

# The Relationship between Perceived Job Insecurity and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors of Middle School Teachers<sup>1</sup>

F. Gülruh GÜRBÜZ<sup>2</sup> & Ezgi DEDE<sup>3</sup>

## ABSTRACT

In this research, the perceptions of job insecurity and organizational citizenship behaviors of middle school teachers working in public and private schools were determined. It was revealed whether or not these perceptions differed according to school type, and if job insecurity had a significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior. Relational search model was used in the research, and job insecurity and organizational citizenship behavior scales were used to determine teachers' perceptions. Descriptive statistics, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, *t*-test and multiple regression analysis were used to measure relationships between variables. According to the research findings, the level of job insecurity of middle school teachers working in public and private schools was low and the level of organizational citizenship behavior was high. Teachers' perceptions of job insecurity and organizational citizenship behaviors differed according to school type. Teachers working in public schools tend to have more job insecurity, but exhibit less organizational citizenship behaviors than teachers working in private schools. In addition, according to the results of multiple regression analysis, it was found that teachers who work in private schools have a negative relationship between qualitative job insecurity perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors. On the other hand, there was a negative correlation between quantitative job insecurity perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers working in public schools.

*Key Words:* Job insecurity, Organizational citizenship behaviour

 DOI Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22521/jesr.2018.81.3>

<sup>1</sup> This study was produced from Ezgi Dede's PhD thesis carried out at İstanbul Ticaret University, Institute of Social Sciences, under F. Gülruh Gürbüz's consultancy.

<sup>2</sup> Prof. Dr. - Marmara University, Faculty of Business Administration, Turkey - gulruhgurubuz@yahoo.com

<sup>3</sup> Dr. - MoNE Kısıklı Şehit Hüseyin Dalgıç Secondary School, Turkey - ezgi.math@gmail.com

## INTRODUCTION

In the evolution of civilization, the structure of societies has developed as traditional society, industrial society, and information society respectively. The speed of these developments has increased at every step, and every transition and development brought about new risks and uncertainties. In other words, the number of risks and uncertainties in the information society is much more than in the traditional society. Because developments within the information society itself increase the risks and uncertainties, the risk society becomes an important issue (Yalçinkaya, & Özsoy, 2003). The term of risk society was first described by Ulrich Beck and social change was determined within three stages: pre-modernization, classical modernization, and reflexive modernization. The reflexive modernization in which risk society occurred is discussed as two stages. The first stage is the transition period from industrial society to risk society, and the risks have been externalized at this stage. In other words, this period is when the side effects of the risks are not recognized. The second stage is the period when the risks are growing, spreading over a wide area, recognizing the side effects of the risks and starting to see society as a risk society (Soydemir, 2011). In the risk society the terms of danger, risk and uncertainty are interwoven. While risk expresses the danger of hurting; uncertainty is described as unclarity, unpredictability and uncertainty of boundaries. The characteristics of the risks are uncertainty, unpredictability, insurability, globalization, concern for the future of danger, prevalence of side effects (Çakır, 2007).

When the risk society is thought in terms of professional working life, the most important uncertainty for employees is whether or not they will continue their job (De Witte, 2005). In the case of uncertainty, the person does not know whether they will continue to work and whether their position will be needed in the future (De Witte, 1999, p. 156). This is known as job insecurity. Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) defined job insecurity as “the perceived powerlessness to maintain the desired continuity in a threatened job situation” (p. 438). As with all other occupational groups, teachers also have some concerns about their jobs, and the consequences of job insecurity must be made aware and necessary precautions taken in order to reduce the adverse effects of job insecurity.

The education system has an important role in shaping community structure and the success of the education system directly relates to how well students are educated. The most important role in this regard falls to the teachers. Behaviors and attitudes that teachers exhibit while performing their teaching profession affect student behaviors positively or negatively (Üstüner, 2006). Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is known as extra-role behaviors which are the act of performing beyond the stated job requirement. Teachers who play an important role in the effectiveness of educational organizations have to perform OCB in order to ensure student growth and academic development. These behaviors are influenced by the perception of job insecurity experienced by the teachers, and these attitudes and behaviors may vary according to the type of school (private/ public) where the teachers work. Teachers in public schools are expected to experience less job insecurity, whereas teachers who are working in private schools are expected to feel more job insecurity. One of the consequences of job insecurity is the reduction in organizational citizenship behavior that teachers exhibit (McInroe, 2013; Öcel, 2009; Reisel, Probst, Chia, Maloles, & König, 2010).

In the current research, perceived job insecurity and organizational citizenship behaviors of middle school teachers working in public and private schools were determined and it was revealed whether or not these perceptions differed according to school type. In

addition, it was revealed whether or not job insecurity had a significant and a negative effect on organizational citizenship behavior.

### **Job Insecurity**

The perception of job insecurity seems to have gained importance since the 1980's, when neoliberal policies intensified. Even if neoliberal policies cause an increase in unemployment, allowing monetarist practices to control inflation and accelerating privatization by reducing the public spending are the prominent applications (Uçkaç, 2010).

Different definitions of job insecurity have been made in the literature. The first definition of job insecurity was by Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt in 1984, who defined job insecurity as “perceived powerlessness to maintain desired continuity in a threatened job situation” (1984, p. 438). According to Heaney, Israel, and House (1994), job insecurity is “an employee's perception of a potential threat to continuity in his or her current job” (p. 1431). Rosenblatt and Ruvio (1996) also considered job insecurity as “an overall concern about the future existence of the job” (p. 587). Another definition was made by Sverke, Hellgren, and Näswall (2002), referring to job insecurity as the “subjectively perceived likelihood of involuntary job loss” (p. 243). According to De Witte (2005), job insecurity is “the perceived threat of job loss and the worries related to that threat” (p.1). In many definitions of job insecurity, it is emphasized that job insecurity relates to a subjective experience, anxiety about the future, involuntary nature, and powerlessness. For example, employees can perceive an objective situation, such as a decrease in orders for the company, in different ways. While some of the employees worry about the continuity of their job, some may not even worry. The first group may think that the company or the organization's future is worsening and that they are going to lose their jobs. On the other hand, the second group may think that they are going to be more comfortable due to the lack of work. In this example the situation is the same, but the perceptions greatly differ from one another.

Insecure employees are uncertain about whether they will retain or lose their current job (De Witte, 2005, p. 1). When people face uncertainty, their ability to control events weakens and they develop a feeling of helplessness (Wichert, 2002). For the occurrence of job insecurity, people interpret some of the events in the internal and external environment differently. It is not necessary for there to be an actual job loss in the occurrence of job insecurity. This feeling appears after one perceives job-threatening symptoms. Job insecurity concerns not only the loss of the whole job, but also insecurity over losing important aspects of the job such as career and development opportunities, valued colleagues, or valued job tasks (Ashford, Lee, & Bobko, 1989; Greenhalgh, & Rosenblatt, 1984).

Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) introduced a theory-based perspective on job insecurity, and later researchers considered job insecurity in two parts; named as qualitative and quantitative job insecurity (De Witte, 2005). Hellgren, Sverke, and Isaksson (1999) developed a two-dimensional approach to job insecurity, naming these dimensions as quantitative and qualitative job insecurity. In the case of qualitative job insecurity, there are perceived threats to the absence of important job characteristics such as deterioration in working conditions, lack of career opportunities and reduced wage increase. On the other hand, there is a concern that people will worry about whether or not they will continue to work in quantitative job insecurity (De Witte, 2005).

When the concept of job insecurity is thought in terms of teaching profession; there are many differences according to the structure of the institution where the teachers work, the methods used and the working environment. These situations sometimes relax teachers and sometimes make them feel job insecurity. It seems that teachers in public schools experience more job insecurity than those working in private schools. On the other hand, teachers in private schools are paid higher salaries than those in public schools (Özdemir, & Yalın, 2000). However, after 2000 there was a rise seen in the number of unassigned teachers and consequently, the rise in the number of teachers seeking work in private schools has caused private sector wages to fall due to the increased labor supply. As a result, the sense of job insecurity can be expressed in short as “anxiety about losing a job” (De Witte, 2005), and can be evidenced at different levels in private and public schools.

The job insecurity that teachers feel affects their behaviors. This influence may be on teachers’ fulfillment of defined tasks, as well as on behaviors exhibited by teachers in other areas beyond their defined tasks. In the current study, the role of these behaviors, called organizational citizenship behaviors, are affected by job insecurity. It is expected that the influence will be different in public schools and private schools.

### **Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

The concept of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) was first formally articulated by Chester Barnard. Although Barnard (1938, as cited in Harper, & College, 2015, p. 2) did not use the name of organizational citizenship behavior in this way, he emphatically emphasized this concept as “willing to work in a cooperation in the organization.” He later defined cooperation as genuine restraint of oneself, actual voluntary service for no reward and even subjection of one’s own personal interests for the betterment of the organization. In other words, it seems that Barnard was the first to suggest that behaviors that go beyond the roles defined in job descriptions are necessary to enable the organization to work effectively and efficiently. Katz (1964, as cited in Harper, & College, 2015, p. 2) later distinguished the concept of OCB as “innovative and spontaneous behaviors” as opposed to the more obligatory role performance. The basis for the differentiation is whether or not the behaviors are found in an individual’s job description, known as in-role performance versus behaviors that support the organization, but that are not detailed in an individual’s job description. For example, behaviors such as teamwork with colleagues, volunteering for tasks that are not in job descriptions, assisting relative and beginners in their adaptation process, supporting other employees in their jobs, or spending more time on work than needed can be considered as organizational citizenship behaviors (as cited in Harper, & College, 2015, p. 2).

Although extra-role behaviors were considered as from the 1930’s in the management field, the concept of “citizenship” become popular after 1980. This was a time when neoliberal policies began to spread and job insecurity increased. In this period, employees began to need extra-role behaviors. However, within the framework of neoliberal policies, there is a growing perception of job insecurity and this affects employees’ extra-role behaviors.

When we review the OCB definitions in the literature, it can be seen that the most accepted definition is by Organ (1988), who stated that OCB is “voluntary individual behavior that, when aggregated across people and time, contributes to the improved performance of the organization” (p. 4). In voluntary behaviors, the individual does not receive any reward or penalty for doing or not doing certain actions as it is considered a personal preference to exhibit such behaviors (Organ, 1997). Although there are many definitions of organizational

citizenship behavior, there is consensus that organizational citizenship behaviors are mainly extra-role behaviors based on volunteerism that contribute to organizational effectiveness.

Organizational citizenship behavior has been investigated by different researchers under different dimensions. For example, Williams and Anderson (1991, pp. 601-602) addressed organizational citizenship behavior under two broad categories. The first is organizational citizenship behaviors towards the individual. These are behaviors directly beneficial to the individual and indirectly beneficial to the organization. The second is organizational citizenship behavior towards the organization, which are beneficial to the organization as a whole. In addition, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000) determined organizational citizenship behavior in seven dimensions. These are helping behavior, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civil virtue, and self-improvement. After considering these studies, it can be determined that the most agreed upon dimensions are by Organ (1988); which are Altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civil virtue.

Altruism refers to the behavior of employees within an organization to help other employees such as helping busy work colleagues (Becker, & Randall, 1994). Teachers demonstrate the altruism dimension of organizational citizenship behavior when they help new teachers adapt to the work or school culture. These behaviors also contribute to the effectiveness of the school (Sezgin, 2005). Altruistic acts within schools may result in making things happen more quickly and more effectively.

Conscientiousness is defined as the act of doing more than the job requires (Organ, 1988). Behaviors of teachers such as attending their schools in a disciplined manner, using their time efficiently in school and in class activities can be assessed within this dimension (Sezgin, 2005). Teachers' behaviors such as making home visits to students' parents to inform them about the success and general attitude of students are within the context of the conscientiousness dimension.

According to Organ (1988), sportsmanship behavior prevents negative thoughts and behaviors such as complaints or idle gossip. Spending time on positive affairs can be considered as a sportsmanship-like behavior (Sezgin, 2005). Despite negative reactions from the principle and/or parents, teachers apply their energy for student learning and success within this dimension.

According to Podsakoff et al. (2000), courtesy is a behavior which includes avoiding or preventing problems, and taking precautions against potential problems. In this dimension, teachers should inform their colleagues about the problems they face and the decisions they take, share the necessary information with the school administration and notify students and parents about the school when necessary (Sezgin, 2005). For example, informing pupils and parents about exams, meetings or activities and the taking of their ideas are assessed as courtesy behaviors.

Civic virtue represents a macro-level interest in, or commitment to the organization as a whole. This is shown by a willingness to participate actively in its governance (e.g., attending meetings, engaging in policy debates, expressing an opinion about what strategy the organization ought to follow, etc.); to monitor its environment for threats and opportunities (e.g., keep up with industry changes that might affect the organization); and to look out for its best interests (e.g., reporting fire hazards or suspicious activities, locking doors, etc.), even at

great personal cost. These behaviors reflect a person's recognition of being part of a larger whole in the same way that citizens are members of a country and accept the responsibilities which that entails (Podsakoff et al., 2000, p. 525). In this definition, the organization represents the school. Behaviors such as participation in meetings and educational events in school social activities are examples of the civic virtue behaviors (Allison, Voss, & Dryer, 2001). Schools in which teachers who have a tendency of exhibiting organizational citizenship behaviors work were found to be more successful. Teachers working in these schools are more willing to help students and colleagues, try to adapt innovative approaches to curricula, spend more time at school, try different strategies for students to succeed, and take on personal responsibilities (DiPaola, & Hoy, 2005).

DiPaola and Hoy (2005) found that schools with teachers who have higher tendency to exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors were more productive, and that students who were taught in these schools were more successful. Teachers working in these schools are more willing to help students and colleagues, try to adapt innovative approaches, spend time on non-school days at school, try different strategies to ensure students are successful, and take personal responsibility.

When the studies in the literature are examined, it can be seen that even though there has been considerable research about the organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers, there has been inadequate research about their job insecurity. A number of studies have been conducted on the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors exhibited by teachers and certain variables (e.g., school climate, leadership qualities of managers, school characteristics, demographic characteristics, etc.) (Baş, & Şentürk, 2011; Celep, Polat, Elbir, & Yapıcı, 2004; Denholm, 2002; DiPaola, & Hoy, 2005; DiPaola, & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Garg, & Rastogi, 2006; Oguz, 2011; Polat, 2007; Ugurlu, & Demir, 2016; Ünal, & Çelik, 2013; Yılmaz, 2010; Yılmaz, Altınkurt, & Yıldırım, 2015). On the other hand, when studies made on job insecurity are examined, some studies can be found about job insecurity and demographic characteristics, working styles, sector differences, etc. (Demir, 2010; Johnson, Bobko, & Hartenian, 1992; Özveren, 2016; Ruvio, & Rosenblatt, 1999).

The organizational citizenship behaviors exhibited by teachers are very important for students to be well-educated and for a successful education system, and factors affecting these behaviors should be revealed. From this perspective, such research differs from previous studies; hence, the current study considers the relationship between job insecurity and organizational citizenship behavior.

### **Purpose of the research**

The main purpose of the study is to determine the relationship between job insecurity perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors of middle school teachers working in public and private schools in Istanbul, Turkey. The study addresses the following research questions for this purpose:

- a) What is the job insecurity and dimensions of job insecurity level of middle school teachers working in public and private schools?
- b) What is the OCB and dimensions of OCB level of middle school teachers working in public and private schools?
- c) Do the teachers' perceptions of job insecurity significantly differentiate according to school type (public/private)

- d) Do the teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors significantly differentiate according to school type (public/private)?
- e) Is the perceived job insecurity among teachers working in public and private schools a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behavior?

## METHOD

### Research Model

The relational survey model (Karasar, 1995) was applied in this study as it focuses on teachers' thoughts about job insecurity and organizational citizenship behaviors working in public and private schools.

### Population and Sample of Research

The population of this study consists of teachers working in public and private middle schools in Istanbul, Turkey. The population includes 31,482 teachers working in 1,159 public schools and 7,129 teachers working in 328 private schools (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 2015). Since it would be impossible to reach the whole population and in order to generalize the obtained results, a sample of adequate size was sought. In determining the size of the sample the size of the population and sampling error were taken as a basis. The size of the sample required for a population of up to 1,000 (.5 sampling error and confidence level  $\alpha = .05$ ) is 278; up to 5,000 is 357; up to 50,000 is 381 (Balçı, 2006). Accordingly, the public schools were represented by a sample of 610 middle school teachers for a population of 31,482 teachers, and the private schools were represented by a sample of 398 middle school teachers for a population of 7,129 teachers. It is therefore assumed that these numbers would be sufficient for the purposes of sampling.

In summary, the research was based on the opinions of 1,008 teachers randomly selected from 36 districts in Istanbul, depending on the research population. The same scales were applied to both sample groups and the identities of the participants were kept confidential.

### Data Collection Tools

The Job Insecurity and the Organizational Citizenship Behavior scales were used for data collection.

The Job Insecurity scale was developed by Ashford et al. (1989), De Witte (1999), and Hellgren et al. (1999), and was used to determine the respondents' perceived job insecurity. The scale was later adapted to Turkish by Şeker (2011). In social sciences, the Cronbach's Alpha values should be greater than .70 for reliability (Robert & Wally, 2003). The fact that the Cronbach's Alpha values for job insecurity dimensions and job insecurity are higher than .70 indicates that this scale is reliable. The reliability coefficients of the Job Insecurity Scale for this study are given in Table 1.

Table 1. *Reliability coefficients of job insecurity scale*

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha - <math>\alpha</math>)</i>
Job Insecurity	.78
Quantitative Job Insecurity	.84
Qualitative Job Insecurity	.78

As a result of the basic component analysis, it was seen that the scale items were collected in two factors. The first and second factor loads ranged from .53 to .88 with nine items. These two factors explain 60.965% of the total variance. Quantitative job insecurity consists of four items (1-4) whereas the qualitative job insecurity consists of five items (5-9). The job insecurity scale consists of nine items and is a five-point, Likert-type scale rated from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Since the name of the scale is a negative concept the scores of the opposite scales (items 5-9) are reversed at the end of the scale. Since the expressions on the job insecurity scale can be generalized to all sectors, it was first applied to teachers in the education sector in this study.

The Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale was developed by Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1989), based on five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior stated by Organ (1988). It was then further developed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) and then Moorman (1991). It was later adapted to Turkish and educational organizations by Polat (2007). In the study of Polat (2007) and the current study, the dimensions of altruism and courtesy were collected under the same factor and in general two dimensions were named as "benevolence." The Turkish version of the scale consists of 20 items and is a five-point, Likert-type scale rated from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). As a result of the basic components analysis, it was seen that scale factors were collected in four factors. The four factors ranged from .62 to .82 with 20 items. These four factors explain 64.216% of the total variance. The reliability coefficients of the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale obtained in the current study are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. *Reliability coefficients of organizational citizenship scale*

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha - <math>\alpha</math>)</i>
Organization Citizenship Behavior	.91
Benevolence	.91
Sportsmanship	.75
Conscientiousness	.84
Civic virtue	.84

### **Analysis of the Data**

The collected data were statistically analyzed using SPSS 21.0 for Windows. Also, prior to the analysis and assessment, the histograms of the scores were drawn and the One Sample Kolmogorow Smirnow test showed that the data was appropriate for normal distribution. During the analysis and assessment, the level of statistical significance was accepted as  $p < .05$  and descriptive statistics, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, *t*-test and multiple regression analysis were used.

## **FINDINGS**

In this part, firstly the level of job insecurity and organizational citizenship behaviors of middle school teachers working in public and private schools were determined, and examined as to whether or not these variables differed according to school type (public/private). Then, it was determined whether or not a relationship exists between perceived job insecurity and organizational citizenship behaviors of middle school teachers working in public and private schools.



The result of the *t*-test analysis on whether there was a meaningful difference between the perceptions of job insecurity and organizational citizenship behavior of teachers according to school type (public/private), and the total average values of job insecurity, organizational citizenship behavior, and the dimensions of these variables are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. *Job insecurity and organizational citizenship behavior of middle school teachers working in public and private schools*

Variable	School Type	n	Mean	Std. Dev.	df	t	p
Quantitative Job Insecurity	Private	398	2.05	.90	920	1.12	.26
	Public	610	2.12	1.02			
Qualitative Job Insecurity	Private	398	2.57	.86	783	11.96	.00**
	Public	610	3.21	.78			
Job Insecurity	Private	398	2.34	.71	1006	8.64	.00**
	Public	610	2.72	.68			
Benevolence	Private	398	4.24	.72	740	5.61	.00**
	Public	610	3.99	.60			
Sportsmanship	Private	398	4.09	.88	765	2.18	.03*
	Public	610	3.98	.76			
Conscientiousness	Private	398	4.28	.82	1006	3.25	.00**
	Public	610	4.11	.76			
Civic virtue	Private	398	4.02	.80	1006	6.30	.00**
	Public	610	3.73	.69			
OCB	Private	398	4.17	.64	695	5.67	.00**
	Public	610	3.96	.49			

\*\* $p < .01$ ; \* $p < .05$

In private schools, the teachers' quantitative job insecurity average was 2.05, while the qualitative job insecurity average was 2.57 ( $S=.86$ ). In addition, the general average of job insecurity was 2.34 ( $S=.71$ ). On the other hand, in public schools, teachers' quantitative job insecurity average was 2.12 ( $S=1.02$ ), while the average for qualitative job insecurity was 3.21 ( $S=.78$ ). The general average of job insecurity was 2.72 ( $S=.68$ ).

The average of teachers' benevolence behaviors in private schools was 4.24 ( $S=.72$ ); the average of sportsmanship behavior was 4.09 ( $S=.88$ ); the mean of conscientious behavior was 4.28 ( $S=.82$ ); and the mean of civic virtue behavior was 4.02 ( $S=.80$ ). In addition, the overall average score of teachers' organizational citizenship behavior in private schools was 4.17 ( $S=.64$ ). On the other hand, in public schools, the average of teachers' benevolence behaviors was 3.99 ( $S=.60$ ); the average of sportsmanship behavior was 3.98 ( $S=.76$ ); the mean of conscientious behavior was 4.11 ( $S=.76$ ); and the mean of civic virtue behavior was 3.73 ( $S=.69$ ). In addition, the general average score of teachers' organizational citizenship behavior in public schools was 3.96 ( $S=.49$ ).

As can be seen in Table 3, a significant difference was found between the school type (public/private) variable and teachers' job insecurity perceptions ( $t_{(1006)}=8.65$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and organizational citizenship behaviors ( $t_{(695)}=5.67$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Teachers working in private schools tend to exhibit more organizational citizenship behaviors and experience less job insecurity than teachers working in public schools. Qualitative job insecurity perceptions ( $t_{(783)}=11.96$ ,

$p < .05$ ) differ according to school type, while quantitative job insecurity perceptions ( $t_{(920)} = 1.12$ ,  $p > .05$ ) of teachers did not differ according to school type. Qualitative job insecurity perception level of teachers was lower in private schools than in public schools. A meaningful difference was found between the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior and school type. Teachers working in private schools tended to exhibit more benevolence ( $t_{(740)} = 5.61$ ,  $p < .05$ ), sportsmanship ( $t_{(765)} = 2.18$ ,  $p < .05$ ), conscientiousness ( $t_{(1006)} = 3.25$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and civic virtue ( $t_{(1006)} = 6.30$ ,  $p < .05$ ) behaviors.

Table 4. Multiple regression analysis showing effect of job insecurity on organizational citizenship behavior in public and private schools

School Type	Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	B	Standard Error B	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Standardized $\beta$	t	F	p	
Private	OCB	Quantitative Job Insecurity	-.03	.03	.46	.22	-.04	.79	54.14	.43	
		Qualitative Job Insecurity	-.33	.04			-.45	9.66		.00**	
	Benevolence	Quantitative Job Insecurity	.01	.04	.42	.18	.01	.26	41.94	.80	
		Qualitative Job Insecurity	-.35	.04			-.42	8.81		.00**	
	Sportsmanship	Quantitative Job Insecurity	-.00	.05	.29	.08	-.00	-.07	17.84	.95	
		Qualitative Job Insecurity	-.27	.05			-.29	5.68		.00**	
	Conscientiousness	Quantitative Job Insecurity	-.11	.05	.40	.15	-.11	2.34	35.31	.02*	
		Qualitative Job Insecurity	-.35	.05			-.34	6.99		.00**	
	Civic virtue	Quantitative Job Insecurity	-.04	.04	.39	.16	-.04	.86	36.19	.39	
		Qualitative Job Insecurity	-.35	.05			-.38	7.81		.00**	
	Public	OCB	Quantitative Job Insecurity	-.04	.02	.21	.04	-.08	1.90	14.11	.06
			Qualitative Job Insecurity	-.12	.03			-.18	4.53		.00**
Benevolence		Quantitative Job Insecurity	-.01	.02	.13	.02	-.01	.33	5.16	.74	
		Qualitative Job Insecurity	-.10	.03			-.13	3.08		.00**	
Sportsmanship		Quantitative Job Insecurity	-.01	.03	.08	.01	-.01	.31	1.99	.76	
		Qualitative Job Insecurity	-.08	.04			-.08	1.88		.06	
Conscientiousness		Quantitative Job Insecurity	-.14	.03	.24	.06	-.18	4.60	19.19	.00**	
		Qualitative Job Insecurity	-.13	.04			-.13	3.24		.00**	
Civic virtue		Quantitative Job Insecurity	-.01	.03	.21	.04	-.03	.79	14.01	.43	
		Qualitative Job Insecurity	-.18	.04			-.20	5.02		.00**	

$N_{private} = 398$ ; \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

$N_{public} = 610$ ; \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Table 4 shows the results of multiple regression analyzes conducted in order to determine whether or not teachers' perceptions of job insecurity predicted their tendency to

exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors. Accordingly, the effect of job insecurity on quantitative job insecurity in public and private schools was found to be statistically insignificant. However, qualitative job insecurity showed a negative and significant effect on the OCB in public and private schools. Quantitative job insecurity shows a negative and significant impact only on the sportsmanship behavior in private and public schools among the dimensions of OCB. Qualitative job insecurity significantly affected the dimensions of OCB in public schools, in terms of benevolence, sportsmanship and civic virtue; while it negatively influenced all dimensions of OCB in private schools.

As can be seen in Table 4, qualitative job insecurity in private schools was found to have a higher influence level on OCB than in public schools. For example, the  $\beta$  value indicating the degree of impact of qualitative job insecurity on OCB is  $-.18$  (18%) in public schools and  $-.45$  (45%) in private schools. This suggests that the increase in qualitative job insecurity in private schools has led to a higher drop in OCB. A similar situation could be seen between qualitative job insecurity and the dimensions of OCB. On the other hand, the relative importance of quantitative job insecurity on sportsmanship behavior had a higher impact in public schools. Quantitative job insecurity described 18% of sportsmanship behaviors in public schools and 11% in private schools.

## **DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

In the literature section of the study, basic information about job insecurity and organizational citizenship behavior is given. In the implementation part of the study, the perceptions of middle school teachers working in public and private schools according to the dimensions of job insecurity and OCB, and overall job insecurity and OCB were determined. In addition, the results were examined to understand whether or not the teachers' perceptions varied according to school type (public/private). Finally, it was revealed that the organizational citizenship behaviors that teachers exhibit differed according to the perceived job insecurity.

Long-term employment contracts can be made in private schools in order to lower the job insecurity level of teachers and to eliminate teachers' worries about their job. On the other hand, public schools should have a career planning process for teachers according to a certain system, and the promotion and reward systems should be well defined. Then it can be possible for teachers to see themselves as more permanently within their schools.

The results of the current study show teachers' level of organizational citizenship behavior at high levels within both public and private schools. However, it would be pertinent to investigate why middle school teachers in public schools have lower levels of organizational citizenship behaviors than teachers who work in private schools and some precautions should be taken in order to motivate teachers to exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors. The first thing that could be done is to identify and implement motivational factors (projects of at least one-year, preparation activities, appointments abroad, prizes, leadership skills of managers, professional training, courses and seminars, graduate and doctoral opportunities, etc.) that will direct teachers to exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors. In addition, appreciating teachers, supporting them in their professional development, building empathy, giving positive feedback, and ensuring that teachers feel valued themselves can also help them to increase their level of exhibiting organizational citizenship behaviors.

The relationship between teachers' job insecurity perceptions and school type was found to be statistically significant. Teachers' job insecurity perceptions are higher in public schools

than in private schools. Teachers working in public middle schools adhere to Law Number 657 on Civil Servants and must be successful in passing the central examination of the Ministry of National Education and/or the Center for Measurement, Selection and Placement (Milli Eğitim Temel Kanunu, 1973). All former contracted teachers in Turkey were transferred to permanent staff contracts in 2011. However, has since been changed, with contracted teaching practices reintroduced in 2016. At the point of the current study's research, there was no contracted teaching practices and all of the public school teachers who participated in the survey were employed as permanent teaching staff. In private institutions, teachers' contracts are by law limited to a minimum of at least one calendar year. Private school teachers are governed by Labor Law Number 4857 (Özel Öğretim Kurumları Kanunu, 2007).

Feather and Rauter (2004) found that teachers who worked with fixed-term work contracts experienced a stronger sense of job insecurity. This result is incompatible with the current study's findings. The reason for this is that the perception of job insecurity reflects the fear of losing one's job as well as the idea of not permanently seeing oneself worked at the current institution. In Turkey, teachers in public schools may want to leave the school where they work because of the school's location, the possibilities of the school, or the teacher's own preferences (e.g., peer status, health status). For example, a teacher working in Istanbul does not see himself as permanent in his school because his wife lives in Izmir and he therefore wants to go to Izmir. The sense of job insecurity means the idea of losing a job or not seeing oneself permanently in private schools but it can be thought differently in public schools. Teachers working in public schools do not lose work easily, even though they don't see themselves as permanent in their schools. In the risk community where risk, uncertainty, danger and anxieties are intensely present, teachers working in public schools may want to change schools more often than teachers working in private schools because of reasons such as not taking an active role in the decisions taken or immortality in student-related relationships. On the other hand, private school teachers' requesting to change schools may not be so easy due to the reasons such as few number of branches of the school they are working at.

The relationship between teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors and school type was found to be statistically significant. Teachers' perception of OCB was higher in private schools than in public schools. A similar result to the current study was seen in the work of Feather and Rauter (2004). The current study has shown that teachers working with fixed-term employment contracts exhibit more organizational citizenship behaviors. This suggests that teachers spend extra effort and undertake additional tasks not usually defined as part of their work tasks. According to the results of a study by Celep et al. (2004), which was similar to the current research, it was found that teachers in private schools exhibited more organizational citizenship behaviors than teachers in public schools. In private schools, teachers showed more OCB considering that renewing their contracts for the next year depends on how effectively they work. Because the school administrators generally want to work with teachers who exhibit OCB at school and therefore may prefer them over teachers who do not. Surveys have shown that organizations perform better in which employees exhibit OCB (Azmi, Desai, & Jayakrishnan, 2016).

According to the regression analysis done in the current research, it was found that OCB in public and private schools was significantly and negatively influenced by qualitative job insecurity. This means that when teachers feel less qualitative job insecurity they exhibit greater OCB. Also, it has been revealed that those who consider they have the possibility to progress in

their career show more OCB. Similar results obtained from a study by Reisel et al. (2010) found a decrease in exhibiting organizational citizenship behaviors when American managers perceived job insecurity. Another study that supported these studies was by McInroe (2013), who found a negative relationship between job insecurity and organizational citizenship behavior. On the other hand, the results of research conducted by Lam, Liang, Ashford, and Lee (2015) in a public-sector electricity company showed a curvilinear relationship (U-shaped) between job insecurity and organizational citizenship behavior. When job insecurity increases from a low to a moderate level, employees respond to organizational negativities by reducing the level of organizational citizenship behavior they exhibit. However, when job insecurity reaches moderate to high levels, employees become more motivated and want to take back their lost control by exhibiting organizational citizenship behavior. The difference in the results of the current research could be considered as due to cultural differences between Turkey and other countries.

Furthermore, since the perception of job insecurity is a personal perception, it can be perceived differently by workers subjected to different conditions and motivational factors in different sectors. Qualitative job insecurity has been shown to have a negative effect on organizational citizenship behavior. The more the qualitative job insecurity perceptions of teachers are reduced, the greater their tendency to exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors. For educators, organizational citizenship behaviors gain importance in order to reach educational goals. Teachers' feelings of qualitative job insecurity may be based on the absence of opportunities for teachers to progress in their careers. For example, teachers may reach the level of assistant principal or director, but then both their workloads and responsibilities increase, although no significant increase seen in their wages. Therefore, such progression may not be preferred, and teachers see the possibility of progress in their profession as inadequate. Considering this aspect, it is expected that increased career steps (such as specialist teacher, senior teacher, etc.) and increases seen in the wages of teachers according to certain criteria (e.g., education, study period, achievements) would reduce teachers' perceptions of qualitative job insecurity and increase their tendency to exhibit organizational citizenship behavior.

This study was conducted on teachers working in private and public schools at the middle school level in Istanbul due to time and financial constraints. For future research, different level institutions (e.g., primary schools, high schools) could be considered. In the current study, the effect of job insecurity on OCB was investigated. In further studies, other variables could be introduced to assess their effect on OCB.

## REFERENCES

- Allison, B. J., Voss, R. S., & Dryer, S. (2001). Student classroom and career success: The role of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Education for Business*, 76(5), 282-288.
- Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1989). Content, cause, and consequences of job insecurity: A theory-based measure and substantive test. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(4), 803-829.
- Azmi, F. T., Desai, K., & Jayakrishnan, K. (2016). Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB): A comprehensive literature review. *Sumedha Journal of Management*, 5(1), 102-117.
- Balcı, A. (2006). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma: Yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Baş, G., & Şentürk, C. (2011). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel vatandaşlık ve örgütsel güven algıları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 17(1), 29-62.

- Becker, T. E., & Randall, D. M. (1994). Validation of a measure of organizational citizenship behavior against an objective behavioral criterion. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54*(1), 160-167.
- Celep, C., Polat, S., Elbir, N., & Yapıcı, E. (2004, July). *Ortaöğretim okullarındaki öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık tutumları*. Paper presented at the XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı, Malatya, Turkey.
- Çakır, B. (2007). Belirsizlik ve korkunun yeni düzenin oluşmasına katkısı. *Sosyoloji Konferansları Dergisi-Istanbul Journal of Sociological Studies, 36*, 63-82.
- Demir, N. (2010). *The analysis of the reflections of flexible working forms in education*. (Unpublished master thesis). Ankara University Educational Sciences Institute, Ankara
- Denholm, P. J. (2002). *A study of organizational citizenship behavior and trust in a public high school*. (Unpublished doctorate thesis). Wilmington College, Ohio.
- De Witte, H. D. (1999). Job insecurity and psychological well-being: Review of the literature and exploration of some unresolved issues. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8*(2), 155-177.
- De Witte, H. D. (2005). Job Insecurity: Review of the international literature on definitions, prevalence, antecedents and consequences. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 31*(4), 1-6.
- DiPaola, M. F., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). School characteristics that foster organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of School Leadership, 15*(4), 387-406.
- DiPaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership, 11*(5), 424-427.
- Feather, N. T., & Rauter, K. A. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviors in relation to job status, job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction and work values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77*(1), 81-94.
- Garg, P., & Rastogi, R. (2006). Climate profile and OCBs of teachers in public and private schools of India. *International Journal of Educational Management, 20*(7), 529-541.
- Greenhalgh, L., & Rosenblatt, Z. (1984). Job insecurity: Toward conceptual clarity. *Academy of Management Review, 9*(3), 438-448.
- Harper, P. J., & College, M. (2015). Exploring forms of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB): antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Management and Marketing Research, 18*, 1.
- Heaney, C. A., Israel, B. A., & House, J. S. (1994). Chronic job insecurity among automobile workers: Effects on job satisfaction and health. *Social Science & Medicine, 38*(10), 1431-1437.
- Hellgren, J., Sverke, M., & Isaksson, K. (1999). A two-dimensional approach to job insecurity: Consequences for employee attitudes and well-being. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8*(2), 179-195.
- Johnson, N., Bobko, P., & Hartenian, L. (1992). Union influence on local union leaders' perceptions of job insecurity: An Empirical Test. *British Journal of Industrial Relations, 30*(1), 45-60.
- Karasar, N. (1995). *Araştırmalarda rapor hazırlama* (10th ed.). Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Lam, C. F., Liang, J., Ashford, S. J., & Lee, C. (2015). Job insecurity and organizational citizenship behavior: Exploring curvilinear and moderated relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(2), 499-510.
- McInroe, J. A. (2013). *Job insecurity, organizational citizenship behaviors, and job search activities: How work locus of control and control-oriented coping moderate these relationships*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Bowling Green State University.

- Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı. (2015). *Millî Eğitim İstatistikleri Örgün Eğitim 2014-2015*. Ankara: MEB.
- Millî Eğitim Temel Kanunu. (1973). *Resmî Gazete*, 1739/14574.
- Moorman, R. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845–855.
- Oğuz, E. (2011). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları ile yöneticilerin liderlik stilleri arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 3(3), 377-403.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85-97.
- Öcel, H. (2009). *A model proposal of antecedent about organizational citizenship behaviours and counterproductive work behaviours of workers*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ankara University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Özdemir, S. & Yalın, H. (2000). *Öğretmenlik mesleğine giriş* (3. Edition). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım
- Özel Öğretim Kurumları Kanunu. (2007). *Resmî Gazete* 5580/26434.
- Özveren, C. G. (2016). *The role of work values on the relationship of perceived job insecurity and job uncertainty with intention to work in public sector* (Unpublished master thesis). Marmara University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1989). *A second generation measure of organizational citizenship behavior*. (Unpublished manuscript). Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- Polat, S. (2007). *Relation between organizational justice perceptions, organizational trust levels and organizational citizenship behaviors of secondary education teachers*. (Unpublished doctorate thesis), Kocaeli University, Institute of Social Sciences, Kocaeli.
- Reisel, W. D., Probst, T. M., Chia, S. L., Maloles, C. M., & König, C. J. (2010). The effects of job insecurity on job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, deviant behavior, and negative emotions of employees. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 40(1), 74-91.
- Robert Baum, J., & Wally, S. (2003). Strategic decision speed and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(11), 1107-1129
- Rosenblatt, Z., & Ruvio, A. (1996). A test of a multidimensional model of job insecurity: The case of Israeli teachers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17(SI), 587-605.
- Ruvio, A., & Rosenblatt, Z. (1999). Job insecurity among Israeli school teachers: Sectoral profiles and organizational implications. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 37(2), 139-158.
- Sezgin, F. (2005). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları: Kavramsal bir çözümleme ve okul açısından bazı çıkarımlar. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(1), 317-339.
- Soydemir, S. (2011). Modernizmin karanlık yüzü: Risk toplumu. *Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(2), 169-178.

- Sverke, M., Hellgren, J., & Näswall, K. (2002). No security: a meta-analysis and review of job insecurity and its consequences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 7*(3), 242-264.
- Şeker, S. (2011). *The correlation of job insecurity and burnout on employees: A field research for pharmaceutical sales representatives* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Dokuz Eylül University Institute of Social Sciences, İzmir.
- Uğurlu, C. T., & Demir, A. (2016). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışının öncülü olarak okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç kaynakları. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 15*(56).
- Ünal, A., & Çelik, M. (2013). Okul yöneticilerinin öğretimsel liderlik davranışı ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının analizi. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 6*(2), 239-258.
- Üstüner, M. (2006). Öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutum ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 45*, 109-127.
- Uçkaç, A. (2010). Türkiye'de neoliberal ekonomi politikaları ve sosyo-ekonomik yansımaları. *Maliye Dergisi, 158*, 422-430.
- Wichert, I. (2002). Job insecurity and work intensification, The effects of on health and well-being. In B. Burchell, D. Ladipo, & F. Wilkinson (Eds.), *Job Insecurity and Work Intensification* (pp. 92-111). London/New York: Routledge.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17*(3), 601-617.
- Yalçınkaya, T., & Özsoy, E. (2003, May). *Risk toplumu: Bilgi toplumunun evriminde yeni boyut*. Paper presented at the II. Uluslararası Bilgi, Ekonomi ve Yönetim Kongresi, Kocaeli Üniversitesi İİBF, Kocaeli.
- Yılmaz, K. (2010). Kamu ortaöğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları ile ilgili görüşleri. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 29*(1), 1-16.
- Yılmaz, K., Altinkurt, Y., & Yıldırım, H. (2015). Türkiye'deki öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına cinsiyet, kıdem ve branş değişkenlerinin etkisi: Bir meta analiz çalışması. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 40*(178), 285-304.

**Please cite as:**

Gürbüz, F. G. & Dede, E. (2018). The relationship between perceived job insecurity and organizational citizenship behaviors of middle school teachers. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi - Journal of Educational Sciences Research, 8*(1), 73-88. <http://ebad-jesr.com/>