

The Relationship between Whistleblowing and Organizational Citizenship Behavior for High School Teachers

Abbas ERTÜRK¹

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between whistleblowing and organizational citizenship behaviors in high school teachers. The research was conducted using the screening model. A total of 381 teachers participated in the research from general and vocational high schools. 216 (56.7%) of them were male and 165 (43.3%) were female. The "Whistleblowing Scale" and "Organizational Citizenship Scale" were used to collect the data. Descriptive statistics, *t*-test and ANOVA were used in the data analysis. The Scheffe test was used for the comparison of multiple tests in order to determine the source of the difference for the F values. Pearson correlation analysis was used to determine the relation between the level of organizational citizenship behavior and whistleblowing. The results were tested at the level of $p < .01$ and $p < .05$. The survey findings indicate that the teachers' level of whistleblowing behavior is moderate and that males are whistleblowers significantly more than females, and that there is no significant difference between the groups in terms of the type of school. The teachers' level of organizational citizenship behavior was high and does not differ according to gender, but significantly differs according to the type of school in favor of vocational schools. In addition, correlation analysis indicates a positive and significant relationship between teachers' whistleblowing behavior and organizational citizenship behavior at a low level.

Key Words: Whistle blowing, Vocational schools, High schools, Teacher

 DOI Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12973/jesr.2016.61.1>

¹ Assist. Prof. Dr. - Muđla Sıtkı Koçman University, Faculty of Education - abbaserturk@mu.edu.tr

INTRODUCTION

The occurrence of unethical behavior, corruption, and misconduct is a fundamental problem for organizations, and studies have been undertaken on this subject. While some of those studies concern preventive measures, others examine facts to identify such problems. At the same time, for the losses arising from unethical and unlawful behavior of employees not to affect organizations adversely or to affect them less, these problems must be known and discovered as early as possible. The party to ensure this is the employees of the organization themselves, who first witness the problem; for it is the employees of the organization who best know the unethical behavior that occurs in the organization. From this point of view, employees are regarded as a major source (Aguilar, 2009, 14). Sometimes, they disclose unethical and unlawful events of this type which occur in the organization. An employee of an organization revealing an unethical or unlawful practice in his organization is referred to as a whistleblower (Near & Miceli, 1985).

Whistleblowing is indispensable to bring out and remove failings in systems. For this reason, many countries have laws concerning the protection of whistleblowing (Aydın, 2003). In Turkey, employees in the public sector often prefer to remain silent in the face of violations they witness (Seçkin & Karasoy, 2012). One of the reasons for such silence is the belief that nothing can be gained by making known the violations that are noted. Another reason is the fact that even if the person would like to make the wrongdoing known, he believes that this would be considered squealing and he would suffer harm as a result (Toker Gökçe, 2014a). For this reason, the aim of the present study is to shed light on the phenomenon of whistleblowing, which is little known and misinterpreted in Turkey, and to ensure its correct understanding. In this way, the correct opinion can be raised regarding what should be done by teachers and administrators in the face of them finding something wrong.

The term “whistleblowing” was first used in 1963 in the USA in documents concerning internal security risks at a Senate committee. As a word, it means the police blowing the whistle against a criminal to prevent a crime (Hersh, 2002, 243). In the Oxford English online dictionary, it is defined as informing on an individual or organization engaged in an illegal or immoral activity.

Near and Miceli (1985, 4) define this phenomenon as the disclosure of violations of ethics and law that occur in an organization under employer’s control by an employee of the organization in a manner that will affect the activities of the organization. Aktan (2006, 1) defines it as the communication of illegal and unethical behaviors and acts in an organization by persons who have knowledge of them to internal or external authorities so that they should not cause harm to others within or outside the organization or to other organizations. Kılıçoğlu and Gürol (1994, 1000) define it with regard to public employees, as the public disclosure by a civil servant of unethical events or his complaints in the department where he works. Jubb (1999, 78) defines it as the intentional and voluntary disclosure to the public of knowledge concerning illegal activities or misconduct occurring in an organization with the aim of eliminating such practices.

Scholars who analyze the phenomenon of whistleblowing state that this includes four elements and that it is a process rather than an event. According to Near and Miceli (1985), this phenomenon comprises at least four elements; the whistleblower, the wrongdoing or misconduct, the authority receiving the complaint or information, and the organization that is complained of. Doizer and Miceli (1985) state that this process involves five steps: 1) The

wrongdoing or misconduct being observed by the employee; 2) The employee deciding to blow the whistle; 3) The employee deciding whether or not this is under his responsibility; 4) Selecting the appropriate method; and 5) Whistleblowing. The fact that the phenomenon moves in a process is important as it shows that it is a decision arising step-by-step as the result of a chain of thinking and analysis, while providing relief of mind for the person who displays the behavior. According to Brennan and Kelly (2007, 65), this rescues the whistleblower from his doubt concerning whether or not to carry out the action and shows that it is an ethical decision-making process. In this process, there are factors influencing the decision of employees to undertake or not to undertake whistleblowing about the organization. According to Miceli, Near, and Schwenk (1991), these factors may be examined under three headings as individual, organizational, and situational factors. Individual factors are values such as the individual's moral values, job satisfaction, and organizational loyalty. Arnold and Ponemon (1991) find that employees with a low level of work ethics have also a low level of whistleblowing behavior. Organizational factors concern organizational culture and the bureaucratic attitude existing in the organization. They concern, for example, the attitude of the organization toward the whistleblower and how it will operate the process. Situational factors concern the type of the unethical activity that is the subject of whistleblowing, whether this activity is directly witnessed or not, and whether it is recorded or not (Miceli et al., 1991; Near & Miceli, 1985).

Park, Blenkinsopp, Öktem, and Omurgonulsen (2008) classify whistleblowing behavior in terms of the way in which it is practiced. This classification includes the authority to which the information is provided (internal/external to the organization), the path followed by the whistleblower (formal/informal), and the way in which the whistleblower reveals the information (anonymous/open). Internal whistleblowing means the communication of illegal or unethical behavior noted in the organization to the internal management (Mansbach & Bachner, 2010, 483-490). A teacher informing the principal of an illegal or unethical act by another teacher or a school accountant or informing the district, province or Ministry officials of such an act by the principal may be given as an example of internal whistleblowing. According to Barnett, Cochran, and Taylor (1993), organizations encouraging internal whistleblowing and eliminating the need for external whistleblowing constitutes an advantage for them. External whistleblowing means informing a violation that occurs within the organization to authorities outside the organization, for example, to an external agency, a professional association, or the press (Mansbach & Bachner, 2010). A teacher informing the press of an illegal or unethical act by another teacher, a school accountant or the principal may be given as an example of external whistleblowing. This type of whistleblowing is not endorsed by our society because it involves leaking information about the organization and thereby causes harm to the image of the organization. However, there are reasons that lead employees to take this path. Perrucci, Anderson, Schendel, and Trachtman (1980) and Elliston, Keenan, Lockhart, and van Schaick (1985) state that these reasons include the fact that communication among employees is graded rather than direct and the fact that officials do not welcome whistleblowing or do not take it seriously.

Looking at the proposals made by scholars, it is proposed that the whistleblowing process should be started from within and should move outward until the desired response is obtained. Trevino and Nelson (2004, 80) lists the stages of whistleblowing from inside toward outside, stating that in the face of a violation witnessed by the employee, he should first bring it to the attention of the relevant manager within the organization, then discuss it with his own

family, and if the desired response is not obtained from the manager, inform managers at other levels, and if the desired response is still not obtained, communicate it to the relevant supervisor in the organization. In this event, the organization can become aware of the violation that has occurred and solve the problem internally. If the desired response is still not obtained, it is stated that external whistleblowing should then be used.

The public perception of whistleblowing is very important. According to Sehgal (2014), some people regard the whistleblower as a hero while others regard him as a traitor. Because whistleblowing and its benefits are not sufficiently discussed and not correctly understood in Turkey, whistleblowers are often accused of treachery. According to Aktan (2006, 3), this behavior is often described with negative words such as “squealing” and “spying”. For this reason, employees usually avoid whistleblowing. According to Sehgal (2014, 1), whistleblowers are faced with threats while expecting something good in return for this useful service they render. To rectify or prevent violations that occur in organizations, it is vital that they should be brought to light (Ahmad, Smith, & İsmail, 2010). To remove this incorrect perception and to clarify whistleblowing, the difference between whistleblowing and spying is emphasized in definitions made. For a case to be considered whistleblowing, the whistleblower must have performed this act not for personal benefit, but for the benefit of the public. In most definitions, it is stated that whistleblowing is behavior based on good faith, that considers the public benefit, or that is undertaken with the aim of preventing harm to others (Aktan, 2006; Near & Miceli, 1985; Rehg, Micelli, Near, & van Scotter, 2008; Ray, 2006; Dozier & Miceli, 1985). Certain definitions bring more clarity and state that whistleblowing is “behavior that is displayed with the aim of rectifying a misconduct, violation, or neglect that threatens public benefit.” In the opposite case, whistleblowing displayed with the aim of securing personal gain is known among the public as spying (Ergun Özler, Dil Şahin, & Giderler Atalay, 2010, 186).

Many surveys conducted show that employees in educational organizations also display whistleblowing behaviors. In a survey by Celep and Konaklı (2012, 77), it was found that teachers often blow the whistle for organizational benefit and for moral and professional values. In research conducted by Sayğan and Bedük (2013) with research assistants, a significant relationship was found between whistleblowing and the sub-dimension, ethical climate of altruism. The researchers state that whistleblowing is undertaken with the aim of helping others. A study by Celep and Konaklı (2012) on primary and secondary school teachers developed scales of whistleblowing and for the reasons for whistleblowing. In the study, it was found that teachers usually prefer internal whistleblowing and that the main reason is for school purposes and school benefit. In the survey conducted by Toker Gökçe (2014a), 32 out of 164 teachers stated that they had witnessed an illegal act, and 11 of them stated that they had resorted to whistleblowing. In this survey, it is found that most teachers prefer informal and internal ways of whistleblowing. According to Toker Gökçe (2014a, 278), teachers avoid such behavior because they believe that they would be penalized by the administration in return for their actions. Toker Gökçe (2014b) finds that teachers prefer internal and non-secretive ways of whistleblowing. In another survey, Toker Gökçe (2013) finds that 46% of teachers who witnessed an unethical or illegal event resorted to whistleblowing. In other words, it may be said that 54% of teachers who witnessed an unethical or illegal event did not blow the whistle, but elected to remain silent.

Another variable of the study is Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). Such behavior is defined as the assumption by employees of positive roles toward the organization about issues that do not fall within their own area of duty, on a voluntary basis and without having any expectation (Neuman & Kickul, 1998, 263). This positive behavior displayed by employees plays an important role in the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization. Organ (1988) states that such behavior is employee behavior on a voluntary basis, which is not included in the organization's formal system of reward, but which helps the organization to perform its functions. According to Gürbüz (2007, 50), OCB is an individual behavior. It shows the attitude and position of the individual toward the organization. The employee displays OCB when he completes the work for which he is formally responsible and goes beyond it and carries out additional voluntary work. In other words, it is behavior that takes place by going beyond the requirements of the employee's duty and doing more than required. According to Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000, 513), such behavior is entirely voluntary as it is not included in the employee's job description. The employee is not faced with a penalty when he does not carry out or neglects such work. This type of behavior is displayed usually as a result of personal choice. In other words, such work is behavior that is not influenced by the organization's system of penalty and reward, that is undertaken on a voluntary basis, and that is for the benefit of the organization. This includes, for example, the display of behavior by an employee such as helping other employees in the organization after he completes his own duty, accepting them as they are, not complaining in the face of small problems, working carefully, contributing to the order and cleanliness of the workplace, using positive expressions about the organization, and protecting the resources of the organization (Bateman & Organ, 1983).

Studies on organizational citizenship behavior have identified the factors influencing the emergence of such behavior. These are organizational factors, the characteristics of the work, the characteristics of the leader, and individual factors. Organizational factors concern organizational justice, the attitude toward work, the hierarchical order, the organizational vision, participation in decision-making, and the integration of the person and the organization. The characteristics of the work concern whether or not the work is of a nature that provides regular feedback and autonomy, the development of the personal sense of control, and the existence of an environment of autonomy without close supervision (Ay, 2007, 40). The characteristics of the leader concern leadership support, the style of leadership, confidence held in the leader, and the perceived impartiality and integrity of the leader. A survey conducted on primary school teachers in Samsun found a positive and significant relationship between OCB displayed by teachers and the transforming and driving styles of leadership shown by administrators (Oğuz, 2011). Individual factors concern personality traits, psychological condition, attitudes and behaviors toward people, the individual's ideas about his environment, and sensitivity to life and to social stimulants (Kamer, 2001, 17).

Studies have identified OCB in five different dimensions: 1) Altruism - helping colleagues who are having problems to complete their work on a voluntary basis (Sezgin, 2005); 2) Courtesy - helping colleagues who are not having problems not to experience problems and to complete their work on a voluntary basis (Sezgin, 2005); 3) Conscientiousness - an employee regularly working in his job, being careful, using the breaks properly and without abuse, and performing his duty in accordance with the rules (Organ, 1988); 4) Sportsmanship - avoiding creating problems in the organization and avoiding making complaints about the work (Sezgin, 2005); 5) Civic Virtue - the employee smoothly adapting

to the organization, developing ideas about issues relating to the organization, and not avoiding expressing them (Organ, 1988). Studies on teachers in schools under these dimensions indicate that teachers display a medium level of OCB (Uslu, Balci, & Coşkun Uslu, 2012; Karaman, Yücel, & Dönder, 2008).

Scholars state that the dimensions of OCB make employees more sensitive and objective about violations (Seçkin & Karasoy, 2012, 55). In addition, Seçkin and Karasoy (2012, 56) state in their theoretical study that there is a relationship between whistleblowing and OCB behavior. Both of the behaviors are based on similar arguments, which are voluntariness, integrity, and the benefit of the organization. It is expected that this current study will prove this theoretical prediction.

The definition of whistleblowing as an indication of good faith, an indication of concern for the benefit of the organization, or a virtue shows that it is the product of a positive psychology toward the organization. For example, people with a high tendency of whistleblowing are also expected to have other positive attitudes toward the organization at a high level. In this context, the current study is aimed at comparing the level of whistleblowing behavior in teachers and their level of OCB, another positive attitude. To reach this aim, answers were sought to the following research questions:

1. What is the level of whistleblowing shown by teachers?
2. Does the level of whistleblowing differ by the variables of gender, duty, type of school, age, level of education, seniority, and length of service at the school?
3. What is the level of organizational citizenship behavior shown by teachers?
4. Does the level of organizational citizenship differ by the variables of gender, duty, type of school, age, level of education, seniority, and length of service at the school?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the levels of whistleblowing and organizational citizenship in teachers?

METHOD

This survey is a descriptive survey and was conducted in the screening model.

Population and Sample

Teachers working in general and vocational high schools in Ankara constitute the population of this survey, which includes 23,386 teachers working in a total of 550 high schools, with 10,077 teachers in 274 general high schools and 13,309 teachers in 276 vocational high schools (MEB, 2015, 134). The population size and the sampling error were used to determine the sample size. For populations of up to 25,000 (sampling error of 0.5 and confidence level of $\alpha=0.05$), the required sample size is 378 (Şahin, 2011, 127). Accordingly, it was considered that a sample of 378 was sufficient for the 23,386 teachers in the population. Considering the unknown return rate of the questionnaires to be administered and the potential resulting loss of data, the sample was increased by 10% to a sample of 416. Of the 420 questionnaires distributed, 404 were returned. It was found that 381 of them were suitable for evaluation, representing a rate of valid return of 91%.

Table 1. Demographic details of the participants

		n	%			n	%
Gender	Male	216	56.7	Duty	Administrator	53	13.9
	Female	165	43.3		Teacher	328	86.1
Career	Teacher	239	62.9	Type of School	General	157	41.2
	Specialist Teacher	134	35.3		Vocational	224	58.8
	Headmaster	7	1.8	Level of Education	Associate Degree	15	4.0
Age (Years)	30 and below	11	2.9		Graduate	311	82.1
	31-40	90	24.1		Postgraduate	53	14.0
	41-50	187	50.1	Length of Service at School (Years)	5 and below	104	27.8
	51 and above	85	22.8		6-10	53	14.2
Seniority (Years)	11 and below	46	12.1		11-15	65	17.4
	12-17	77	20.2		16-20	70	18.7
	18-23	112	29.4	21 and above	82	21.9	
	24-29	96	25.2				
	30 and above	50	13.1				

Of the participants included in the sample, 57% are male and 43% female. 14% of them work as administrators and 86% as teachers. When the age variable is considered, it is noted that 75% of the participants are aged 31 to 50. In terms of the type-of-school variable, it is noted that 41% of the teachers who participated in the survey are employed in general high schools and 59% in vocational high schools.

Data Collection Tool

The data collection tool consisted of three parts. In the first part, the personal details of the teachers were asked. In the second part, the “Whistleblowing Scale” was used to determine the level of whistleblowing enacted by teachers. This scale was developed by Celep and Konak (2012). The scale consists of four factors (16 items). These factors are internal whistleblowing (five items: total variance 26.38%), external whistleblowing (four items: total variance 22.08%), supporter whistleblowing (four items: total variance 13.76%), and anonymous whistleblowing (three items: total variance 9.28%). The total variance explained by the factors in relation to the scale is 71.5%. The Cronbach reliability coefficient for the whole of the scale is $\alpha = .76$. In the third part, the “Organizational Citizenship Scale” was used to determine the OCB level of teachers. This scale was adapted into Turkish by Basım and Şeşen (2006). Two scales developed by Vey and Campbell (2004), and Williams and Shiaw (1999), were used in the adaptation, where it was found that the scale has five dimensions (19 items). These dimensions are: Altruism (five items: total variance 40.1%); Conscientiousness (three items: total variance 8.0%); Courtesy (three items: total variance 6.7%); Sportsmanship (four items: total variance 5.2%); and Civic Virtue (four items: total variance 4.8%). The total variance explained in relation to the scale is 64.8%. The Cronbach reliability coefficient for the whole of the scale was found to be $\alpha = .91$.

After the data collection tool was prepared, it was applied on a pilot basis at four high schools in two districts of the Ankara province. Reliability and factor analysis was performed with the data collected. In the factor analysis of the Whistleblowing Scale, two items (6 and 16) were found to have a high load value in more than one factor. It was considered appropriate to remove those two items from the scale. It was also found that the scale consists of three factors (*anonymous whistleblowing*, *internal whistleblowing*, and *external whistleblowing*). The data

captured in the analyses concerning these three factors are given in Table 2. In the factor analysis of the Organizational Citizenship Scale, it was found that two items (11 and 12) had a high load value in more than one factor and that one item (10) had a value below .30. It was found appropriate to remove those three items from the scale. In addition, it was found that the scale consists of four factors (*Sportsmanship, Conscientiousness, Altruism, and Civic Virtue*). The data captured in the analyses concerning these four factors are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Data concerning the whistleblowing and OCB scales

Dimension	Sub-dimension	Number of items	Variance %	Load values	Alpha
Whistleblowing	Anonymous	7	37.35	.764 - .836	.946
	Internal	4	18.89	.618 - .849	.831
	External	3	15.72	.623 - .814	.771
KMO= .921	Total	14	71.97		.929
OCB	Sportsmanship	4	16.46	.626 - .869	.799
	Conscientiousness	4	16.29	.642 - .771	.754
	Altruism	5	15.38	.435 - .761	.778
	Civic Virtue	3	14.34	.677 - .897	.819
KMO= .795	Total	16	62.47		.808

Collection and Analysis of the Data

The data were collected from 381 teachers and administrators working at a total of 21 high schools in five districts of the Ankara province. The schools were randomly selected from the list on the website of the Ankara Provincial Directorate of National Education. Of the administrators and teachers working at the selected schools, those who volunteered participated in the survey. The collected data were coded to the SPSS version 13.0 data analysis program and then analyzed. Descriptive statistics, *t*-test, and ANOVA test were used in the analysis of the survey data. For the F values whose ANOVA result turned out to be significant, the Scheffe test among the multiple comparison tests was used in order to determine the source of the difference. In the research, Pearson correlation analysis was used in order to determine the relation between the teachers' whistleblowing tendency and their level of OCB. The results were tested at the level of $p < .01$ and $p < .05$. The scales are of the five-grade Likert-type, and the scores obtained were "none" (1.00-1.80), "low" (1.81-2.60), "medium" (2.61-3.40), "high" (3.41-4.20), and "very high" (4.21-5.00). A correlation coefficient of 0.00-0.29 in absolute value was interpreted as a relationship at a "low" level, 0.30-0.69 at a "medium level", and 1.00-0.70 at a "high" level (Büyüköztürk, 2009).

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

The values concerning the whistleblowing behavior of the teachers included in the sample are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Values concerning the whistleblowing behavior of teachers

Dimension	Sub-dimension	n	\bar{X}	S
Whistleblowing	External	376	2.89	1.11
	Internal	372	2.64	1.08
	Anonymous	360	3.25	1.16
	Total	353	3.00	.96

When Table 3 is examined, it is noted that the whistleblowing behavior of the teachers who participated in the survey is at a medium level ($\bar{x} = 3.00$). Among the sub-dimensions, the sub-dimension with the highest mean is *anonymous whistleblowing* ($\bar{x} = 3.25$; $S = 1.16$), while the sub-dimension with the lowest mean is *external whistleblowing* ($\bar{x} = 2.64$; $S = 1.08$). Table 4 gives the *t*-test results of the levels of whistleblowing by teachers working in high schools with respect to the gender variable.

Table 4. *t*-test results of the level of whistleblowing by teachers according to gender

	Sub-dimension	Gender	n	\bar{x}	S	sd	t	p
Whistleblowing	Internal	Male	211	3.13	1.15	374	4.94	.000
		Female	165	2.57	.98			
	External	Male	210	2.73	1.14	370	1.97	.049
		Female	162	2.51	.99			
	Anonymous	Male	203	3.32	1.16	358	1.35	.177
		Female	157	3.15	1.16			
	Total	Male	197	3.12	1.01	351	2.68	.008
		Female	156	2.85	.87			

When the results concerning the gender variable given in Table 4 are examined, a significant difference is observed in favor of the males for the sub-dimensions of *internal whistleblowing* [$t_{(374)}=4.94$, $p<.05$] and *external whistleblowing* [$t_{(370)}=1.97$, $p<.05$]. No significant difference is observed on the sub-dimension of *anonymous whistleblowing* [$t_{(358)}=1.35$, $p>.05$]. When the whistleblowing results in general are examined, a significant difference is observed in favor of the male teachers [$t_{(351)}=2.68$, $p<.05$]. Male teachers show whistleblowing behaviors more than females. Accordingly, the gender variable is a significant determinant in the display of whistleblowing behavior by teachers.

In the analyses made, it was found that the whistleblowing behavior of teachers did not differ by the variables of duty [$t_{(351)}=.86$, $p>.05$], career [$F_{(2-349)}=.728$, $p>.05$], type of school [$t_{(351)}=.49$, $p>.05$], age [$F_{(3-342)}=.737$, $p>.05$], level of education [$F_{(2-349)}=.562$, $p>.05$], seniority [$F_{(4-348)}=.940$, $p>.05$], and length of service at the school [$F_{(4-342)}=1.097$, $p>.05$]. Table 5 gives the values concerning the OCB of the teachers included in the sample.

Table 5. Values concerning the OCB of teachers

Dimension	Sub-dimension	n	\bar{x}	S
OCB	<i>Altruism</i>	379	3.29	.77
	<i>Conscientiousness</i>	379	3.35	.82
	<i>Sportsmanship</i>	377	3.03	1.07
	<i>Civic Virtue</i>	374	2.56	1.08
	Total	368	3.69	.66

When the distribution concerning OCB is examined in Table 5, it is noted that the OCB of the teachers who participated in the survey is high ($\bar{x} = 3.69$). When the mean values of the sub-dimensions of OCB are examined, it is noted that the sub-dimension with the highest mean is conscientiousness ($\bar{x} = 3.35$; $S = .82$), while the sub-dimension with the lowest mean is civic virtue ($\bar{x} = 2.56$; $S = 1.08$). Table 6 gives the *t*-test results of the levels of OCB by teachers working in high schools with respect to the gender variable.

Table 6. *t*-test results of the levels of OCB by teachers according to gender

	Sub-dimension	Gender	n	\bar{x}	S	sd	t	p
OCB	Altruism	Male	215	3.27	.78	377	.65	.514
		Female	164	3.32	.76			
	Conscientiousness	Male	214	3.33	.85	377	.54	.588
		Female	165	3.38	.79			
	Sportsmanship	Male	214	3.19	1.00	375	3.27	.001
		Female	163	2.83	1.14			
	Civic Virtue	Male	214	2.61	1.05	372	1.17	.244
		Female	160	2.48	1.12			
	Total	Male	209	3.74	.64	366	1.73	.084
		Female	159	3.62	.68			

When the *t*-test results of the OCB levels given in Table 6 with respect to the gender variable are examined, it is noted that there is a significant difference on the sub-dimension of *sportsmanship* in favor of the male teachers [$t_{(375)}=3.27$, $p<.05$]. No significant difference is observed on the sub-dimensions of *altruism* [$t_{(377)}=.65$, $p>.05$], *conscientiousness* [$t_{(377)}=.54$, $p>.05$], and *civic virtue* [$t_{(372)}=1.17$, $p>.05$]. When the OCB results in general are examined, it is observed that there is no significant difference according to the gender variable [$t_{(366)}=1.73$, $p>.05$]. Accordingly, the gender variable is a significant determinant for the display of OCB by teachers only on the sub-dimension of *sportsmanship*. Table 7 gives the *t*-test results of the levels of OCB by teachers working in high schools with respect to the type-of-school variable.

Table 7. *t*-test results of the teachers' levels of OCB with respect to the type-of-school variable

	Sub-dimension	Type of school	n	\bar{x}	S	sd	t	p
OCB	Altruism	General	157	2.97	.86	377	7.28	.000
		Vocational	222	3.52	.60			
	Conscientiousness	General	156	3.05	.91	377	6.21	.000
		Vocational	223	3.56	.69			
	Sportsmanship	General	157	2.60	1.00	375	6.91	.000
		Vocational	220	3.34	1.02			
	Civic Virtue	General	153	2.39	1.01	372	2.56	.011
		Vocational	221	2.68	1.11			
	Total	General	152	3.34	.61	366	9.54	.000
		Vocational	216	3.94	.58			

When the *t*-test results of the levels of OCB given in Table 7 with respect to the type-of-school variable are examined, a significant difference is observed between vocational high schools and general high schools on the sub-dimensions of *altruism* [$t_{(377)}=7.28$, $p<.05$], *conscientiousness* [$t_{(377)}=6.21$, $p<.05$], *sportsmanship* [$t_{(375)}=6.91$, $p<.05$], and *civic virtue* [$t_{(372)}=2.56$, $p<.05$]. According to these values, the teachers working in vocational high schools have a higher level of OCB than the teachers working in general high schools. When the OCB results in general are examined, a significant difference is observed again [$t_{(366)}=9.54$, $p<.05$]. According to these values, the teachers working in vocational high schools have a higher level of OCB than the teachers working in general high schools. Accordingly, the type-of-school variable is a significant determinant of the teachers' levels of OCB.

In the analyses made, the teachers' level of OCB does not differ by the variables of duty [$t_{(366)}=.166$, $p>.05$], career [$F_{(2-364)}=.993$, $p>.05$], age [$F_{(3-356)}=.707$, $p>.05$], level of education [$F_{(2-363)}=1.661$, $p>.05$], seniority [$F_{(4-363)}=1.227$, $p>.05$], and length of service at the school

[$t_{(4-356)}=.258, p>.05$]. Table 8 gives the correlation between the levels of whistleblowing and OCB of teachers working in high schools.

Table 8. Results of correlation between teachers' levels of whistleblowing and OCB

		Whistleblowing (WB)			
		Internal	External	Anonymous	WB General
OCB	<i>Altruism</i>	-.020	.033	.026	.026
	<i>Conscientiousness</i>	.058	.070	.082	.092
	<i>Sportsmanship</i>	.240(**)	.178(**)	.199(**)	.243(**)
	<i>Civic Virtue</i>	.107(*)	.068	.046	.079
	<i>OCB General</i>	.168(**)	.164(**)	.171(**)	.204(**)

**at the $p<0.01$ level; * at the $p<0.05$ level

Examining the Pearson correlation analysis made in Table 8 to determine the relationship between the teachers' levels of whistleblowing and OCB, it is noted that generally there is a positive significant relationship at a low level between whistleblowing and OCB ($r=.204, p<0.01$). In the sub-dimensions of whistleblowing, it is noted that there is also a positive significant relationship at a low level between *internal whistleblowing* and OCB ($r=.168, p<0.01$), between *external whistleblowing* and OCB ($r=.164, p<0.01$) and between *anonymous whistleblowing* and OCB ($r=.171, p<0.01$).

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND PROPOSALS

This study is aimed at comparing the level of whistleblowing behavior and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in high school teachers. According to the survey findings, high school teachers display whistleblowing behavior at a medium level. The fact that *anonymous whistleblowing* behavior among the sub-dimensions has the highest value indicates that teachers mainly prefer to keep their identities secret during whistleblowing. Comparing the levels of internal and external whistleblowing, it is noted that the level of internal whistleblowing is higher. This conclusion is in agreement with Toker Gökçe and Alataş (2014) and also Toker Gökçe (2014a). The fact that teachers prefer methods of internal whistleblowing is an important and positive situation for the education organization, because this will enable the school to internally resolve the violation that has occurred and expediently, before the incident escalates and the image of the education organization suffers damage. According to MacNab et al. (2007), in the event of this type of whistleblowing, the organization has the opportunity to rectify itself before suffering greater damage.

It is found that whistleblowing behavior significantly differs by the variable of gender. Generally, male teachers display significantly more whistleblowing behaviors than female teachers. This conclusion is in agreement with the results obtained in certain studies. In the results obtained in two separate studies made by Toker Gökçe (2014a, 274; 2013, 1192), it was found that male teachers display more whistleblowing behaviors than female teachers. According to Rehg et al. (2008, 229), women behave more timidly, in particular when they are in a minority. At the same time, they are more worried than men about being labeled as a whistleblower. A man feels that he is doing his duty when he is blowing the whistle, but a woman is worried about appearing to be doing harm to others and about being stigmatized as unreliable. In this context, it is believed that this difference found based on the gender variable in the current study is also due to this reason. In other words, the fact that women resort less to whistleblowing behaviors than men is due to their concern to protect their image

within the organization. In the study made by Celep and Konaklı (2012), a significant difference according to gender was found, but with female teachers having shown a higher level of whistleblowing compared to male teachers. Again in the current study, it appears that females mainly prefer the external and *anonymous type of whistleblowing*.

The OCB findings indicate that teachers display a generally high level of OCB. The results obtained in surveys conducted in Turkish high schools are identical with this conclusion (Polat, 2007, 105; Titrek, Bayrakçı, & Zafer, 2009, 14; Yılmaz, 2010, 7). The fact that the level of OCB displayed by teachers is high shows that teachers working in high schools have a high level of willingness to work on a voluntary basis at the schools where they are employed. It may be said that the willingness of teachers to work on a voluntary basis positively affects schools' organizational and institutional objectives. Çetin, Korkmaz, and Çakmakçı (2012, 29) state that the high level of organizational citizenship behavior shown by teachers indicates that these teachers are willing to display extra roles without seeking recompense. Allison, Voss, and Dryer (2001) have shown that organizational citizenship behavior displayed by teachers plays an important role in student and school achievement. In the current study, it is found that *conscientiousness* is the sub-dimension with the highest value among the sub-dimensions of OCB. The same conclusion was reached by Çetin et al. (2012). According to Dipaola and Hoy (2005), *conscientiousness* means that an employee makes efficient use of his time and displays a better performance than required at minimum expectations.

The teachers' general level of OCB does not significantly differ according to the gender variable. The same result was obtained by Ertürk (2015). It may be generally stated that there is no difference between males and females with respect to working on a voluntary basis at the school. Titrek et al. (2009) obtained a similar result. However, there are also surveys producing a different result in this respect. For example, Yılmaz (2010, 9) found a significant difference in favor of female teachers.

When the sub-dimensions are examined, it is noted that male teachers display more OCB than female teachers only in the sub-dimension of *sportsmanship*, which includes employees not complaining about problems within the organization, showing tolerance, and performing the duty without whining (Podsakoff et al., 2000, 518). According to Demirel and Geçgel (2011, 315), this sub-dimension ensures that employees maintain their positive attitude in the face of negative situations that occur in the organization. In this context, it may be said that among teachers, men display these characteristics more than women. But a meta-analysis study conducted by Yılmaz, Altunkurt, and Yıldırım (2015, 298) that included 24 studies on teachers, showed that the female teachers showed more OCB in conscientiousness, courtesy, and volunteerism dimensions; whereas, male teachers showed more OCB in sportsmanship, civic virtue, and altruism dimensions. In addition, it was found that gender had a very weak effect on the overall OCB. So researchers state that it is possible to say that gender does not have a significant effect on the organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers.

When the analyses about seniority are examined, it is noted that the OCB level does not differ by the variable of seniority. Elma and Aytaç (2015, 71), conducted a meta-analysis study included 17 studies and their study showed the same finding. According to this current study, there is no significant difference among teachers' perception about OCB depending on seniority variable.

The level of OCB significantly differs according to the type-of-school variable. Such difference appears to be in favor of vocational high schools across all dimensions. Teachers working in vocational high schools display organizational citizenship behaviors more than teachers working in general high schools. The same result was found by Ertürk (2015). Although Titrek et al. (2009) found such a difference between primary schools and high schools, a significant difference was not found between general high schools and vocational high schools either in the current study or by Polat and Celep (2008).

The correlation analyses showed that there is a positive and significant relationship at a low level between the OCB and whistleblowing behavior of teachers. In other words, teachers who have a high level of OCB have also a high level of whistleblowing behavior. When the literature is examined, it is noted that this is a relationship not covered by previous surveys. However, it is a relationship stated in theoretical studies. Seçkin and Karasoy (2012, 56) state that there is a close relationship between OCB and whistleblowing because both are voluntary behaviors. In this context, we may argue that whistleblowing behavior displayed by teachers is parallel to OCB, and that teachers who display more OCB also display more whistleblowing behavior. For this reason, we may argue that whistleblowing behavior is, like OCB, a type of virtuous behavior displayed in consideration of the interests of the institution.

When comparing OCB in general and the sub-dimensions of whistleblowing, it is noted that the highest relationship is between OCB and *anonymous whistleblowing* and the lowest relationship is between OCB and *external whistleblowing*. In this context, it may be said that in addition to organizational citizenship behavior displayed by them, teachers use the method of *anonymous whistleblowing* and do not prefer *external whistleblowing*.

All the sub-dimensions of whistleblowing behavior are in a positive and significant relationship at a low level with *sportsmanship* as a sub-dimension of OCB. In this context, teachers' whistleblowing behavior is related with the OCB sub-dimension of *sportsmanship*. In other words, it may be said that teachers engaged in whistleblowing consider such behavior as one of the duties under the OCB sub-dimension of *sportsmanship*, which includes the behaviors of making sacrifices for good teamwork, not causing tension in the work environment, not complaining about unimportant problems, displaying a constructive attitude, and advocating the activities of the organization even outside of the organization (Organ, 1988, 11).

The fact that teachers' whistleblowing behavior is positively and significantly related with OCB, as shown by the findings obtained, indicates that such behavior serves to the organizational goals. In addition, the fact that teachers prefer mainly *anonymous whistleblowing* and afterward *internal whistleblowing*, is interpreted as a clue that they are afraid of the harm they would suffer or the adverse situations in which they would find themselves as a result of whistleblowing behavior. In other words, teachers fear both the administrative punishment and the social punishment such as being excluded and accused of spying. It is obvious that teachers who want to blow the whistle are afraid and worried because of the misunderstanding about whistleblowing. Research conducted by Toker Gökçe and Oğuz (2015), has shown that whistleblowing is associated with individuals' cultural values. This suggests that the whistleblowing behavior may be associated with the culture of fear. In order to remove or reduce these fears and worries, there is a need to explain whistleblowing correctly. For this reason, information should be provided at schools as to what

whistleblowing behavior actually is and how it differs from the behaviors commonly described as spying, betrayal and squealing. In addition, the findings indicate that teachers also use *external whistleblowing* even if to a limited extent. To eliminate such problems in organizations, it is clear that transparency is most effective method in the long term, but it is also clear that *external whistleblowing* corrupts the image of the organization. To eliminate the need for *external whistleblowing*, it is necessary to explain, keep open, and make internal complaint mechanisms or *internal whistleblowing* easier. The necessary administrative and legal measures in this respect should be taken. These measures would expose misconduct in educational organizations, while also preventing the occurrence of such misconduct through their deterrent effect.

Considered in general, whistleblowing behavior is something that develops due to a lack of transparency. Violations may occur within organizations that lack transparency, and whistleblowing develops as a need or a last resort for the exposure of such violations, as a behavior to serve the organizational goals. Violations of laws and ethics that occur in organizations where transparency and whistleblowing do not exist are concealed by employees. The concealment and non-exposure of violations that occur in organizations is regarded by some employees as an acceptable and tolerable behavior. This behavior is usually interpreted as loyalty. However, these types of behavior cause harm to the organization, the employees, and those receiving services from the organization. Loyalty is a desirable behavior only if it serves the organization and its goals. Loyalty that harms the organization while serving personal interests is not a correct behavior. In this context it is useful to clarify the difference between the loyalty to the organization and loyalty to the individual.

REFERENCES

- Aguilar, M. K. (2009). Whistleblower policy a necessity in weak economy. *Compliance Week*, 6(67), 14-16
- Ahmad, S. A., Smith, M. & İsmail, Z. (2010). Internal whistleblowing intentions in Malaysia: Factors that influence internal auditors decision-making process. *International Conference on Business and Economic Research*, (ICBER 2010), At Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia, 1-14.
- Aktan, C. C. (2006). Organizasyonlarda yanlış uygulamalara karşı bir sivil erdem, ahlaki tepki ve vicdani red davranışı: Whistleblowing. *Mercek Dergisi*, October, Sayısı, 1-13.
- 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.
- Arnold, D. F., and Ponemon, L. A. (1991). Internal auditors' perceptions of whistle-blowing and the influence of moral reasoning: an experiment. *Journal of Practice and Theory*, 10 (2): 1-15.
- Ay, B. (2007). Öğretmenlerin öz yetenekleri ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı. *Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi*. Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyon.
- Aydın, U. (2003). İş hukuku açısından işçinin bilgi uçurması (Whistleblowing). *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(1), 79-100.
- Barnett, T., Cochran, D. S. & Taylor, G. S. (1993). The internal disclosure policies of private-sector employers: an initial look at their relationship to employee whistleblowing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12(2), 127-136. doi: 10.1007/BF00871932.
- Basım, H. N. & Şeşen, H. (2006). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ölçeği uyarlama ve karşılaştırma çalışması. *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 61(4), 83-102.

- Bateman, T. S. & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587-595.
- Brennan, N. & Kelly, J. (2007). A study of whistleblowing among trainee auditors. *The British Accounting Review*, 39(1), 61-87.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2009). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Celep, C. & Konaklı, T. (2012). Bilgi uçurma: Eğitim örgütlerinde etik ve kural dışı uygulamalara yönelik bir tepki. *E-Uluslararası Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(4), 65-88.
- Çetin, Ş., Korkmaz, M. & Çakmakçı, C. (2012). Dönüşümsel ve etkileşimsel liderlik ile lider-üye etkileşiminin öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı üzerindeki etkisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 18(1), 7-36.
- Demirel, Y. & Geçgel, S. (2011). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı. In Ö. Yeniçeri & Y. Demirel (Eds.), *Yönetimde Birey ve Örgüt Odaklı Davranışlar*, (pp. 309-328). Bursa: Ekin Basım.
- Dipaola, M. F. & Hoy, W. K. (2005). Organizational citizenship of faculty and achievement of high school students. *The High School Journal*, 88(3), 35-44.
- Dozier, J. B. & Miceli, M. P. (1985). Potential predictors of whistle-blowing: A prosocial behavior perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 823-836.
- Elliston, F., Keenan, J., Lockhart, P., & van Schaick, J. (1985). *Whistleblowing research managing dissent in the workplace*. New York: Praeger Press.
- Ergun Özler, D., Dil Şahin, M., & Giderler Atalay, C. (2010). Teorik bir çerçevede whistleblowing-etik ilişkisi. *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 11(2), 169-194.
- Ertürk, A. (2015). Organizational citizenship and mobbing behavior of secondary schools teachers. *Anthropologist*, 22(1), 113-124.
- Gürbüz, S. (2007). Yöneticilerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının iş tatmini ve algıladıkları örgütsel adalet ile ilişkisi. *Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi*. İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Hersh, M. A. (2002). Whistleblowers-heroes or traitors? Individual and collective responsibility for ethical behaviour. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 26(2), 243-262. doi: 10.1016/S1367-5788(02)00025-1.
- Jubb, P. B. (1999). Whistleblowing: A restrictive definition and interpretation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 21(1), 77-94.
- Kamer, M. (2001). Örgüte güven, örgüte bağlılık ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışına etkileri. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Karaman, K., Yücel, C. & Dönder, H. (2008). Öğretmen görüşlerine göre, okullardaki bürokrasi ile örgütsel vatandaşlık arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, (53), 49-74.
- Kılıçoğlu, A. & Gürol, E. (1994). *İş dünyası sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Cem Yayınları.
- MacNab, B., Brislin, R., Worthley, R., Galperin, B. L., Jenner, S., Lituchy, T. R., MacLean, J., Aguilera, G. M., Ravlin, E., Tiessen, J.H., Bess, D. & Turcotte, M. F. (2007). Culture and ethics management whistle-blowing and internal reporting within a NAFTA country context. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 7(1), 5-28.
- Mansbach, A. & Bachner, G. Y. (2010). Internal or external whistleblowing: Nurses' willingness to report wrongdoing. *Nursing Ethics*, 17(4), 483-490.
- MEB. (2015). *Milli eğitim istatistikleri 2014-2015: Örgün eğitim*. Ankara: Türk İstatistik Kurumu.

- Miceli, M. P., Near, J. P. & Schwenk, C. R. (1991). Who blows the whistle and why? *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 45(1), 113-130.
- Near, J. P. & Miceli, M. P. (1985). Organizational dissidence: The case of whistleblowing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 4(1), 1-16.
- Neuman, G. A. & Kickul, J. R. (1998). Organizational citizenship behaviors: Achievement orientation and personality. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13(2), 263-279.
- Oğuz, E. (2011). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları ile yöneticilerin liderlik stilleri arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 17(3), 377-403
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Oxford English online dictionary. Retrieved from <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/learner/whistle-blower> (accessed on 19.09.2015).
- Park, H., Blenkinsopp, J., Öktem, M. K. & Omurgonulsen, U. (2008). Cultural orientation and attitudes toward different forms of whistleblowing: A comparison of South Korea, Turkey and the U.K. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82(4), 929-939.
- Perrucci, R., Anderson, R. M, Schendel D. E. & Trachtman, L. E. (1980). Whistle-blowing: Professionals' resistance to organizational authority. *Social Problems*, 28(2), 149-164. doi: 10.2307/800148.
- 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). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet algıları, örgütsel güven düzeyleri ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi*. Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.
- Polat, S. & Celep, C. (2008). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel güven, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına ilişkin algıları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 14(54), 307-331.
- Ray, S. L. (2006). Whistleblowing and Organizational Ethics, *Nursing Ethics*, 13(4), 438-445.
- Rehg, M. T., Micelli, M. P., Near, J. P, & Van Scotter, J. R. (2008). Antecedents and outcomes of retaliation against whistleblowers: Gender differences and power relationships. *Organization Science*, 19(2), 221-240.
- Sayğan, S. & Bedük, A. (2013). Ahlaki olmayan davranışların duyurulması (whistleblowing) ve etik iklimi ilişkisi üzerine bir uygulama. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28(1), 1-23.
- Seçkin, Z. & Karasoy, H. A. (2012). A conceptual study on the relationship between the importance of whistle-blowing and organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management*, 6(1), 50-58.
- Sehgal, P. (2014). Whistleblowers: Traitors or Heroes? A global perspective. *Proceedings of 26th International Business Research Conference* (pp. 1-12). UK: Imperial College London.
- Sezgin, F. (2005). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları: Kavramsal Bir çözümleme ve okul açısından bazı çıkarımlar. *Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(1), 317-339.
- Şahin, B. (2011). *Metodoloji*. (Edt. Tanrıoğen, Abdurrahman. Bilimsel Araştırma yöntemleri) 109-130.
- Titrek, O., Bayrakçı, M. & Zafer, D. (2009). Öğretmenlerinin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına ilişkin görüşleri. *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, (17), 1-28.

- Toker Gökçe, A. (2013). Relationship between whistle-blowing and job satisfaction and organizational loyalty at schools in Turkey. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 8(14), 1186-1197. doi: 10.5897/ERR2013.1485.
- Toker Gökçe, A. (2014a). Okullarda bilgi uçurma: İş doyumunu ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi. *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, (22), 261-282.
- Toker Gökçe, A. (2014b). Öğretmenlerin farklı bilgi uçurma tercihlerinde belirleyici olan değer yönelimleri. *Trakya University Journal of Education* 4(2), 1-11.
- Toker Gökçe, A. & Alataş, H. (2014). Öğretmenlerin istenmeyen yönetici davranışlarına yönelik tutumları: Bilgi uçurma (whistle-blowing) mı? Sessiz kalma mı? V. *Eğitim Yönetimi Forumu*. (11-13 Eylül 2014). Konya: Bildiri Özetleri Kitabı.
- Toker Gökçe, A. & Oğuz, E. (2015). Relationship between Teachers' Cultural Values and Preference for Whistle Blowing. *Trakya University Journal of Education* 5(1), 51-64.
- Trevino, K. L. & Nelson, A. K. (2004). *Managing business ethics: Straight talk about how to do it right* (5th edition). USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Uslu, B., Balcı, E. & Coşkun Uslu, A. (2012). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(2), 13-24.
- Vey, M. A. & Campbell, J. P. (2004). In role or extra-role organizational citizenship behavior: Which are we measuring?. *Human Performance*, 17(1), 119-135.
- Williams, S. & Shiaw, W. T. (1999). Mood and organizational citizenship behavior: The effects of positive affect on employee OCB intentions. *The Journal of Psychology*, 133(6), 656-668.
- 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). The effects of gender, seniority and subject matter variables on teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors in Turkey: A meta-Analysis. *Education and Science*, 40(178), 285-304. doi: 10.15390/EB.2015.4033

Ortaöğretim Kurumlarında Bilgi Uçurma ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışları Arasındaki İlişki

Abbas ERTÜRK²

Giriş

Bilgi uçurma olgusu, bir örgütteki yasa ve etik dışı davranış ve eylemlerin, bilgi sahibi kişiler tarafından iç ve dış yetkililere iletilmesi olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Park ve diğerleri (2008), yapmış oldukları çalışmalarda bilgi uçurma davranışını yapılaş itibari ile sınıflandırmışlardır. Bu sınıflandırmada, bilginin uçurulduğu makam (örgüt içi/örgüt dışı), bilgi uçuran kişinin izlediği yol (formal/informal) ve bilgi uçuran kişinin kendine ait bilgileri açıklama durumu (gizli/açık) şeklinde ele almışlardır. Bir öğretmenin, bir başka öğretmenin ya da mutemedin yaptığı yasa dışı bir davranışı okul müdürüne bildirmek veya okul müdürünün sergilediği etik veya yasa dışı bir davranışı ilçe, il ya da Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı yetkililerine bildirmesi, içsel bilgi uçurmaya örnek olarak verilebilir. Bir öğretmenin, bir başka öğretmenin, mutemedin ya da okul müdürünün sergilediği etik veya yasa dışı bir davranışı basına bildirilmesi, dışsal bilgi uçurmaya örnek olarak verilebilir. Örgütler içsel bilgi uçurma davranışlarını teşvik ederek dışsal bilgi uçurmaya olan gerekliliği ortadan kaldırması mümkündür. Bu sayede örgüt var olan sorunları kendi içinde çözme fırsatı elde eder. Bu durum örgütte yaşanan sorunların örgüt dışına sızmasını ve örgüt imajının zarar görmesini engelleyebilir.

Bu olgu sistemlerdeki aksaklıkların ortaya çıkarılması ve giderilmesi için vazgeçilmez bir unsurdur. Ancak Türkiye’de kamu sektöründe çalışanlar gördükleri ihlaller karşısında çoğu zaman sesiz kalmayı tercih etmektedirler (Seçkin & Karasoy, 2012). Bu sessizliğin iki nedeni vardır. İlki görülen ihlalleri duyurarak herhangi bir şeyin yapılamayacağına olan inançtır. İkincisi ise bu davranışın pozitif yönlerinin anlaşılması ve “ispiyonculuk” olarak değerlendirilmesidir (Toker Gökçe, 2014a). Türkiye’de, bilgi uçurma olgusu ve getireceği yararlar yeteri kadar tartışılmadığından ve doğru bilinmediğinden, bilgi uçuran kişiler daha çok “hain” ya da “ihane” ile suçlanırlar. Yapılan tanımlarda bilgi uçurma ile ispiyonculuk arasındaki fark da vurgulanmıştır. Buna göre bir olayın bilgi uçurma olarak sayılabilmesi için, bilgi uçuran kişinin bu davranışı kişisel yarar değil kamu yararı gözeterek yapmış olması gerekir. Aksi halde kişisel çıkar sağlamak amacıyla ortaya konulan bilgi uçurma davranışı halk arasında ispiyonculuk olarak nitelendirilmektedir (Özler vd., 2010, 186).

Celep ve Konaklı (2012, 77) tarafından yapılan bir araştırma, öğretmenlerin daha çok örgütsel yarar, ahlaki ve mesleki değerler nedeniyle bilgi uçurduklarını saptamıştır. Araştırmada öğretmenlerin daha çok içsel bilgi uçurma yolunu tercih ettikleri ve bilgi uçurmada öncelikli nedenin okul amaçları ve okul yararı olduğu saptanmıştır. Toker Gökçe (2014a) tarafından yapılan araştırmada ise 164 öğretmenden 32’ si yasadışı bir eyleme tanık olduğunu ifade ederken, bunlardan 11’i bilgi uçurduğunu ifade etmiştir. Bu çalışmada, öğretmenlerin çoğu informal ve içsel bilgi uçurma yollarını tercih ettikleri saptanmıştır. Toker Gökçe’ye (2014a, 278) göre, öğretmenler böyle bir davranışa karşılık yönetim tarafından cezalandırılacaklarına inandıkları için bu davranışı sergilemekten çekinmektedirler.

² Yrd. Doç. Dr. - Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi - abbaserturk@mu.edu.tr

Bu araştırmanın bir diğer değişkeni örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışıdır (ÖVD). Bu davranış, çalışanların görev alanlarına girmeyen konularda gönüllü ve hiçbir beklenti içinde olmadan örgüte yönelik olumlu roller üstlenmesi olarak tanımlanmaktadır (Neuman & Kickul, 1998, 263). Çalışanlar tarafından sergilenen bu pozitif davranış örgütün verimliliği ve etkinliğinde önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Podsakoff vd. (2000, 513) göre sergilenen bu rol fazlası davranışlar, çalışanın iş tanımlarında yer almadığından dolayı tamamen gönüllülüğe dayalıdır. Örneğin bir çalışanın kendi görevini tamamladıktan sonra, kurumdaki diğer çalışanlara yardım etmesi, onları oldukları gibi kabul etmesi, küçük problemler karşısında şikâyetçi olmaması, iş yaparken özenli yapması ve işyerinin düzen ve temizliğine katkı sağlaması, örgüt hakkında olumlu ifadeler kullanması ve örgütsel kaynaklarını korumak gibi davranışlar sergilemesi bu kapsama giren davranışlardır (Bateman & Organ, 1983).

Bilgi uçurmanın bir iyi niyet ve kurum yararını düşünmenin bir göstergesi ya da bir erdemlik olarak ifade edilmesi, bu olgunun örgüte dönük pozitif bir psikolojinin eseri olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu durumda bilgi uçurma davranışına başvuran çalışanların örgüte dönük diğer pozitif tutumlarının da söz konusu olması gerekmektedir. Örneğin bilgi uçurma eğilimi yüksek olan kişilerin örgüte dönük diğer pozitif tutumlarının da yüksek olması beklenir. Bu bağlamda bu araştırma, öğretmenlerin bilgi uçurma davranış düzeyi ile bir başka pozitif tutum olan ÖVD'nin karşılaştırmasını amaçlamıştır.

Yöntem

Bu araştırma Ankara'da bulunan genel ve mesleki liselerde çalışan öğretmenler üzerinde tarama modelinde yapılmıştır. Araştırma örneklemine dahi edilenlerin % 57'si erkek % 43'ü kadın olmak üzere toplam 381 öğretmeni kapsamaktadır. Bilgi uçurma düzeyinin belirlenmesi amacıyla Celep ve Konak (2012) tarafından geliştirilen "Bilgi Uçurma Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Örgütsel vatandaşlık düzeyini belirlemek amacıyla Basım ve Şeşen (2006) tarafından Türkçeye uyarlanan "Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Ölçeklere ilişkin geçerlilik ve güvenirlik analizlerinin yapılması amacıyla Ankara ilinin 2 ilçesinde bulunan 4 ortaöğretim okulunda pilot uygulama yapılmıştır. Bilgi Uçurma Ölçeği için yapılan faktör analizinde, iki maddenin (6 ve 16.) birden fazla faktörde yüksek yük değerine sahip olduğu için ölçekten çıkarılmıştır. Ayrıca ölçeğin üç faktörden oluştuğu (*gizli bilgi uçurma*, *içsel bilgi uçurma* ve *dışsal bilgi uçurma*) görülmüştür. Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Ölçeği için yapılan analizlerde, iki maddenin (11 ve 12.) birden fazla faktörde yüksek yük değerine sahip olduğu ve bir maddenin (10.) .30'un altında değer aldığı için bu maddeler ölçekten çıkarılmıştır. Ayrıca ölçeğin dört faktörden oluştuğu (*Centilmenlik*, *Vicdanlılık*, *Özgecilik* ve *Sivil erdem*) görülmüştür. Araştırma verileri, Ankara ilinin 5 ilçesinde (21 okul) görevli öğretmen ve yöneticiden toplanmıştır. Verilerinin analizinde betimsel istatistikler kullanılmıştır. Bilgi uçurma eğilimleri ile ÖVD düzeyi arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemek için Pearson korelasyon analizinden yararlanılmıştır.

Bulgular ve Yorumlar

Araştırmaya katılan öğretmenlerin bilgi uçurma davranışı orta ($\bar{x}=3.00$) düzeyde olduğu görülmüştür. Alt boyutlar arasında en yüksek ortalama *gizli bilgi uçurma* boyutu ($\bar{x}=3.25$; $S=1.16$) iken, en düşük ortalama *dışsal bilgi uçurma* boyutunda ($\bar{x}=2.64$; $S=1.08$) görülmüştür. Cinsiyet değişkenine ilişkin sonuçlarda sadece *içsel bilgi uçurma* ve *dışsal bilgi uçurma* alt boyutlarında erkekler lehine anlamlı bir fark görülmüştür. Genel olarak bilgi uçurma sonuçları, erkek öğretmenlerin kadınlara göre anlamlı düzeyde daha fazla bilgi uçurma davranışı sergilediklerini göstermiştir. Öğretmenlerin bilgi uçurma davranışları

görev, kariyer, okul türü, yaş, eğitim düzeyi, kıdem ve bulunduğu okuldaki görev süresi değişkenlerine göre farklılaşmadığı görülmüştür.

Araştırmaya katılan öğretmenlerin ÖVD'nin yüksek ($\bar{x}=3.69$) düzeyinde olduğu görülmüştür. ÖVD alt boyutlarına ilişkin en yüksek ortalama *vicdanlılık* ($\bar{x}=3.35$; $S=.82$), en düşük ortalama *sivil erdem* alt boyutlarında ($\bar{x}=2.56$; $S=1.08$) görülmüştür. Cinsiyet değişkenine ilişkin sonuçlarda sadece *centilmenlik* alt boyutunda erkek öğretmenler lehine anlamlı bir fark görülmüştür. *Özgecilik*, *vicdanlılık* ve *sivil erdem* alt boyutlarında anlamlı bir fark görülmemiştir. Genel olarak ÖVD sonuçlarında cinsiyet değişkenine göre anlamlı bir fark görülmemiştir.

ÖVD düzeylerinin okul türü değişkenine ilişkin t-testi sonuçları incelendiğinde, *özgecilik*, *vicdanlılık*, *centilmenlik* ve *sivil erdem* alt boyutlarında meslek liseleri lehine anlamlı bir fark görülmüştür. Buna göre meslek liselerinde görev yapan öğretmenlerin genel liselerde görev yapan öğretmenlere göre daha yüksek ÖVD düzeyine sahiptirler. Genel olarak ÖVD sonuçlarında da meslek liselerinde görev yapan öğretmenlerin lehine anlamlı bir fark görülmüştür. Ayrıca öğretmenlerin ÖVD düzeyi görev kariyer, yaş, eğitim düzeyi, kıdem ve bulunduğu okuldaki görev süresi değişkenlerine göre farklılaşmamaktadır.

Yapılan Pearson korelasyon analizi, genel olarak bilgi uçurma ile ÖVD arasında düşük düzeyde pozitif anlamlı bir ilişkinin olduğunu göstermektedir. Bilgi uçurma tüm alt boyutlarının ÖVD ile düşük düzeyde pozitif anlamlı bir ilişki içinde olduğu da görülmüştür.

Tartışma, Sonuç ve Öneriler

Bu araştırmanın amacı öğretmenlerin bilgi uçurma davranış düzeyi ile bir başka pozitif tutum olan ÖVD arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemektir. Bulgular ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin bilgi uçurma davranışını orta düzeyde sergilediklerini göstermiştir. Alt boyutlardan *gizli bilgi uçurma* davranışının en yüksek değere sahip olması, öğretmenlerin bilgi uçurma sırasında kimliklerinin gizli kalmasını öncelikle tercih ettiklerini göstermektedir. İç ve dış bilgi uçurma düzeyleri karşılaştırıldığında iç bilgi uçurma düzeyinin daha yüksek olduğu görülmektedir. Bu sonuç, Toker Gökçe & Alataş'ın (2014) ve Toker Gökçe'nin (2014a) çalışması ile tutarlılık göstermektedir. Öğretmenlerin iç bilgi uçurma yollarını tercih etmeleri eğitim örgütü için önemli ve pozitif bir durumdur. Çünkü eğitim örgütünün sahip olduğu problemlerin kendi iç dinamikleri ile çözülmesini sağlar.

Genel olarak erkekler kadınlara göre daha çok bilgi uçurma davranışı göstermektedir. Bu sonuç yapılan bazı araştırmalarda elde edilen sonuçlarla örtüşmektedir. Toker Gökçe (2014a, 274 ve 2013, 1192) tarafından yapılan iki ayrı araştırmada elde edilen sonuçlarda da, erkek öğretmenlerin kadın öğretmenlere göre daha yüksek bilgi uçurma davranışı gösterdikleri saptanmıştır. Rehg vd. (2008, 229) göre kadınlar, özellikle azınlıkta olduklarında çekingen davranırlar. Aynı zamanda erkeklere göre bilgi uçuran kişi olarak etiketlenmekten daha çok endişe duyarlar. Bir erkek bilgi uçurduğunda görevini yapıyor olarak hissederken, bir kadın diğerlerine kötülük yapıyor gibi görünmekten ve güvenilmez olarak damgalanmaktan endişe eder. Bu bağlamda bu araştırmada cinsiyet değişkenine dayalı olarak görülen bu fark bu nedene dayalı olduğu düşünülmüştür.

Öğretmenlerin sergilediği ÖVD'nin genel olarak yüksek düzeyde olduğu görülmüştür. Benzer sonuç Polat (2007, 105), Titrek vd. (2009, 14) ve Yılmaz (2010, 7) tarafından ortaöğretim kurumlarında saptanmıştır. Öğretmenlerin sergilediği ÖVD düzeyinin yüksek olması, liselerde görev yapan öğretmenlerin buldukları okullarda gönüllü olarak çalışma

isteklerinin yüksek düzeyde olduğunu göstermektedir. Öğretmenlerin gönüllü çalışma istekleri okul örgütü ve kurumsal hedefleri olumlu şekilde etkilediği ifade edilebilir.

Öğretmenlerin genel ÖVD düzeyinin cinsiyet değişkenine göre anlamlı bir fark göstermemektedir. Bu sonuç Ertürk'ün (2015) yapmış olduğu çalışmada da elde edilmiştir. Bu durum okulda gönüllü çalışma açısından erkek ve kadınlar arasında bir farkın olmadığı genel olarak ifade edilebilir. Titrek, Bayrakçı ve Zafer'in (2009) araştırmasında da benzer bir sonuç elde edilmiştir. Sadece *centilmenlik* alt boyutunda erkek öğretmenler lehine anlamlı bir fark görülmüştür. Yılmaz vd. (2015, 298) tarafından 24 çalışmayı kapsayan bir meta analizi çalışmasında kadın öğretmenlerin farklı ve erkek öğretmenlerin farklı alt boyutlarda birbirlerine göre daha çok ÖVD sergilediklerini saptamışlardır. Bu çalışmada genel olarak cinsiyet değişkeninin ÖVD düzeyini etkileyebilecek anlamlı bir değişken olmadığı da ifade edilmiştir. Ayrıca çalışmada meslek liselerinde çalışan öğretmenlerin, genel liselerde çalışan öğretmenlere göre anlamlı düzeyde daha çok ÖVD gösterdiği saptanmıştır. Aynı sonuç Ertürk'ün (2015) yaptığı çalışmada saptanmıştır.

Korelasyon analizleri, öğretmenlerin ÖVD ile bilgi uçurma davranışı arasında düşük düzeyde pozitif ve anlamlı bir ilişkinin olduğunu göstermiştir. Alanyazın incelendiğinde, bu ilişkinin önceki araştırmalar tarafından incelenmemiş bir ilişki olduğu görülmüştür. Ancak Seçkin ve Karasoy (2012, 56), yaptıkları kuramsal çalışmada iki değişken arasında yakın bir ilişki olduğunu ve her iki değişkenin de gönüllülük esasına dayalı davranışlar olduğunu ifade etmişlerdir. Bu bağlamda öğretmenlerin sergilediği bilgi uçurma davranışı ÖVD ile paralellik gösterdiğini, ÖVD daha çok sergileyen öğretmenler aynı zamanda bilgi uçurma davranışlarını da daha çok sergilediklerini ifade edilebilir. Bu nedenle bilgi uçurma davranışı, daha çok ÖVD gibi kurum çıkarları gözetilerek sergilenen erdemli bir davranış olduğu ifade edilebilir.

Genel olarak ÖVD ile bilgi uçurma alt boyutları karşılaştırıldığında en yüksek ilişkinin ÖVD ile *gizli bilgi uçurma* arasında ve en düşük ilişki ise ÖVD ile *dışsal bilgi uçurma* arasında olduğu görülmektedir. Bu bağlamda öğretmenler sergiledikleri örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının yanı sıra *gizli bilgi uçurma* yoluna başvurdukları ve *dışsal bilgi uçurmayı* tercih etmedikleri ifade edilebilir.

Elde edilen bulgular, öğretmenlerin bilgi uçurma davranışının ÖVD ile pozitif anlamlı bir ilişki içinde olduğunu ve öğretmenlerin başvurduğu bilgi uçurma davranışlarının örgütsel amaçlara hizmet eder nitelikte olduğunu göstermektedir. Ayrıca öğretmenlerin öncelikle *gizli bilgi uçurma* sonrasında *içsel bilgi uçurma* yollarını tercih etmeleri de, bilgi uçurma davranışından dolayı uğrayacakları zarar ya da düşecekleri kötü durumlardan korktuklarına dair ipuçları olarak görülmüştür. Başka bir ifade ile öğretmenler, bilgi uçurma konusunda, hem idari cezadan hem de dışlanma ve ispiyonculukla suçlanmak gibi sosyal cezadan çekinmektedirler. Bilgi uçurma konusunda yanlış anlaşılardan dolayı, bilgi uçurmak isteyen, öğretmenler üzerinde bir korku ve endişe olduğu açıktır. Bu korku ve endişeyi ortadan kaldırma ya da hafifletmek için bilgi uçurma olgusunun doğru anlatılmasına ihtiyaç vardır. Bu nedenle okullarda öncelikle bilgi uçurma davranışının ne olduğunu ve ispiyonculuk, ihanet ve gammazlık olarak ifade edilen davranışlardan nasıl farklılaştığının anlatılması gerekir. Ayrıca bulgular öğretmenler *dışsal bilgi uçurma* yollarını az da olsa tercih ettiklerini göstermektedir. *Dışsal bilgi uçurma* gerekliliğini tamamen ortadan kaldırmak için iç bilgi uçurma ya da şikâyet yollarının açıklanması, açık tutulması ve kolaylaştırılması gereklidir. Bunu sağlamak için gerekli yönetsel ve hukuki tedbirlerin alınması gerekir. Bu tedbirler eğitim

örgütlerinde var olan suiistimalleri ortaya çıkarır ve caydırıcı olması itibariyle yeni suiistimallerin yaşanmasını engelleyecektir.

Genel olarak bakıldığında, bilgi uçurma davranışı şeffaflığın olmayışından dolayı gelişen bir olgudur. Şeffaflığın olmadığı örgütlerde ihlaller ve bu ihlallerin ortaya çıkması için de bilgi uçurma davranışı bir ihtiyaç ya da son çare olarak, örgütsel amaçlara hizmet etmek için, başvurulan bir davranış olarak gelişmiştir. Şeffaflığın ve bilgi uçurma davranışlarının olmadığı örgütlerde meydana gelen yasa ve etik dışı ihlaller çalışanlar tarafından saklanır. Örgütlerde meydana gelen ihlallerin saklanması ve açığa vurulmaması bazı çalışanlar tarafından kabul edilir ve hoşgörülür bir davranış olarak görülür. Bu davranış genellikle sadakat olarak yorumlanmaktadır. Ancak bu tür davranışlar örgüte, çalışanlara ve örgütten hizmet alan kişilere zarar verir. Bu yüzden sadakat, güzel bir davranıştır, ancak örgütlere veya örgütsel amaçlara hizmet ettiği sürece güzel bir davranıştır. Kişilerin çıkarlarına hizmet ederken örgütlere zarar veren sadakat doğru bir davranış değildir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Bilgi uçurma, Mesleki ortaöğretim, Genel lise, Öğretmen

Atıf için / Please cite as:

Ertürk, A. (2016). The relationship between whistleblowing and organizational citizenship behavior for high school teachers [Ortaöğretim kurumlarında bilgi uçurma ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki]. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi - Journal of Educational Sciences Research*, 6 (1), 1-22. <http://ebad-jesr.com/>