performed on the scale forms filled in by 356 teachers and 139 school administrators. The information regarding the teachers and school administrators participating in the study in terms of various variables were presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. The Frequency and Percentages of the Participants in Terms of Various Variables**

Variables	Group	Teachers		School Administrators	
		n	%	n	%
Gender	Female	206	57.9	45	32.4
	Male	150	42.1	94	67.6
	Total	356	100	139	100
Marital status	Married	280	78.7	119	85.6
	Single	76	21.3	20	14.4
	Total	356	100	139	100
Educational status	Undergraduate degree	287	80.6	118	82.0
	Postgraduate degree	69	19.4	21	15.1
	Total	356	100	139	100
Teaching level	Primary	92	25.8	50	36.0
	Secondary	122	34.3	38	27.3
	High school	142	39.9	51	36.7
	Total	356	100	139	100
The duty at school	School principal	-		59	42.4
	Vice principal	-		80	57.6
	Teacher	356	100	-	-
	Total	356	100	139	100
Seniority	10 years and below	108	30.3	23	16.5
	11-20 years	149	41.9	69	49.6
	21 years and above	99	27.8	47	33.8
	Total	356	100	139	100
Seniority at the same school	10 years and below	126	35.4	43	30.9
	11-20 years	142	39.9	62	44.6
	21 years and above	88	24.7	34	24.5
	Total	356	100	139	100
Branch	Classroom teachers	92	25.8	37	26.6
	Social subject teachers	114	32.0	41	29.5
	Numerical subject teachers	74	20.8	31	22.3
	Vocational subject teachers	76	21.4	30	21.6
	Total	356	100	139	100

According to Table 1, when the distribution of the teachers who participated in the research according to the gender was examined, it could be revealed that 206 of the teachers (57.9%) were female, and 150 of them (42.1%) were male; whereas, when the distribution of the school administrators who participated in the research according to the gender was examined, it could be revealed that 45 of the school administrators (32.4%) were female, and 94 of them (67.6%) were male. When the marital status of the teachers who participated in the study was examined, it was found that 280 of the teachers (58.4%) were married, while 76 of them (21.3%) were single; whereas, it could also be observed that 119 of the school administrators who participated in the study (85.6%) were married, and 20 of them (14.4%) were single.

When the educational status of the teachers who participated in the study were examined, it was found that 287 of the teachers (80.6%) had an undergraduate degree, and 69 of them (19.4%) had a postgraduate degree; while it was observed that 118 of the school administrators who participated in the study (84.9%) had an undergraduate degree, and 21 of them (15.1%) had a postgraduate degree. When the participants in the study were examined according to the duty at school variable, it was revealed that the duty of 356 of the participants in the study at school was teaching; whereas, 59 of the school administrators (42.4%) were working as school principals and 80 of them (57.6%) were working as vice principals.

### Data Collection Tool

As the data collection tool in the study, the Likert-type "Selfishness in Education Scale", which consisted 14 items and 3 dimensions, was used. The "Selfishness in Education Scale" was developed by Çalııcı Çelik and Kırıl (2019). The scale is a 5-point Likert-type measuring instrument consisting 14 items. Among the items of the scale; 8 are in the sharing sub-dimension, while 3 are in utilitarianism sub-dimension, and 3 are in the harming sub-dimension. The degree of observation for the situation stated in each of the propositions given by the individuals evaluating the scale is "too many people (5), many people (4), few people (3), very few people (2), and nobody (1)". The scale was composed of two sections as "Personal Information Form" and "Selfishness

in Education Scale". The same scale was applied to both the teachers and the school administrators who participated in the study. The results of the Exploratory Factor Analysis performed regarding the validity of the factor structure of the "Selfishness in Education Scale" were given in Table 2.

**Table 2. Exploratory Factor Analysis for "Selfishness in Education Scale"**

Sub-Dimension	No	Items	F1	F1	F3
Sharing	18	They Do Not Want to Share Assessment and Evaluation Resources (Exam Questions, Acquisition Assessment, Performance Assessment Test, etc.) With Their Colleagues.	.901		
	12	They Do Not Share Important Information Resources (Book, Slide, Education Video, etc.) With their colleagues.	.838		
	15	They Do Not Share Their Own Materials and Equipment (Computer, Printer, etc.) With Others.	.829		
	13	They Do Not Want to Help Others In Order Not To Steal From Their Own Time.	.817		
	17	They Think That They Will Be More Inadequate In Terms of Information And Knowledge Than The Other Teachers When They Share Information About Their Branches.	.815		
	11	They Hide The Methods And Techniques They Use To Increase Their Success.	.805		
	14	They Want to Use The Sole Educational Environments (Laboratory, Library, etc.) for The Learning Activities Only By Themselves.	.770		
	16	When Other Teachers Have an Emergency, They Do Not Want to Deal With Their Students.	.735		
Utilitarianism	19	They Care More About The People They Provide Mutual Benefits At School.		.780	
	110	They Take Part in The Group Activities That Will Benefit Them.		.685	
	111	They Insist on Adjusting Their Own Time Tables According to Their Own Requests More.		.417	
Harming	125	They Tend To Change The Decisions Made In Line With Their Own Interests.			.896
	124	They Prefer To Remain Silent If It Is Not Themselves Who Are Subjected To Injustice.			.851
	123	They Do Not Refrain from Harming Their Colleagues So As To Become A Favorite Teacher.			.797
Cronbach's Alpha			.934	.761	.841
Variance Explained %			43.68	8.93	12.98
Cumulative Variance %			43.68	56.66	65.60

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Test for Sampling Adequacy .894

Bartlett's Test of Sphericity  $\chi^2= 2770.920$ , Degree of Freedom (df): 91

Sig. (p)<.001

Cronbach's Alpha Value of the Whole Scale .864

As a result of the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) presented in Table 2, the remaining items in the scale were reordered, and it was determined that the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> items of the "Selfishness in Education Scale" were in the sharing sub-dimension; while the 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, and 11<sup>th</sup> items were in the utilitarianism sub-dimension; and the 12<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup>, and 14<sup>th</sup> items were in the harming sub-dimension. After obtaining sufficient evidence for the validity of the factor structure of the "Selfishness in Education Scale", the Cronbach Alpha coefficients were calculated in order to evaluate the reliability levels of the overall scale and its sub-dimensions. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients of the sub-dimensions were found as; .93 for the sharing sub-dimension; .76 for the utilitarianism sub-dimension, and .84 for the harming sub-dimension. The internal consistency coefficient for the overall scale was found as .86. As a result of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis for the "Selfishness in Education Scale", the ratio of the Chi-square to the degree of freedom ( $\chi^2/df$ ) was found as 2.54. The RMSEA (Root Mean Square of Approximation) value was .06, and the significance of the model exhibited good fit. Of the fit indices; Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI) value was .97, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) value was .98; Standardized Root of Mean Square (SRMR) value was .04. These values indicated that the scale exhibited a good fit (Çalışıcı Çelik & Kırıl, 2019). Solely the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients were calculated for the reliability of this study. The reason for this is that Çalışıcı Çelik and Kırıl (2019) also worked in a similar sample group. It was found that the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was .93 for the sharing sub-dimension, .79 for the utilitarian sub-dimension; and .86 for the harming sub-dimension. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient for the overall scale was calculated as .92. As the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient between .60 and .80 is considered reliable, and the coefficient between .80 and 1.00 is considered highly reliable (Alpar, 2014), it can be said that the data in this study indicates that the scale is reliable.

## Data Analysis

SPSS 22.0 software was used to analyze the data of the study. Descriptive statistics of the frequency and percentage distributions were found for the data collected by using the Personal Information Form, and the results were presented in tables in the findings section. In this study, the normality of the data was examined by considering that the skewness and kurtosis values of each sub-dimension of the scale were between -1 and +1 (Hair, Hult, Ringle & Sarstedt, 2016), and that the results of the divisions of the skewness and kurtosis values by their standard errors were between -1.96 and +1.96 (Kim, 2013). The statistical analyses of the research were performed by parametric tests when the data showed normal distribution, and by non-parametric tests when the data did not show normal distribution, and the results were presented in Table 3.

**Table 3. Normality Distribution Analysis for “Selfishness in Education Scale” in Terms of Various Variables and the Statistics Used**

Variables	Sub-Dimensions	Variable Type	Teachers			School Administrators			
			Skewness /Standard error	Kurtosis /Standard error	Statistical Method Used	Skewness /Standard error	Kurtosis /Standard error	Statistical Method Used	
Gender	Sharing	Male	1.59	-1.43	t- testi	2.78	3.62	Mann-Whitney U	
		Female	1.76	-1.17		1.49	2.98		
	Utilitarianism	Male	-1.50	-.85		-2.33	1.40		
		Female	.20	.80		2.66	2.38		
		Harming	Male	-1.02		1.59	-.76		-2.59
			Female	-1.19		.170	2.22		2.87
Marital status	Sharing	Married	-2.82	2.17	Mann-Whitney U	1.99	-3.24	Mann-Whitney U	
		Single	-1.49	3.22		6.74	-.88		
	Utilitarianism	Married	3.08	-1.78		-2.62	1.57		
		Single	-.49	3.32		2.52	-2.90		
		Harming	Married	-2.66		-2.04	3.90		2.65
			Single	1.44		-3.64	2.42		-2.40
Educational status	Sharing	Undergraduate degree	3.47	.46	Mann-Whitney U	-2.67	3.97	Mann-Whitney U	
		Postgraduate degree	1.31	2.78		-2.07	-2.88		
	Utilitarianism	Undergraduate degree	2.79	-2.45		-3.11	2.76		
		Postgraduate degree	1.55	1.03		-1.95	-2.13		
		Harming	Undergraduate degree	-2.33		-2.84	-2.83		3.25
			Postgraduate degree	-3.18		1.37	-2.20		2.60
Teaching level	Sharing	Primary	-.65	-1.10	ANOVA	-1.12	-1.30	ANOVA	
		Secondary	.50	-1.49		.67	-.57		
	Utilitarianism	High school	.05	-.39		1.27	-.75		
		Primary	-.44	-.77		1.41	-.24		
		Secondary	-1.35	1.27		.63	.63		
		High school	-.99	.89		.53	.90		
Harming	Primary	-1.46	-.16	.64	1.03				
	Secondary	.19	-.13	-.50	.69				
	High school	.62	-.16	.65	.62				
The duty at school	Sharing	School principal	-	-	Kruskal Wallis testi	-2.28	-1.44	Kruskal Wallis testi	
		Vice principal	-	-		1.06	-3.56		
		Teacher	3.01	.11		-	-		
	Utilitarianism	School principal	-	-		-2.47	-.88		
		Vice principal	-	-		-2.58	1.27		
		Teacher	3.30	2.22		-	-		
Harming	School principal	-	-	-1.46	-.16				
	Vice principal	-	-	.29	3.23				
	Teacher	2.81	2.62	-	-				
Seniority	Sharing	10 years and below	.58	-.88	ANOVA	2.93	3.13	Kruskal Wallis testi	
		11-20 years	.62	.44		2.31	3.93		
		21 years and above	.05	-1.40		1.27	2.38		
	Utilitarianism	10 years and below	1.03	.93		3.45	-4.01		
		11-20 years	.67	-.86		-3.11	2.64		
		21 years and above	-.90	1.19		-1.02	-3.41		
Harming	10 years and below	1.34	-.92	3.72	3.54				
	11-20 years	-1.41	.78	2.25	2.91				
	21 years and above	-.14	.04	1.03	2.14				
Sharing	10 years and below	.68	-1.12	ANOVA	.82	-.74	ANOVA		
	11-20 years	.36	1.71		1.27	-.32			

Seniority at the same school	Utilitarianism	21 years and above	1.02	1.03		.76	.71	
		10 years and below	1.39	1.64		-1.72	.47	
		11-20 years	1.08	-.39		.43	.54	
	Harming	21 years and above	.78	-1.24		-1.01	-1.62	
		10 years and below	.76	-.88		.28	-1.16	
		11-20 years	-1.33	.93		.49	1.02	
		21 years and above	-.86	.97		.91	.79	
Branch	Sharing	Classroom teachers	1.80	-.90		1.27	-1.44	
		Social subject teachers	1.87	-1.37		1.59	-.57	
		Numerical subject teachers	1.31	.05		1.24	-.91	
		Vocational subject teachers	1.52	-1.05		1.25	.26	
		Classroom teachers	-1.75	-.34		-1.54	-.58	
		Social subject teachers	-1.54	-1.64		1.41	.83	
	Utilitarianism	Numerical subject teachers	1.49	.92	ANOVA	-.23	-.90	ANOVA
		Vocational subject teachers	-1.74	1.04		-1.12	.49	
		Classroom teachers	1.14	-1.59		.72	-1.45	
		Social subject teachers	1.21	-1.75		.30	-1.31	
		Harming	Numerical subject teachers	.49	-1.52		.51	-.96
			Vocational subject teachers	.49	-.95		.68	.77

In Table 3, normality analyses of each dimension of the "Selfishness in Education Scale" were examined in terms of different variables, and when the values of the divisions of the skewness and kurtosis values by their standard errors were between -1.96 and +1.96 and the data showed normal distribution; t-test, which is one of the parametric tests, was performed for bivariate data; ANOVA, which is one of the parametric tests, was performed for the data with more than two variables. Besides, in cases when the results were not between -1.96 and +1.96 and the data did not show normal distribution; Mann-Whitney U test, which is one of the non-parametric tests, was performed for bivariate data; and Kruskal Wallis test, which is one of the non-parametric tests, was performed for the data with more than two variables. In the research, the limit values used in the "Selfishness in Education Scale" were used as 1.00-1.79 (nobody); 1.80-2.59 (very few people); 2.60-3.39 (few people); 3.40-4.19 (many people); 4.20-5.00 (too many people).

## FINDINGS

In this section, the data obtained by the quantitative data collection tool used in the research process were transformed into findings, and in accordance with the sub-problems determined at the beginning of the study, the findings with significant differences were presented in tables, and those without significant differences were presented within the text with their numerical data.

### The Findings Regarding the Selfishness Levels of Teachers in Educational Organizations

The findings regarding the perception levels of teachers and school administrators in terms of the selfishness in teachers according to the overall scale and its dimensions were presented in Table 4.

**Table 4. The Selfishness Levels of Teachers According to the Perceptions of Teachers and School Administrators**

	Sub-Dimensions	n	$\bar{x}$	ss	Degree
Teacher	Sharing	356	3.33	.73	Few people
	Utilitarianism		4.54	.88	Too many people
	Harming		4.00	.74	Many people
	Genel Ortalama		3.96	.78	Many people
School Administrator	Sharing	139	2.88	.84	Few people
	Utilitarianism		3.75	1.12	Many people
	Harming		2.92	1.10	Few people
	Genel Ortalama		3.18	1.02	Few people

As can be seen in Table 4, according to the perception levels of both teachers ( $\bar{X}=4.54$ ) and school administrators ( $\bar{X}=3.75$ ) in terms of the selfishness in teachers; the highest mean score was found in the utilitarianism sub-dimension, which was followed by the harming sub-dimension for the school administrators ( $\bar{X}=4.00$ ) and for the teachers ( $\bar{X}=2.92$ ). According to the perception

levels of teachers ( $\bar{X}=3.33$ ) and school administrators ( $\bar{X}=2.88$ ) in terms of the selfishness in teachers, it was revealed that the lowest mean score was in the sharing sub-dimension. It was also found that the overall mean score for the perception levels of teachers ( $\bar{X}=3.96$ ) in terms of the selfishness in teachers was at “many people” level; whereas the overall mean score for the perception levels of school administrators ( $\bar{X}=3.18$ ) in terms of the selfishness in teachers was at “few people” level.

### The Findings Regarding the Investigation of the Selfishness Levels of Teachers According to the Perceptions of Teachers and School Administrators in Terms of Various Variables

The findings obtained regarding whether the perception levels of teachers and school administrators in terms of the selfishness in teachers showed a significant difference according to gender, marital status, educational status, teaching level, the duty at school, seniority, seniority at the same school, and branch variables were given in Table 5.

**Table 5. T-test Results in Terms of the Selfishness in Teachers According to Gender**

	Sub-Dimensions	Gender	n	$\bar{x}$	ss	Sd	t	p
Teacher	Sharing	Male	206	3.59	.79	354	3.056	.000*
		Female	150	3.02	.69			
	Utilitarianism	Male	206	4.60	.89		1.107	.260
		Female	150	4.50	.87			
	Harming	Male	206	4.25	.68		3.296	.03*
		Female	150	3.72	.79			

\*p is significant at “<.05” level.

As could be seen in Table 5, when the perception levels of teachers in terms of the selfishness in teachers were examined; it was found that there was a statistically significant difference in the sharing [ $t_{(354)}=3.056$ ;  $p<.05$ ] and harming [ $t_{(354)}=2.276$ ;  $p<.05$ ] sub-dimensions according to gender variable. Accordingly, it was revealed that the mean score of the perception levels of female teachers in the utilitarianism and sharing sub-dimensions was higher ( $\bar{X}=3.59$ ) than the mean score of male teachers ( $\bar{X}=3.02$ ). In the harming sub-dimension, the mean score of female teachers ( $\bar{X}=4.25$ ) was found to be higher than the mean score of male teachers ( $\bar{X}=3.72$ ). According to the findings of the research, it can be said that the gender of teachers affects their perceptions in terms of the selfishness in teachers. It was also found in the research that there was not a statistically significant difference in the perception levels of school administrators in terms of the selfishness in teachers in the sharing ( $U=1904.500$ ;  $p>.05$ ), utilitarianism ( $U=1866.000$ ;  $p>.05$ ), and harming ( $U=1901.385$ ;  $p>.05$ ) sub-dimensions according to gender variable. According to the findings of the research, it can be said that the gender of school administrators does not affect their perceptions in terms of the selfishness in teachers. It was also revealed that there was not a statistically significant difference in the perception levels of teachers in terms of the selfishness in teachers in the sharing ( $U=13033.500$ ;  $p>.05$ ), utilitarianism ( $U=12638.000$ ;  $p>.05$ ), and harming ( $U=13225.500$ ;  $p>.05$ ) sub-dimensions according to marital status variable. Besides, it was found that there was not a statistically significant difference in the perception levels of school administrators in terms of the selfishness in teachers in the sharing ( $U=1162.500$ ;  $p>.05$ ), utilitarianism ( $U=1176.500$ ;  $p>.05$ ), and harming ( $U=1155.000$ ;  $p>.05$ ) sub-dimensions according to marital status variable. According to the findings of the research, it can be said that the marital status of both teachers and school administrators does not affect their perceptions in terms of the selfishness in teachers. Mann Whitney U test results regarding whether the perception levels of teachers in terms of the selfishness in teachers differed significantly in the sub-dimensions of the “Selfishness in Education Scale” according to educational status variable was presented in Table 6.

**Table 6. Mann-Whitney U Test Results in Terms of the Selfishness in Teachers According to Educational Status**

	Sub-Dimensions	Educational Status	n	Average Rank	Rank Sum	U	p
Teacher	Sharing	Undergraduate degree	287	189.71	420312.5	12044	.021*
		Postgraduate degree	69	218.89	211503.5	.50	
	Utilitarianism	Undergraduate degree	287	149.98	440468.5	12946	.034*
		Postgraduate degree	69	204.78	201786.5	.00	
	Harming	Undergraduate degree	287	181.12	430574.5	13521	.016*
		Postgraduate degree	69	221.58	205203.5	.00	

When Table 6 was examined, it was determined that the perception levels of teachers in terms of the selfishness in teachers showed a significant difference in the sharing ( $U=12044.500$ ;  $p<.05$ ), utilitarianism ( $U=12946.000$ ;  $p<.05$ ), and harming ( $U=13521.000$ ;  $p<.05$ ) sub-dimensions according to educational level variable. According to the findings of the research, the perception levels of teachers with a postgraduate degree in terms of the selfishness in teachers differed significantly in all the dimensions of the scale when compared to the perception levels of those with an undergraduate degree, and that they had a higher mean score in the mean ranks. It was also found that there was not a statistically significant difference in the perception

levels of school administrators in terms of the selfishness in teachers in the sharing ( $U=1089.000$ ;  $p>.05$ ), utilitarianism ( $U=1132.500$ ;  $p>.05$ ), and harming ( $U=1074.000$ ;  $p>.05$ ) sub-dimensions according to educational level variable. According to the findings of the research, while the educational status of teachers affects their perception levels in terms of the selfishness in teachers, the educational status of school administrators does not affect their perception levels in terms of the selfishness in teachers. ANOVA test results regarding whether the perception levels of teachers and school administrators in terms of the selfishness in teachers differed significantly in the sub-dimensions of the "Selfishness in Education Scale" according to teaching level variable was presented in Table 7.

**Table 7. ANOVA Test Results in Terms of the Selfishness in Teachers According to Teaching Level Variable**

	Sub-Dimension	Teaching Level	n	$\bar{x}$	ss	Sd	f	p	Significant difference	
Teacher	Sharing	1)Primary	92	3.66	.69	2,353	3.926	.005*	1 ve 2 1 ve 3	
		2)Secondary	122	3.12	.78					
		3)High school	142	3.02	.74					
	Utilitarianism	1)Primary	92	4.64	.93		2,136	4.552	.011*	1 ve 2
		2)Secondary	122	4.06	.85					
		3)High school	142	4.62	.83					
	Harming	1)Primary	92	4.01	.68		2,136	1.040	.662	-
		2)Secondary	122	3.99	.79					
		3)High school	142	3.97	.74					
School Administrators	Sharing	1)Primary	50	3.05	.89	2,136	4.338	.034*	1 ve 3	
		2)Secondary	38	2.96	.80					
		3)High school	51	2.63	.82					
	Utilitarianism	1)Primary	50	3.77	.96		2,136	1.831	.569	-
		2)Secondary	38	3.73	1.18					
		3)High school	51	3.75	1.21					
	Harming	1)Primary	50	2.95	1.08		2,136	1.569	.990	-
		2)Secondary	38	2.89	1.06					
		3)High school	51	2.93	1.19					

\*p is significant at "<.05" level.

As could be seen in Table 7, the perception levels of teachers in terms of the selfishness in teachers showed a significant difference in the sharing [ $F_{(2-353)}=3.926$ ;  $p<.05$ ] and utilitarianism [ $F_{(2-353)}=4.552$ ;  $p<.05$ ] sub-dimensions according to teaching level variable. Tukey test was performed so as to find out from which teaching level variable the difference found stemmed from in the sharing and utilitarianism sub-dimensions, and according to the results obtained; it was found that the perception levels of teachers at primary school level ( $\bar{X}=3.66$ ) differed significantly from those at secondary school level ( $\bar{X}=3.12$ ) in the sharing sub-dimension, and that the effect size calculated as a result of the test ( $\eta^2=.06$ ) showed that this difference was at moderate level. It was also determined that the perception levels of teachers at the primary school level ( $\bar{X}=3.66$ ) differed significantly from those at high school level ( $\bar{X}=3.02$ ), and that the effect size calculated as a result of the test ( $\eta^2=.07$ ) showed that this difference was at moderate level. According to the results of the Tukey test, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference between primary school teachers and secondary school teachers in utilitarianism sub-dimension. It was determined that the perception levels of teachers at primary school level ( $\bar{X}=4.64$ ) were significantly higher than the perception levels of teachers at secondary school level ( $\bar{X}=4.06$ ). The effect size calculated as a result of the test ( $\eta^2=.09$ ) showed that this difference was at moderate level.

As could be seen in Table 7, the perception levels of school administrators in terms of the selfishness in teachers showed a significant difference in the sharing [ $F_{(2-136)}=4.338$ ;  $p<.05$ ] sub-dimension according to teaching level variable. Tukey test was performed so as to find out from which teaching level variable the difference found stemmed from in the sharing sub-dimension, and according to the results obtained; it was found that the perception levels of school administrators at primary school level ( $\bar{X}=3.05$ ) were significantly higher than the perception levels of the school administrators at high school level ( $\bar{X}=2.63$ ) in the sharing sub-dimension, and that the effect size calculated as a result of the test ( $\eta^2=.06$ ) showed that this difference was at moderate level. According to the findings of the research, the school levels in which teachers and school administrators work affect their perceptions levels in terms of the selfishness in teachers. The analysis of the sub-problem regarding whether the perception levels of teachers and school administrators in terms of the selfishness in teachers showed a significant difference according to the duty at school variable was performed by combining the data obtained from school principals, vice principals and teachers since the sub-problem covered the whole study group. According to Kruskal Wallis test results; it was determined that there was not a statistically significant difference in the sharing ( $X^2_{(2-492)}=1.614$ ;  $p>.05$ ), utilitarianism ( $X^2_{(2-492)}=1.407$ ;  $p>.05$ ) and harming ( $X^2_{(2-492)}=1.506$ ;  $p>.05$ ) sub-dimensions. According to the findings of the research, the duties of teachers and school administrators at school do not affect their perceptions in terms of the selfishness in teachers. ANOVA test results regarding

whether the perception levels of teachers in terms of the selfishness in teachers differed significantly in the sub-dimensions of the "Selfishness in Education Scale" according to seniority variable was presented in Table 8.

**Table 8. ANOVA Test Results in Terms of the Selfishness in Teachers According to Seniority Variable**

	Sub-Dimension	Seniority	n	$\bar{x}$	ss	Sd	f	p	Significant difference
Teachers	Sharing	1)10 years and below	108	3.13	.81	2,353	3.762	.000*	1 ve 3
		2)11-20 years	149	3.12	.67				
		3)21 years and above	99	3.66	.65				
	Utilitarianism	1)10 years and below	108	4.67	.72				
		2)11-20 years	149	4.49	.89				
		3)21 years and above	99	4.75	.82				
	Harming	1)10 years and below	108	4.05	.76		1.078	.742	-----
		2)11-20 years	149	3.95	.68				
		3)21 years and above	99	4.08	.69				

\*p is significant at "<.05" level.

As could be seen in Table 8, the perception levels of teachers in terms of the selfishness in teachers showed a significant difference in the sharing [ $F_{(2-353)}=3.762$ ;  $p < .05$ ] and utilitarianism [ $F_{(2-353)}=3.249$ ;  $p < .05$ ] sub-dimensions in seniority variable. Tukey test was performed so as to find out from which seniority variable the difference found stemmed from in the sharing and utilitarianism sub-dimensions, and according to the results obtained; it was found that the perception levels of teachers with seniority of 21 years and above ( $\bar{X}=3.66$ ) were significantly higher than those of teachers with seniority of 10 years and below ( $\bar{X}=3.13$ ) in the sharing sub-dimension, and that the effect size calculated as a result of the test ( $\eta^2=.07$ ) showed that this difference was at moderate level. It was also determined that the perception levels of teachers with seniority of 21 years and above ( $\bar{X}=4.75$ ) were higher than the perception levels of teachers with seniority of 11-20 years ( $\bar{X}=4.49$ ) in the utilitarianism sub-dimension, and that and that the effect size calculated as a result of the test ( $\eta^2=.04$ ) showed that this difference was at low level. According to the findings of the research, the seniority of teachers affects their perceptions in terms of the selfishness in teachers. It was also revealed that the perception levels of school administrators in terms of the selfishness in teachers did not show a statistically significant difference in the sharing ( $X^2(2-136)=1.328$ ;  $p > .05$ ), utilitarianism ( $X^2(2-136)=1.374$ ;  $p > .05$ ), and harming ( $X^2(2-136)=1.439$ ;  $p > .05$ ) sub-dimensions according to seniority variable. According to the results of the research, the seniority of school administrators does not affect their perceptions in terms of the selfishness in teachers. ANOVA test results regarding whether the perception levels of school administrators in terms of the selfishness in teachers differed significantly in the sub-dimensions of the "Selfishness in Education Scale" according to seniority at the same school variable was presented in Table 9.

**Table 9. ANOVA Test Results in Terms of the Selfishness in Teachers According to Seniority at the Same School Variable**

	Sub-Dimension	Branch	n	$\bar{x}$	ss	Sd	f	p	Significant difference
Teachers	Sharing	1) Classroom teachers	92	3.33	.68	3,352	.960	.412	-
		2) Social subject teachers	114	3.35	.79				
		3) Numerical subject teachers	74	3.34	.72				
		4) Vocational subject teachers	76	3.29	.73				
	Utilitarianism	1) Classroom teachers	92	4.66	.85				
		2) Social subject teachers	114	4.54	.94				
		3) Numerical subject teachers	74	4.52	.90				
		4) Vocational subject teachers	76	4.34	.82				
	Harming	1) Classroom teachers	92	4.08	.58		.809	.489	-
		2) Social subject teachers	114	3.92	.89				
		3) Numerical subject teachers	74	4.02	.74				
		4) Vocational subject teachers	76	3.98	.76				

\*p is significant at "<.05" level.

As can be seen in Table 9, the perception levels of school administrators in terms of the selfishness in teachers showed a significant difference in the sharing [ $F_{(2-136)}=4.245$ ;  $p < .05$ ], utilitarianism [ $F_{(2-136)}=3.736$ ;  $p < .05$ ], and harming [ $F_{(2-136)}=3.374$ ;  $p < .05$ ] sub-dimensions according to seniority at the same school variable. Tukey test was performed so as to find out from which seniority at the same school variable the difference found stemmed from, and according to the results obtained; it was found that the perception levels of school administrators with seniority at the same school of 21 years and above ( $\bar{X}=3.30$ ) were significantly higher than the perception levels of school administrators with seniority at the same school of 10 years and below ( $\bar{X}=2.71$ ) in the

sharing sub-dimension, and that the effect size calculated as a result of the test ( $\eta^2=.06$ ) showed that this difference was at moderate level.

It was also determined that the perception levels of school administrators with seniority at the same school of 21 years and above ( $\bar{X}=3.95$ ) were higher than the perception levels of school administrators with seniority at the same school of 11-20 years ( $\bar{X}=3.63$ ) in the utilitarianism sub-dimension, and that and that the effect size calculated as a result of the test ( $\eta^2=.03$ ) showed that this difference was at low level. Besides, it was also revealed that the perception levels of school administrators with seniority at the same school of 21 years and above ( $\bar{X}=3.45$ ) were higher than the perception levels of school administrators with seniority at the same school of 10 years and below ( $\bar{X}=2.62$ ) in the harming sub-dimension, and that and that the effect size calculated as a result of the test ( $\eta^2=.08$ ) showed that this difference was at moderate level. According to the findings of the research, while seniority of teachers at the same school did not show a significant difference in the sharing [ $F_{(2-353)}=1.902$ ;  $p>.05$ ], utilitarianism [ $F_{(2-353)}=1.392$ ;  $p>.05$ ], and harming [ $F_{(2-353)}=1.786$ ;  $p>.05$ ] sub-dimensions, seniority of school administrators at the same school affected their perceptions in terms of the selfishness in teachers. ANOVA test results regarding whether the perception levels of teachers in terms of the selfishness in teachers differed significantly in the sub-dimensions of the "Selfishness in Education Scale" according to branch variable was presented in Table 10.

**Table 10. ANOVA Test Results in Terms of the Selfishness in Teachers According to Branch Variable**

	Sub-Dimension	Seniority at the Same School	n	$\bar{x}$	ss	Sd	f	p	Significant difference
School Administrators	Sharing	1)10 years and below	43	2.71	.71	2,136	4.245	0.02*	1 ve 3
		2)11-20 years	62	2.45	.96				
		3)21 years and above	34	3.30	.79				
	Utilitarianism	1)10 years and below	43	3.41	.84		3.736	0.04*	2 ve 3
		2)11-20 years	62	3.63	.86				
		3)21 years and above	34	3.95	1.02				
	Harming	1)10 years and below	43	2.62	.91		3.374	0.00*	1 ve 3
		2)11-20 years	62	3.06	.88				
		3)21 years and above	34	3.45	.93				

\*p is significant at "<.05" level.

As could be seen in Table 10, while the perception levels of teachers in terms of selfishness in teachers did not show a significant difference in the sharing [ $F_{(3-352)}=.960$ ;  $p>.05$ ] and harming [ $F_{(3-352)}=.809$ ;  $p>.05$ ] sub-dimensions, there was a statistically significant difference in the utilitarianism [ $F_{(3-352)}=4.280$ ;  $p<.05$ ] sub-dimension. Tukey test was performed so as to find out from which branch variable the difference found stemmed from in the utilitarianism sub-dimension, and according to the results obtained; it was found that the perception levels of classroom teachers ( $\bar{X}=4.66$ ) were significantly higher than those of vocational subject teachers ( $\bar{X}=4.34$ ), and that the effect size calculated as a result of the test ( $\eta^2=.04$ ) showed that this difference was at low level. When the perception levels of school administrators in terms of the selfishness in teachers were examined, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference in the sharing [ $F_{(3-135)}=1.382$ ;  $p>.05$ ], utilitarianism [ $F_{(3-135)}=1.411$ ;  $p>.05$ ], and harming [ $F_{(3-135)}=1.408$ ;  $p>.05$ ] sub-dimensions. According to the findings of the research, the branches of teachers affect their perceptions in terms of the selfishness in teachers, whereas the branches of the school administrators do not affect their perceptions in terms of the selfishness in teachers.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

According to the results of the study, it was determined that the highest perception levels for both teachers and school administrators was in the utilitarianism sub-dimension, and it was at "too many people" level for teachers, whereas "many people" for school administrators. Likewise, it was determined that the lowest perception levels for both teachers and school administrators was in the sharing sub-dimension, and it was at "few people" level for both teachers and school administrators. The steps to be taken so as to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of educational institutions may involve more than one step. It is necessary that the problems underlying the selfishness behaviors in the employees should be identified and that these employees should not be left alone while solving these problems. School administrators can be successful if they act by taking the harmony and personal characteristics of the stakeholders within the institution into consideration, in accordance with the protection of the teachers against external environmental factors and calming down the conflicts within the organization in the tendency to compete, make comparisons, and exhibiting negative attitudes among the employees.

According to Özdemiş (2005), in cases when the individuals think that there is a situation of inequality, they motivate themselves according to the situation in which they assume equality. In cases when they think there is equality, they avoid behaviors that will harm the organization. Under the selfish behaviors displayed, it can be said that teachers think they are working in an unequal work environment. The functioning of the school organization is not always perfect. According to Kâtip (2019), it was observed that some obstacles were put in front of teachers (timetables, shift days, etc.) by school administrators and a harsh atmosphere was created within the organization. In the study by Polat (2007) conducted in educational organizations, the fact

that the distribution was fair increases teacher perceptions of trust in their institutions and their school administrators, and as a result, it was observed that a positive relationship was set regarding organizational citizenship behaviors. Such behaviors as selfishness, which arise within the organization and harm the organization, can cause the employees to become insensitive and remain silent in the case of injustice. When studies on employee silence were examined (Abaslı, 2018; Ergen, 2015; Gökyer & Türkoğlu, 2018; Kantarcıoğlu, 2016; Klonsky, 2010; Nartgün & Kartal, 2013), it was seen that organizational silence was common among employees and intertwined with other organizational behaviors, and that the personal characteristics of employees, the democratic or autocratic management style of the organization, organizational climate, political fears, etc. disrupted the relationships in the working environment, reduced the performance of the organization and pushed the employees into silence.

In order for organizations to achieve their goals, it may not be sufficient for only school principals to do their share in such situations such as adjusting the timetables and distributing the tasks. It is significant that teachers have adopted not to complain about minor discontents but to avoid creating big problems from small events. For the organization to be successful, it is important for employees to overcome the difficulties of organizational life without complaining, to avoid all kinds of behaviors that may cause conflicts within the working environment, not to complain about trivial problems, to be respectful to others, and to see the positive aspects rather than the negative aspects of their work (George & Brief, 1992; Gürbüz, 2006; Schnake & Dumler, 2003). In this sense, the fact that teachers and school administrators work in cooperation by leaving personal interests aside for the good of the school organization, may produce conclusions for the sake of the organization.

According to the findings of the research, when the perceptions of the participants were examined according to educational status variable, it was concluded that the perception levels of teachers with a postgraduate degree were higher than the perception levels of those with an undergraduate degree, and that they observed the selfishness behaviors more frequently. As a result of the academic studies carried out by the teachers with a postgraduate degree, the fact that their knowledge and expectations increase but they are unable to get satisfaction accordingly may have caused other teachers to think that their behaviors were selfish. Considering that those who have a postgraduate degree have received more education, it can be assumed that they may have more ideas about such issues as the detection and elimination of the problems regarding education and instruction, the development of educational processes etc. than other teachers who have received less education, and therefore they may observe more selfishness behaviors. According to the findings of the research, the school levels in which teachers and school administrators worked affected their perceptions of the selfishness in teachers. In the sharing sub-dimension, it was found that the perception levels of teachers working at primary school level was significantly higher than the perception levels of teachers working at secondary and high school levels, and that the perception levels of school administrators working at primary school level was significantly higher than the perception levels of school administrators working at high school levels. Correspondingly, when the perception levels of teachers in terms of the selfishness in teachers in branch variable were examined, it was found that classroom teachers observed more selfishness behaviors than teachers in the vocational course branches in the utilitarianism sub-dimension. It can be argued that primary school teachers, especially 1<sup>st</sup> grade teachers, are compared with each other more within the scope of first reading and writing, that they design more materials while teaching, and that they do not want to share their own methods due to the competition among them. The fact that primary school teachers attend all the classes of their students and are responsible for younger age group of students when compared to other grades can mean that they are compared more by parents.

According to the findings of the research, while the seniority of school administrators did not affect their perception levels of the selfishness in teachers, the seniority of teachers affected their perception levels of the selfishness in teachers. The reason for this is that as the professional seniority of the employee increases, their experience in work-related issues also increases. It can be considered that as experienced employees have more expectations than other employees regarding their work, and thus are able to determine the needs of both their students and the school more accurately and easily and act accordingly in line with the increase in their professional experience when compared to those with less experience, they may be observing the behaviors of their less experienced colleagues as selfishness behaviors. The relationships with colleagues are important in terms of increasing the quality of teaching, improving the teachers themselves and forming a team spirit within the school (Cranston, 2002; Uysal Arpağ, 2011). However, teachers may face difficulties in the first years of their profession (Kozikoğlu & Senemoğlu, 2018), and these difficulties may differ from teacher to teacher (Hammond, 2005).

The perceptions of teachers in terms of the selfishness in teachers did not show a significant difference according to working at the same school variable, whereas the perceptions of school administrators differed significantly according to working at the same school variable. Accordingly, the perceptions of school administrators working at the same school for 21 years and above were higher than those working at the same school for 10 years and below in the sharing sub-dimension; the perceptions of school administrators working at the same school for 21 years and above were higher than those working at the same school for 11-20 years in the utilitarianism sub-dimension; and the perceptions of school administrators working at the same school for 21 years and above were higher than those working at the same school for 10 years and below in the harming sub-dimension. The approach of the school administrators working in the system as administrators for many years and having gained experience in their profession to the selfishness in teacher may be stemming from the fact that they have more internalized the situation due to maturity and experience brought together by their age. Since these people have been working at the same school for a long time, they may have more embraced and owned the institution they are working for when compared to others. Finally, it can also be

argued that these conclusions obtained from the research may be stemming from the differences in the personal characteristics, environments and lifestyles of the teachers and school administrators who participated in the study.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

In this section, the recommendations for practitioners and researchers, developed based on the research findings, are given below under separate headings.

### Recommendations for Practitioners

According to the findings of the research, it was revealed that the overall mean score of the perception levels of teachers in terms of the selfishness in teachers was at "many people" level. In order to be able to manage the behaviors like selfishness properly in educational institutions; the inclusion of teachers in interviews and psycho-technical tests aimed at determining their professional ethical behavior levels, both while they are teacher candidates and after they are employed, may be effective in detecting such behaviors that will disrupt organizational harmony. Behavioral scientists or psychologists can give various seminars in educational organizations. If this cannot be achieved, the fact that school administrators have been trained on such issues can play an active role in solving possible problems.

### Recommendations for Researchers

More comprehensive results can be achieved by changing the study population of this research and conducting it on a regional scale, and thus comparing the results. A similar study can be carried out in private schools. It can be performed by using qualitative data collection or mixed data collection methods. The relationship between the perception levels of teachers in terms of selfishness and a different variable can be analyzed. Since this study is the first of the researches examining teacher selfishness in the field of education, it is thought that investigating the perception levels in terms of selfishness in educational organizations with different institutions and different samples will contribute to the literature.

### Ethics Committee Approval Information

In the Aydın Adnan Menderes University, Faculty of Education, Educational Research Ethics Committee meeting dated 17.04.2020 and numbered 2020/05, it was decided by unanimous vote that this research is in compliance with ethical rules.

## REFERENCES

- Abaslı, K. (2018). *Örgütsel dışlanma, işe yabancılaşma ve örgütsel sinizm ilişkisine yönelik öğretmen algıları*. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Alpar R. (2014). *Uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik yöntemler*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Ardıç, M. (2019). *Modernite ve bencillik*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Arslan Hendekci, E. ve Özen, F. (2018). Algılanan örgütsel etik iklimin ilköğretim okullarında öğretmenlerin etik dışı davranışlarına etkisi Diyarbakır merkez ilçeleri örneği. *Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15(2), 425-450.
- Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2013). *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Büte, M. (2011). Algılanan örgüt ikliminin etik olmayan davranışlar üzerindeki etkilerinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 25 (2), 103-122.
- Büyüköztürk, S., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, O. E., Karadeniz, S. & Demirel, F. (2016). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Can, M. (2018). Ayn Rand'ın rasyonel bencillik ahlakı. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Erzurum.
- Cranston, N. C. (2002). school-based management, leaders and leadership: change and challenges for principal. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 30(1), 2-12.
- Çalışıcı Çelik, N. & Kırıl, B. (2019). Eğitimde bencillik ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi: geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Social Sciences Research Journal*, 8 (3), 156-168.
- De Vries, D. & Vardi, Y. (2001) The bank shares regulation affair and illegality in Israeli society: A theoretical perspective of unethical managerial behaviour. *Israel Affairs*, 8 (1), 226-252. doi: 10.4324/9781410609052
- Dubois, D., Rucker, D. D & Galinsky, A. D. (2015). Social class, power, and selfishness: when and why upper and lower class individuals behave unethically. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1, 1-16. doi: 10.1037/pspi0000008
- Ergen, S. (2015). *Öğretmenlerin örgütsel sinizm düzeyleri ile örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Ersoy, E. (2014). *Ayn Rand'ın siyaset felsefesinde etik egoizmin rolü*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

- George, J. M. & Brief, A.P. (1992). Feeling good-doing good: a conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112 (2), 310-329. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.112.2.310
- Gökkyer, N. & Türkoğlu, İ. (2018). Liselerde görev yapan öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek algıları ile örgütsel sinizm tutumları arasındaki ilişki. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 43, 317-340. doi: 10.15390/EB.2018.7440
- Gül, H. (2006). Etik dışı davranışlar ve ussallaştırılması: devlet hastanelerinde bir uygulama. *Selçuk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 10 (9), 65-79.
- Gürbüz, S. (2006). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ile duygusal bağlılık arasındaki ilişkilerin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 3(1), 53-56.
- Hair J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M. & Sarstedt, M. (2016). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. 2nd edition, Thousand Oaks: Sage. <http://www.pls-sem.com/> adresinden 28.12.2019 tarihinde edinilmiştir.
- Hammond, M. (2005). *Next steps in teaching: a guide to starting your career in the secondary school*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Jones, C. (2005). Character virtue and physical education. *European Physical Education Review*, 11(2), 139–151. doi: 10.1177/1356336X05052893.
- Kantarcıoğlu, J. (2016). *Örgüt kültürü ve örgütsel sinizm ilişkisi: ermeni azınlık okulları*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Karasar, N. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kasapoğlu, A. (2010). *Kur'ân psikoloji atlası*. Malatya: Kendini Bilmek Yayınları.
- Katip, M. (2019). *Ortaöğretim okul yöneticilerinin etik dışı liderlik davranışları hakkında öğretmen algıları*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Kesikoğlu, Ş. (2016). *Felsefede bencillik kavramı ve sosyal darwinizm eleştirisi*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Kim, H. Y. (2013). Statistical notes for clinical researchers: assessing normal distribution using skewness and kurtosis. *Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics*, 38(1), 52–54. doi: 10.5395 / rde.2013.38.1.52
- Klonsky, M. F. (2010). *Discussing undiscussables: exercising adaptive leadership*. Doctoral Thesis, Fielding Graduate University, Santa Barbara.
- Kolthoff, E. W. (2012. April). The quest for catalysts of corruption and other organizational misbehavior. *13th International Winelands Conference, Stellenbosch*, 1-18.
- Kozikoğlu, İ. & Senemoğlu, N. (2018). Mesleğe yeni başlayan öğretmenlerin karşılaştıkları güçlükler: nitel bir çözümleme. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 6(3), 341-371. doi:10.14689/issn.2148-2624.1.6c3s16m.
- Nartgün, S. Ş. & Kartal, V. (2013). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel sinizm ve örgütsel sessizlik hakkındaki algıları. *Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(2), 47-67. doi : 10.14686/201321980.
- Onsekizoğlu, N. (2004). *Kelam ilmi açısından egoizm*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
- Önal, N. E. (2018), Burjuvazinin “insan bencildir” tezinin eleştirisine doğru. *Madde, Diyalektik ve Toplum*, (3), 212-225.
- Özbay, A. (2018). *Kur'an-ı Kerim'e göre sebep ve sonuçlarıyla bencillik ve diğer kâmlık*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Özdemir, Y. (2005). *Kariyer devreleri ile örgütsel vatandaşlık eğilimi arasındaki ilişki: Sakarya üniversitesi İİBF örneği*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sakarya.
- Polat, S. (2007). *Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet algıları, örgütsel güven düzeyleri ile örgütsel vatandaşlık arasındaki ilişki*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.
- Rachlin, H. (2002). Altruism and selfishness. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 25, 239–296. doi: 10.1017/S0140525X02000055.
- Saavedra, A. R., & Opfer, D. (2012). Teaching and learning 21st century skills: lesson from learning sciences. RAND Corporation. [https://www.rand.org/pubs/external\\_publications/EP51105.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/external_publications/EP51105.html) adresinden 19.12. 2019 tarihinde edinilmiştir.
- Schnake, M. E. & Dumler, M. P. (2003). Levels of measurement and analysis issues in organizational citizenship behaviour research. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76, 283–301. doi: 10.1348/096317903769647184.
- Şen, A. (2016). Eğitim ile bencillik arasındaki ilişki: Dumlupınar Üniversitesi örneği. Eğitim ile bencillik arasındaki ilişki: Dumlupınar üniversitesi örneği. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (5)7, 1892-1904. doi: 10.15869/itobiad.259351.
- Tabancalı, E. ve Korumaz, M. (2014). Eğitim örgütlerinde yetenek yönetimi. *International Journal of Social Science*, 25, 139-156. doi: 10.9761/JASSS2336.
- Tanrikulu, B. (2008). *Egoizm in party time and kozalar*, Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Konya
- Tarhan, N. (2006). *Duyguların psikolojisi*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayıncılık.

- 
- Uysal ArpaguŖ, A. (2011). *Okul kltrnn đretmen davranıŖlarına etkisi*. YayınlanmamıŖ Yksek Lisans Tezi. Trakya niversitesi, Edirne.
- Vardi Y. & Wiener Y. (1996). Misbehavior in organizations: a motivational framework. *Organization Science*, 7(2), 151-165. doi: 10.1287/orsc.7.2.151.
- Vardi, Y., & Weitz, E. (2004). *Misbehavior in Organizations: Theory, Research, and Management*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Whillans, A. V., Caruso, E. M. & Dunn, E. W. (2017). Both selfishness and selflessness start with the self: How wealth shapes responses to charitable appeals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 70, 242-250. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2016.11.009.

