

Examining Organizational Citizenship Behaviours (OCBs) of Teacher Candidates at the Faculty of Education

Sevilay Sahin

*Department of Educational Administration, Supervision, Planning and Economics,
University of Gaziantep*

Abstract

The primary aim of this study is to examine the OCBs of teacher candidates. Since OCB concept is considered an issue related to professional achievement and performance in the teaching profession, as well as in any field of any other profession, it is important to examine OCBs of teacher candidates. However, very limited studies have been conducted to explain OCBs of teacher candidates who will work in schools after graduation. In this article teacher candidates' OCBs were examined according to their academic scores. The study sample consisted of 224 university students attending Faculty of Education. OCB scale was used to obtain data. The data analyses were conducted by descriptive and correlative statistics. The results revealed that students attending Faculty of Education showed an adequate level of OCB and students having high academic scores showed high level of OCBs.

Key words: *civic virtue; conscientiousness; individual initiative; organizational loyalty; professional achievement.*

Introduction

Organizational citizenship behaviour (hereinafter OCB), along with other organizational issues such as organizational culture, organizational climate, organizational trust etc. has gained a great deal of attention in the recent years with regard to the maximum efficiency of organizations and individuals. In general, OCB has been defined by Organ (1990) as informal contributions that an individual can choose to perform or withhold without regard to considerations of sanctions or formal incentives (Somech & Ron, 2007).

While research on OCB in the literature has mostly focused on the antecedents of OCB, research on OCB itself and its consequences have been more recent. The related studies have indicated that OCB has a strong positive impact on individuals' work outcome (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, Bachrach, 2000; Allen & Rush, 1998; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, Fetter, 1993; Park & Sims, 1989). In other words, correlates and causes of OCB frequently focus on individual characteristics (George & Bettenhausen, 1990). These individual characteristics have two important aspects: employees' attitudes and dispositional variables. Under the employee attitudes category, the relationship between OCB and satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Lee & Allen, 2002), organizational commitment (Van Yperen, Van den Berg & Willering, 1999), perception of fairness (Folger, 1993; Moorman, Niehoff & Organ, 1993) etc. have been studied. Under the dispositional category, studies investigating the relationship between OCB and disposition, variables such as affectivity (George, 1990), agreeableness (Konovsky & Organ, 1993) and conscientiousness (Organ & Ryan, 1995) have been studied.

In organizations, when urgent situations arise, spontaneous creative and new behaviours (Di Paolo & Hoy, 2005), flexibility and extra effort (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000, 2001) are required. Here, the practical importance of OCB is that it improves organizational efficiency and effectiveness by contributing to the resource transformation, innovation and adaptability (Organ 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Williams & Anderson, 1991). In his study, Turnipseed (1996) studied the relationship between OCB and the environment in which that citizenship behaviour was manifested. The aim of such behaviour is to "lubricate the social machinery of the organization" (Bateman & Organ, 1983, p.558). The participants' willingness to make an extra self-effort, which is not included in the formal obligation or duty, has been considered an important component of participants' organizational performance.

OCBs in the teaching profession affect professional achievement, as in other professions. OCBs of teachers are affected by many factors and situations in school processes and OCBs have an impact on the professional achievement of teachers. There are many areas to be declared as having relationship with OCBs of teachers in the literature. Some of these areas are: teachers' self-efficacy (Yücel, Yalçın & Ay, 2009), organizational culture (İpek, 2011), justice (Arslantaş & Pekdemir, 2007), job satisfaction (Mohammad, Habib, & Alias, 2011), organizational health (Buluç, 2008), individualism-common behaviouralism (Özdemir, 2010), organizational trust (Yüceli & Samancı, 2009), bureaucracy (Karaman, Yücel, & Dönder, 2008), organizational equity and organizational trust (Baş & Şentürk, 2011) and organizational learning values (Taşçı & Koç, 2007). The relationships between the OCBs and these areas have an important role in the performance of teachers related to the instruction and other educational issues.

The OCBs which teacher candidates possess for their university may provide a basis for schools where they will work in the future. In order to have teacher candidates

possess desired OCBs in the schools where they will work in the future, it is necessary to determine the potential of OCB which the teacher candidates possess and strive for improving their potential related to OCB during their university education.

Citizenship Behaviour Dimensions

Despite the growing interest in citizenship-like behaviours, there is still a lack of common agreement on the dimensionality of this construct. In the related literature, nearly 30 different forms of citizenship behaviour have been defined by various authors. Through analyzing these behaviours from a broad perspective, it may be possible to collect seven common dimensions (Podsakoff et al., 2000). The first one is "*helping behaviour*" that involves voluntarily helping others, or preventing the occurrence of work-related problems. The first part of this definition (stated as helping others with work-related problems) found its reflection in Organ's altruism, peacemaking, and cheerleading dimensions (Organ 1988, 1990b); Graham's interpersonal helping (Graham, 1989); Williams and Anderson's OCB-I which is labelled as altruism in their previous research (Williams & Anderson, 1991); Van Scotter and Motowidlo's interpersonal facilitation (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1986); and the helping co-workers' behaviours from George and Brief (1992) and George and Jones (1997). The second part of the definition includes Organ's (1988, 1990b) notion of courtesy involving helping others by taking steps to prevent the creation of problems with their co-workers. Empirical research in related topics has confirmed that all of these various helping behaviours are based on a single factor (MacKenzie et al., 1993; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 1999; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997). The second one is "*sportsmanship behaviour*". Organ (1990b, p. 96) defined sportsmanship as "a willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining". However, this definition can be considered narrow. If a person has sportsmanship behaviour, this means that he not only has not complained when he is inconvenienced by others but is not offended when others do not follow him, he is willing to sacrifice his personal interest for the good of the work group, and does not take the rejection of his ideas personally (Podsakoff et al., 2000). "*Organizational loyalty*", the third dimension, consists of loyal boosterism and organizational loyalty (Graham 1989, 1991), endorsing, supporting and defending organizational objectives (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997). Essentially, this dimension requires complete commitment to the organization under any adverse conditions. "*Organizational compliance*", the fourth one, is referred to as generalized compliance by Smith et al. (1983); following organizational rules and procedures by Borman and Motowidlo (1993); and job dedication by Van Scotter & Motowidlo (1996). This dimension may include a person's scrupulous adherence to organizational rules, procedures and regulations without others' observing and monitoring compliance. Another dimension, the fifth one, is "*individual initiative*" which is similar to Organ's conscientiousness (Organ, 1988), Graham's and Moorman

and Blakely's (Graham 1989; Moorman & Blakely, 1995) personal industry and individual initiative, George's (George & Brief, 1992; George & Jones, 1997) making constructivist suggestions and Morrison and Phelps' taking charge at work construct (Morrison & Phelps, 1999). This dimension is considered to be the most difficult one because it differs more in degree than in kind. "Civic virtue", the following one, includes representing macro level interest in the organization as a whole. It is referred to as civic virtue by Organ (1988, 1990b), organizational participation by Graham (1991) and protecting the organization by George and Brief (1972). This dimension includes behaviours which participate actively in governance; monitor its environment for threats and opportunities; and look out for its best interests even at a great personal cost. The final dimension, "self-development", is accepted as a key dimension which includes voluntary behaviours shown by employees to engage in the improvement of their knowledge, skills and abilities (George & Brief, 1992).

In academic settings, helping fellow students with their school work (e.g. completing an assignment, preparing for an examination, writing a paper, running a computer) is seen as behaviour of altruism. Attending class on time, turning assignments in on time, participating in class discussions and activities with enthusiasm, volunteering to do more work than is required and encouraging other students to do the same are all seen as behaviours of conscientiousness. Being a volunteer to help organize or participate in school activities such as student government, campus social events, athletic team pep rallies, speakers series, philanthropic activities (e.g., food drives) and school club duties is seen as behaviour of civic virtue. Informing instructors when unable to attend a class; informing team members when unable to attend meetings; obtaining feedback from team members before making changes to team projects; or refraining from actions that would be disruptive to others during lectures are seen as behaviours of courtesy dimension. Refraining from complaining about instructor's delays in grading an assignment, classroom equipment malfunctions or class members' not contributing equally to team projects in academic settings is seen as behaviour of sportsmanship.

In the literature, the effects of OCBs on organizational performance and success have recently been at the centre of authors' interest because, as Organ (1988) stated, when aggregated over time and people, OCB enhances organizational effectiveness. There are several reasons for the effects of citizenship behaviour on organizational effectiveness (George & Battenhausen, 1990; Karambayya, 1990; MacKenzie et al., 1993; Organ, 1988, 1990; Podsakoff et al., 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994, 1997). OCB may contribute to organizational success by (Podsakoff et al., 2000) enhancing co-worker and managerial productivity; freeing up resources to be used for more productive purposes; reducing the need to devote scarce resources to purely maintenance functions; helping coordinate activities both within and across work groups; strengthening the organization's ability to attract and retain the best employees; increasing the stability of the organization's performance, enabling the organization to adapt more effectively to environmental changes.

From an educational point of view, this research is important as it can affect the primary goal of universities, which is to prepare their students for successful teaching careers in their subject field. Ideally, as Allison et al. (2001) stated, this preparation would manifest itself in graduates' securing well-placed positions and demonstrating superior performance, accelerated career advancement and success on other measures of achievement. There are several essential skills and behaviours for obtaining such achievement, some of which are related to technical aspects of their subject field and some of which are related to their job duties and responsibilities. In university education, the latter one which may be considered as OCBs has generally been ignored in curricula.

However, these skills and behaviours, known as OCB, have a critical role in the career success of university students (Allison et al., 2001). For this reason it is important for students to become aware of OCB and its application in their academic setting.

Aim of the Study and Problem Statement

The aim of this study is to examine the organizational citizenship behaviours performed by teacher candidates in academic settings. Keeping this in mind, the following research problems were studied:

To what degree do teacher candidates perform organizational citizenship behaviours?

Is there a statistically significant difference between teacher candidates' OCB according to their academic success?

Are there statistically significant differences between teacher candidates' sub-dimensions of OCBs according to their academic success?

Method

Population and Sample

The population of the study included undergraduate students enrolled in a state-funded university at the Faculty of Education in the south-eastern Turkey. Purposeful and random sampling methods were used for choosing the sample. It has been considered that OCBs can be observed more clearly among students attending the second, third and fourth year classes, since they know their faculty and its characteristics better. For this reason, the sample consisted of 224 undergraduate Faculty of Education students, determined by random sampling method among the students of the second, third and fourth year. The questionnaires used in this study were distributed to 254 undergraduate students and all returned them. 30 questionnaires were excluded because some of the items were not responded to. The usable response rate was 88.18 %.

The sample consisted of 119 female and 105 male students. 80 of the participants attend the Turkish Teaching programme; 55 attend the Mathematic Teaching programme and 89 attend the Primary School Teaching programme. Before preparing the forms about demographic information, participants were asked how much their

families earned in a month and what their academic scores were. After examining the response of the participants, 3 levels were determined showing socioeconomic level by taking the minimum wage in Turkey (the minimum wage was 356.17 €/836 TL [Turkish Liras] when the study was conducted) and the wage ranges stated by the students into account. These ranges are: "0-836 TL named as low socioeconomic level; "837-1674 TL named as medium socioeconomic level and "1675 TL and over named as high socioeconomic level. 37 students had low socioeconomic level, 177 students had medium socioeconomic level and 10 students had high socioeconomic level. In order to determine the achievement levels of students, academic scores (in other words, grade point average) stated by students were examined and ranges of the students' grade point average were classified under three levels. Academic success of 81 students (their grade point average) was between the scores of 0.00 and 2.49; academic success of 100 students was between the scores of 2.50 and 2.99 and academic success of 43 students was between the scores of 3.00 and 4.00.

Data Collection Tool

The scale consisting of 25 items was developed in order to collect data, as a result of the literature review related to the organizational citizenship behaviours (Graham, 1989; Organ, Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 2006; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; VanYperen, Berg, & Willering, 1999); and the examinations of scales dealing with OCBs (Khalid et. al., 2010; Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et. al., 2000; Somech & Ron, 2007). The scale was applied to 125 university students, after validity and reliability studies had been done beforehand. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency value related to the scale was determined as .92 and the factor analysis was used to provide the construct validity.

The KMO test result was determined as 91.7 % (.917) and the Bartlett test result was also significant. According to these results, the data set was suitable for the factor analysis. In the factor analysis, the principal components analysis with varimax rotation was carried out. As a result of the factor analysis, the scale was explained under five factors. According to the analysis, the structure of five factors with eigenvalues over 1 for each factor was accepted as suitable for the scale. While determining the factors, the cut-off point was considered as 0.35. There was at least .10 factor load difference between the factor loadings of each item in different factors. The determined five factors were described as altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy and sportsmanship in line with the literature. And each dimension included five items. Factor loadings of the items belonging to altruism subscale ranged between .45 and .67; to civic virtue subscale ranged between .37 and .75; to conscientiousness subscale ranged between .65 and .79; to courtesy subscale ranged between .64 and .75 and to sportsmanship subscale ranged between .52 and .68.

Data Analysis

Percentages, means, standard deviations, Levene and ANOVA tests were used in analyzing the data. Students' individual grade point average was considered as a

measure for academic success. In the Turkish university system, grades of 0.00-0.99 and 1.00-1.99 are considered as failure; grade of 2.00-2.99 is considered as a pass; grade of 3.00-4.00 is considered as pass successfully. In the beginning of the study, to enter the data related to the academic success it was planned to take the data between the ranges of 0.00-0.99, 1.00-1.99, 2.00-2.99 and 3.00-4.00. However, when the obtained data related to the academic successes was examined, it was seen that the grade point average was dense in the range 2.50-2.99. There were no students in the range 0.00-0.99 and there were very few students in the range 1.00-1.99. For this reason, in order to minimize the differences in the numbers of students in academic success groups, the initial ranges of success were combined. In conclusion, three academic success ranges (groups) were determined as 0.00-2.49, 2.50-2.99 and 3.00-4.00. The range 0.00-2.49 was defined as a low academic success group, 2.50-2.99 as a medium academic success group and 3.00-4.00 as a high academic success group.

Findings

The Students' Degree of Showing OCB

The degree of showing OCBs was examined in terms of percentage of the mean score according to the highest mean score that could be obtained from the subscales. In interpreting the mean scores in terms of the levels of OCB showed by university students, the range of the mean scores was interpreted as follows: the mean score under 50% means that university students show an inadequate/unsatisfactory level of OCB; the mean score between 50% and 70% means that university students show a moderate level of OCB; the mean score between 70% and 80% means that university students show an adequate/satisfactory level of OCB and the mean score over 80% shows a fairly adequate/satisfactory level of OCB.

In these terms, the percentage of the mean score for altruism was 71.37%; for conscientiousness 73.56%; for courtesy 73.52%; for civic virtue 63.96% and for sportsmanship (willingness) 73.32%, respectively. In the light of these findings, it can be said that students attending the Faculty of Education show a satisfactory level of OCBs, in overall. But in terms of dimensions of OCB, while civic virtue had the lowest mean score, conscientiousness had the highest one.

The Difference between OCBs of Students according to Their Academic Success

In order to decide on the statistical techniques to be used for the analysis of the differences in the students scores obtained from OCB scale in relation to their academic success, a Levene test was used. As seen in Table 1 below, since the data obtained were normally scattered ($p > .05$), an ANOVA test was considered suitable for the statistical analysis.

According to the results obtained, there was a difference between students' OCBs according to their academic success [$f(2-221) = 9.63, P < .01$]. According to the results

Table 1. Result of Levene Test

	Levene statistics	p (significance level)
Total scale	.519	.596
Altruism	.861	.424
Conscientiousness	1.242	.291
Courtesy	.048	.953
Civic virtue	.341	.712
Willingness	1.508	.224

Table 2. ANOVA results of students' OCBs and academic success

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	P	Significant difference (According to Tukey test)
Between groups	4963.349	2	2481.675	9.632	.000	3.00-4.00/0.00-2.49 and 3.00-4.00/2.50-2.99
Within groups	56937.789	221	257.637			
Total	61901.138	223				

of the Tukey test used to determine the groups showing differences, the group with the academic score ranging between 3.00-4.00 had a higher level of showing OCB than the group whose score ranged between 0.00 and 2.49 (the mean difference: 13.29 P=.00). The group with 3.00-4.00 academic score had, again, a higher level of showing OCB than the group with academic score 2.50-2.99.

The Difference between Students' Behaviours of Altruism according to Their Academic Success

Table 3. ANOVA results of students' behaviours of altruism and academic success

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	p	Significant difference (According to Tukey test)
Between groups	249.976	2	124.988	7.423	.001	3.00-4.00/0.00-2.49 and 3.00-4.00/2.50-2.99
Within groups	3721.234	221	16.838			
Total	3971.210	223				

According to the results obtained, the students' behaviours of altruism changed according to their academic success [F (2-221) =7.42, p<.01]. Students having high academic scores ranging from 3.00 to 4.00 showed a higher level of altruistic behaviours than the groups having 2.50-2.99 academic scores (the mean difference 2.98 and p=.00) and 0.00-2.49 academic scores (the mean difference 1.87 and p=.035).

The Difference between Students' Behaviours of Conscientiousness according to Their Academic Success

Table 4. ANOVA results of students' behaviours of conscientiousness and academic success

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	p	Significant difference (According to Tukey test)
Between groups	297.545	2	148.772	11.412	.000	3.00-4.00/0.00-2.49; 3.00-4.00/2.50-2.99 and 2.50-2.99/0.00-2.49
Within groups	2880.955	221	13.036			
Total	3178.500	223				

As seen in the table, students' having 3.00-4.00 academic scores had a higher level of these behaviours than the groups having 2.50-2.99 academic score (with the mean difference: 1.95 $P=.01$) and 0.00-2.49 academic score (with the mean difference: 1.30 $P=.045$). Between the groups having 0.00-2.49 academic score and 2.50-2.99 academic score, there was a statistically significant difference.

The Difference between Students' Behaviours of Courtesy according to Their Academic Success

Table 5. ANOVA results of students' behaviours of courtesy and academic success

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	p	Significant difference (According to Tukey test)
Between groups	162.066	2	81.033	7.003	.001	3.00-4.00/0.00-2.49
Within groups	2557.180	221	11.571			
Total	2719.246	223				

As seen in the table, a statistically significant difference was found between the students' behaviours of courtesy according to their academic success [$F= 2-211=8.05$, $p<.01$]. Again, according to the results, students having 3.00-4.00 academic score had a higher level of behaviours of courtesy than the group having 0.00-2.49 academic score (the mean difference: 2.39 $p=.001$).

The Difference between Students' Behaviours of Civic Virtue according to Their Academic Success

Table 6. ANOVA results of students' behaviours of civic virtue and academic success

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	p	Significant difference (According to Tukey test)
Between groups	216.888	2	108.444	8.056	.000	3.00-4.00/0.00-2.49 and 3.00-4.00/2.50-2.99
Within groups	2975.094	221	13.462			
Total	3191.982	223				

In the analysis of the results, it can be seen that a statistically significant difference was found [$F(2-221)=8.05$, $P<.01$]. Again, the group having 3.00-4.00 academic score had a higher level of showing the OCB than the other two groups with 0.00-2.49 (the mean difference: 2.78, $P=.00$) and 2.50-2.99 (the mean difference: 1.78, $P=.023$) respectively.

The Difference between Students' Behaviours of Willingness according to Their Academic Success

Table 7. ANOVA results of students' behaviours of willingness and academic success

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	p	Significant difference (According to Tukey test)
Between groups	107.668	2	53.834	3.373	.036	3.00-4.00/0.00-2.49
Within groups	3527.541	221	15.962			
Total	3635.210	223				

A significant difference was found between students' behaviours of willingness according to their academic success [$F(2-221) = 3.37, P < .01$]. The group with 3.00-4.00 academic score indicated a difference from the group with 0.00-2.49 academic score (the mean difference: 1.89 $p = .034$). The former group showed a higher level of behaviour of willingness.

Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

In the current study, it was found that students with high academic success showed more OCBs than the others. The feeling of motivation and satisfaction caused by high academic success enables them to love and adapt to their faculties and universities. This situation may be the main cause of showing OCBs more frequently because they have a more positive image of their university. Polat (2011), supporting this comment, determined that there was a relationship between the perceptions of the students' organizational image and their academic success. At the same time, that the students with high academic success tend to take more responsibilities can be an effective factor in their showing OCBs. Allison, Voss and Dryer (2001) found that OCB has got a positive and significant effect on academic success. The picture showing the OCBs in accordance with academic success can also be seen in the behaviours of altruism. When the behaviours such as giving course notes to friends are considered in the dimension of altruism, it is clearly understood that students with high academic success show a high level of behaviour of altruism.

The difference between students with medium level academic success and low level academic success was found in the behaviours of conscientiousness. This difference may derive from the feeling of responsibility. Since the feeling of responsibility may contribute to students' academic success, students with a high level of responsibility may show behaviours of conscientiousness more frequently.

In the dimension of courtesy, the difference was found between students with high academic success and students with low academic success. The indicator of students' showing behaviours in the courtesy dimension is their close relationship with their instructors. Students' irregular attendance at courses and a lack of confidence resulting from their failure might affect their relationship and communication with instructors and classmates. In their study, Koç et al. (2004) found that problems in interpersonal relationships caused low academic success. Özerbaş et al. (2007) found similar results indicating that students with high academic success have more positive communicative skills than the ones with low academic success. For this reason, inefficiency in behaviours of courtesy based on interpersonal communication may affect students' academic success. However, Somech and Ron (2007) showed in their study that there was no relationship between behaviours of courtesy and instructor support.

In terms of showing behaviours of civic virtue, students with high academic success showed behaviours of civic virtue more frequently than those with medium and low

academic success. This may stem from individual commitment to academic success. Students' loving their faculties and/or universities due to their success may play a significant role in their attaching more importance to the image of their faculties and/or universities, introducing them to other people in society and participating in activities more often, serving the development of their faculties and/or universities. Lizzio et al. (2002) found that positive perceptions of students related to their learning environment directly affected their academic success. Therefore, civic virtue along with higher positive perceptions of students related to their learning environment can have an important impact on academic success.

In the dimension of willingness, students with high academic success showed more behaviours of willingness than those with low academic success. While behaviours in the courtesy dimension are based on effective interpersonal communication, behaviours in the willingness dimension are based on solving and preventing problems. This may be the result of motivation and the feeling of responsibility based on the feeling of success. In this context it can be said that they have high levels of awareness of their social environment.

In general, as the result of this study, it can be said that teacher candidates show a satisfactory level of OCBs and students with high academic success have a higher level of performing OCBs than others. The result that teacher candidates have a satisfying OCB potential reached in this study is promising in terms of improving schools' success by boosting teachers' OCBs.

The following suggestions can be made based on the findings of the study: since the students having higher academic achievement show a more satisfactory level of OCBs, it should be examined in which ways academic achievement affects OCBs. OCBs of university students can be formed with positive perceptions of their universities. Keeping this in mind, in order to boost students' academic achievement by OCBs social and especially orientation activities should be organized in universities.

References

- Allen, T.D., & Rush, M.C. (1998). The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 247-260.
- 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), 282-289.
- Arslantaş, C. C., & Pekdemir, I. (2007). An empirical study on the associations among transformational leadership-organizational citizenship behaviour and organizational justice. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 1, 261-286.
- Baş, G., & Şentürk, C. (2011). The perceptions of primary school teachers on organizational equity-organizational citizenship and organizational confidence. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 17 (1), 29-62.

- Bateman, T.S., & Organ, D.W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 6(4), 587-595.
- Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, W.C. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp.71-98). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Buluç, B. (2008). The relationship between organizational health and organizational citizenship behaviours at secondary schools. *Journal of Turkish Education Sciences*, 6(4), 571-602.
- 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.
- Folger, R. (1993). Justice, motivation, and performance beyond role requirements. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6, 239-248.
- George, J.M. (1990). Personality, affect and behavior in groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 462-474.
- George, J. M., & Bettenhausen, K. (1990). Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance and turnover: A group-level analysis in a service context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 698-709.
- George, J.M., & Brief, A.P. (1992). Feeling good doing good. A conceptual analysis of the mood at work organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 310-329.
- George, J.M., & Jones, G.R. (1997). Organizational spontaneity in context. *Human Performance*, 10, 153-170.
- Graham, J.W. (1989). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, operationalization, and validation*. Unpublished working paper, Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.
- Graham, J.W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4, 249-270.
- Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2000). School bureaucracies that work: Enabling not coercive. *Journal of School Leadership*, 10, 524-541.
- Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). Designing better schools: The meaning and nature of enabling school structure. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37, 296-321.
- İpek, C. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational citizenship behaviours at secondary schools according to the teachers' perceptions. *Advertisement of Reputations Education*, (26-28 October), Eskişehir Osmangazi University Education Faculty, Eskişehir, Turkey.
- Karaman, K., Yücel, C., & Dönder, H. (2008). The relationship between bureaucracy and organizational citizenship at schools according to the teachers' perceptions. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 82, 49-74
- Karambayya, R. (1990). *Contexts for organizational citizenship behavior: Do high performing and satisfying units have better 'citizens'*. York University working paper.
- Khalid, S.A., Jusoff, H.J.K., Othman, M., Ismail, M., & Rahman, N.A. (2010). Organizational citizenship behavior as a predictor of student academic achievement. *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 2(1), 65-71.

- Koç, M., Avşaroğlu, S., & Sezer, A. (2004). Üniversite öğrencilerinin akademik başarıları ile problem alanları arasındaki ilişki. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11, 483-498.
- Konovsky, M.A., & Organ, D.W. (1993). *Dispositional versus contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior*. Unpublished manuscript. Tulane University, New Orleans, LA.
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 131-142.
- Lizzio, A., Wilson, K., & Simons, R. (2002). University students' perceptions of the learning environment and academic outcomes: Implications for theory and practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(1), 27-52.
- MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M., & Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of sales performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 57, 70-80.
- MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M., & Rich, G.A. (1999). *Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance*. Working paper, Indiana University.
- Mohammad, J., Habib, F. Q., & Alias, M. A. (2011). Job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour: An empirical study at higher learning institutions. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 2(16), 149-165.
- Moorman, R.H., Niehoff, B.P., & Organ, D.W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6, 209-225.
- Moorman, R.H., & Blakely, G.L. (1995). Individualism and collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(2), 127-142.
- Morrison, E. E. W., & Phelps, C. C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extra role efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4), 403-419.
- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D.W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12, 43-72.
- Organ, D.W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 775-802.
- Organ, D.W., Podsakoff, P.M., & MacKenzie, S.B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Özdemir, A. (2010). The relationship between organizational citizenship behaviours and the administrator support and individualism-common behaviouralism perceived at primary schools. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 1 (16), 93-112.
- Özerbaş, M.A., Bulut, M., & Usta, E. (2007). Öğretmen adaylarının algıladıkları iletişim becerisi düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (KEFAD)*, 8(1), 123-135.
- Park, O. S., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1989). *Beyond cognition in leadership: Prosocial behavior and affect in managerial judgment*. Working paper, Seoul National University and Pennsylvania State University.

- Podsakoff, P.M., & MacKenzie, S.B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(3), 351-363.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S.B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 262-270.
- 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. (2011). The relationship between university students' academic achievement and perceived organizational image. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri [Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice]*, 11(1), 257-262.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
- Somech, A., Ron, I. (2007). Promoting organizational citizenship behavior in schools: The impact of individual and organizational characteristics. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(1), 38-66.
- Taşçı, D., & Koç, U. (2007). The relationship between organizational citizenship behaviours and organizational learning values. *Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(7), 373-382.
- Turnipseed, D. (1996). Organizational citizenship behavior: An examination of the influence of the workplace. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 17, 42-47.
- Van Scotter, J.R., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 525-531.
- Van Yperen, N.W., Berg, A.E., & Willering, M.C. (1999). Towards a better understanding of the link between participation in decision making and organizational citizenship behavior: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 377-392.
- 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.
- Yücel, C., Yalçın, M., & Ay, B. (2009). Teachers' self-efficacy and organizational citizenship behaviours. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 21, 221-235.
- Yüceli, C., & Samancı, G. (2009). Organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Firat University Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(19), 113-132.

Sevilay Sahin

University of Gaziantep,
Department of Educational Administration, Supervision,
Planning and Economics,
Üniversite Bulvarı P.K. 27310 Şehitkamil / Gaziantep, Turkey
ssahin@gantep.edu.tr

Istraživanje o organizacijskom građanskom ponašanju (OGP) studenata na Učiteljskom fakultetu

Sažetak

Glavni cilj ovoga istraživanja bio je ispitati organizacijsko građansko ponašanje studenata Učiteljskoga fakulteta. Budući da se organizacijsko građansko ponašanje smatra pojmom vezanim uz profesionalna postignuća i rad u učiteljskom zanimanju, ali i u svakom drugom zanimanju, važno je ispitati organizacijsko građansko ponašanje studenata koji će raditi u učiteljskoj struci. Provedeno je istraživanje kojemu je cilj objasniti organizacijsko građansko ponašanje budućih učitelja koji će nakon završetka fakulteta raditi u školama. U ovome radu ispitivano je organizacijsko građansko ponašanje budućih učitelja prema njihovome akademskom uspjehu. Uzorak uzet za istraživanje sastojao se od 224 studenata Učiteljskoga fakulteta. Za dobivanje podataka koristila se Skala organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja. Pri analiziranju podataka koristila se deskriptivna i korelacijska statistika. Rezultati su pokazali da studenti koji pohađaju Učiteljski fakultet imaju odgovarajući stupanj organizacijskog građanskog ponašanja, a studenti koji imaju bolji akademski uspjeh pokazali su i viši stupanj organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja.

Ključne riječi: građanska vrlina; individualna inicijativa; organizacijska odanost; profesionalno postignuće; savjesnost

Uvod

Organizacijsko građansko ponašanje (OGP), zajedno s drugim organizacijskim pojmovima kao što su organizacijska kultura, organizacijska klima, povjerenje u organizaciju itd., posljednjih godina privuklo je veliku pažnju s obzirom na maksimalnu učinkovitost organizacija i pojedinaca. Općenito gledajući, organizacijsko građansko ponašanje Organ (1990) je definirao kao neformalan doprinos koji pojedinac može dati ili uskratiti bez obzira na mogućnost sankcija ili na formalne poticaje (Somech i Ron, 2007).

Dok se istraživanje organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja u literaturi pretežno fokusiralo na njegove preteče, istraživanja u polju organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja provedena su tek nedavno. Slična istraživanja pokazala su da organizacijsko građansko ponašanje ima velik, pozitivan utjecaj na radni učinak pojedinaca (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, Bachrach, 2000; Allen i Rush, 1998; Podsakoff i MacKenzie, 1994; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, Fetter, 1993; Park i Sims, 1989). Drugim riječima, veze i uzroci organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja često se usredotočuju na pojedinačne karakteristike (George i Bettenhausen, 1990). Te pojedinačne karakteristike imaju dva važna aspekta, a to su: stavovi zaposlenika i dispozicijske varijable. U kategoriji stavova zaposlenika istraživana je veza između organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja i zadovoljstva (Bateman i Organ, 1983; Lee i Allen, 2002), posvećenosti organizaciji (Van Yperen, Van der Berg i Willering, 1999) itd. U dispozicijskoj kategoriji provedena su istraživanja o vezi između organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja i dispozicije, varijabli kao što su afektivnost (George, 1990), ugodnost (Konovsky i Organ, 1993) i savjesnost (Organ i Ryan, 1995).

Kada se u organizacijama dogode izvanredne situacije, potreban je spontani, kreativni i novi oblik ponašanja (Di Paolo i Hoy, 2005), fleksibilnost i dodatan trud (Hoy i Sweetland, 2000, 2001). Tada se očituje praktična važnost organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja – ono povećava učinkovitost i uspješnost organizacije tako što pridonosi transformaciji resursa, inovaciji i prilagodljivosti (Organ 1988; Podsakoff i sur. 2000; Williams i Anderson, 1991). Turnipseed (1996) je u svojem istraživanju analizirao vezu između organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja i okoline u kojoj se takvo građansko ponašanje manifestira. To ponašanje „podmazuje društveni mehanizam organizacije“ (Bateman i Organ, 1983, str.558). Volja sudionika da ulože svoj vlastiti dodatni trud, koji nije dio njihovih formalnih dužnosti, smatra se važnom sastavnicom rada pojedinaca u organizaciji.

Organizacijsko građansko ponašanje u učiteljskom zanimanju utječe na profesionalno postignuće, kao i u drugim zanimanjima. Organizacijsko građansko ponašanje učitelja pod utjecajem je brojnih faktora, a situacije u školskim procesima i organizacijsko građansko ponašanje imaju učinak na profesionalna postignuća učitelja. U literaturi postoje mnoga područja za koja se smatra da su povezana s organizacijskim građanskim ponašanjem učitelja. Neka od njih su: samoučinkovitost učitelja (Yücel, Yalçın i Ay, 2009), organizacijska kultura (İpek, 2011), pravednost (Arslantaş i Pekdemir, 2007), zadovoljstvo poslom (Mohammad, Habib i Alias, 2011), organizacijsko zdravlje (Buluç, 2008), bihevizizam utemeljen na individualizmu (Özdemir, 2010), organizacijsko povjerenje (Yüceli i Samancı, 2009), birokracija (Karaman, Yücel i Dönder, 2008), organizacijska jednakost i organizacijsko povjerenje (Baş i Şentürk, 2011) i organizacijske vrijednosti učenja (Taşçı i Koç, 2007). Veze između organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja i tih područja imaju važnu ulogu u radu nastavnika s obzirom na nastavu i druga pitanja u obrazovanju.

Organizacijsko građansko ponašanje koje studenti, budući učitelji, imaju i pokazuju na svojem fakultetu mogu pružiti osnovu za škole u kojima će oni u

budućnosti raditi. Da bi budući učitelji imali željeno organizacijsko građansko ponašanje u školama u kojima će u budućnosti raditi, potrebno je odrediti potencijal organizacijskog građanskog ponašanja koji studenti imaju i težiti poboljšanju toga potencijala tijekom njihova sveučilišnog obrazovanja.

Dimenzije građanskoga ponašanja

Usprkos rastućemu zanimanju za građansko ponašanje još uvijek ne postoji dogovor o dimenzijama toga pojma. U srodnoj literaturi različiti autori definirali su gotovo 30 različitih oblika građanskoga ponašanja. Analizirajući te oblike ponašanja iz šire perspektive, moguće je razlikovati sedam zajedničkih dimenzija (Podsakoff i sur. 2000). Prva je dimenzija „pomaganje“, koje podrazumijeva dobrovoljno pružanje pomoći drugima ili sprečavanje problema vezanih uz posao. Prvi dio te definicije (naveden kao pružanje pomoći drugima s problemima vezanima uz posao) reflektiran je u Organovim dimenzijama altruizma, mirenja i navijanja (Organ, 1988, 1990b); Grahamovu međusobnom pomaganju (Graham, 1989); Williamsovu i Andersonovu organizacijskom građanskom ponašanju koje se naziva altruizmom u njihovu ranijem istraživanju (William i Anderson, 1991); Van Scotterovoj i Motowidlovoj interpersonalnoj facilitaciji (Van Scotter i Motowidlo, 1986); te u pomaganju radnim kolegama kod Georga i Briefa (1992) i Georga i Jonesa (1997). Drugi dio definicije uključuje Organov (1988, 1990b) pojam uljudnosti koji podrazumijeva pomaganje drugima tako što se sprečava stvaranje problema s radnim kolegama. Empirijska istraživanja provedena o sličnim temama potvrdila su da se svi ti različiti oblici ponašanja u kojima se pruža pomoć drugima temelje na istome faktoru (MacKenzie i sur. 1993; MacKenzie, Podsakoff i Rich, 1999; Podsakoff i MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff, Ahearne i MacKenzie, 1997). Druga je dimenzija tzv. „sportsko ponašanje“. Organ (1990b, str. 96) je definirao sportsko ponašanje kao „voljnost pojedinca da tolerira neizbježne poteškoće i nametnute obveze na poslu bez prigovaranja“. Međutim, ta se definicija može smatrati sažetom. Ako pojedinac pokazuje sportsko ponašanje, to znači da on ne samo da se nije žalio kada su mu drugi prouzročili poteškoće nego se neće uvrijediti ako ostali ne slijede njegov primjer. On je voljan žrtvovati svoj osobni interes za dobrobit radne grupe i ne shvaća kao ništa osobno činjenicu da se njegove ideje ne uvažavaju (Podsakoff i sur. 2000). „Organizacijska odanost“, treća dimenzija, sastoji se od poticanja odanosti i organizacijske odanosti (Graham 1989, 1991), poticanja, podržavanja i branjenja organizacijskih ciljeva (Borman i Motowidlo, 1993, 1997). Zapravo, ta dimenzija zahtijeva potpunu predanost organizaciji pod bilo kakvim, pa i nepovoljnim, okolnostima. „Poštivanje organizacije“, kao četvrtu dimenziju, Smith i suradnici (1983) smatraju poštivanjem u općenitom smislu; Borman i Motowidlo (1993) smatraju ga poštivanjem pravila i procedura u organizaciji, a Van Scotter i Motowidlo (1996) predanošću poslu. Ta dimenzija može obuhvaćati pojedinca koji se skrupulozno pridržava organizacijskih pravila, procedura i propisa bez potrebe da drugi promatraju i nadgledaju poštuje li on ta pravila. Daljnja, peta dimenzija, je

„individualna inicijativa“ koja je slična Organovoj savjesnosti (Organ, 1988); Grahamovu, Moormanovu i Blakelyjevu (Graham 1989; Moorman i Blakely, 1995) osobnom poduzetništvu i individualnoj inicijativi; Georgovim (George i Brief, 1992; George i Jones, 1997) konstruktivističkim sugestijama, Morrisonovoj i Phelpsvoj ideji o preuzimanju odgovornosti na poslu (Morrison i Phelps, 1999). Ta se dimenzija smatra najkompliciranijom budući da se više razlikuje po intenzitetu nego po vrsti. „Građanska vrlina“, sljedeća dimenzija, obuhvaća interes za organizaciju kao cjelinu na makro nivou. Organ (1988, 1990b) je naziva građanskom vrlinom, Graham (1991) je naziva organizacijskom participacijom, a George i Brief (1972) nazivaju je zaštitom organizacije. Ta dimenzija uključuje oblike ponašanja kojima se aktivno sudjeluje u rukovođenju, kojima se nadzire okolinu da bi se uočile prijetnje i prilike i kojima se vlastiti interesi brane čak i uz cijenu velike osobne žrtve. Posljednja dimenzija, „samorazvoj“, prihvaćena je kao ključna dimenzija koja obuhvaća dobrovoljno ponašanje koje pokazuju zaposlenici da bi poboljšali svoje znanje, vještine i sposobnosti (George i Brief, 1992).

U akademskom okruženju pomaganje kolegama u školskom radu (npr. završavanju zadataka, pripremanju za ispit, pisanju sastavaka, radu na računalu) smatra se altruističkim ponašanjem. Dolaženje na nastavu na vrijeme, predavanje radova na vrijeme, entuzijastično sudjelovanje u raspravama i aktivnostima na fakultetu, dobrovoljno javljanje da se obavi više zadataka nego što se traži, poticanje ostalih studenata da učine isto – sve se to smatra savjesnim ponašanjem. Biti dobrovoljac i pružiti pomoć u organiziranju ili sudjelovanju u nastavnim aktivnostima kao što su studentsko vijeće, društvena događanja u kampusu, okupljanja navijača koji podržavaju atletski tim, debate, filantropske aktivnosti (npr. skupljanje hrane za potrebne) i zaduženja u studentskim klubovima smatraju se ponašanjem koje pokazuje građansku vrlinu. Ponašanje koje pokazuje dimenziju uljudnosti obuhvaća obavještanje nastavnika da student ne može doći na nastavu, javljanje članovima tima kada student ne može prisustvovati sastanku, dobivanje dozvole članova tima prije izmjena u zajedničkim projektima ili suzdržavanje od aktivnosti koje bi mogle ometati druge studente tijekom predavanja. Suzdržavanje od pritužbi na nastavnike koji kasne s ocjenjivanjem studentskih radova, na neispravnost opreme u učionicama ili na kolege koji ne daju jednak doprinos u timskim projektima u akademskom se okruženju smatra sportskim ponašanjem.

U literaturi je učinak organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja na rad i uspjeh organizacije nedavno bio u središtu pažnje jer, kako je Organ (1988) naveo, kada se organizacijsko građansko ponašanje akumulira tijekom vremena i u ljudima, ono povećava učinkovitost organizacije. Postoji nekoliko razloga za učinak građanskog ponašanja na organizacijsku učinkovitost (George i Battenhousen, 1990; Karambayya, 1990; MacKenzie i sur. 1993; Organ, 1988, 1990; Podsakoff i sur. 1997; Podsakoff i MacKenzie, 1994, 1997). Organizacijsko građansko ponašanje može doprinijeti uspješnosti organizacije (Podsakoff i sur. 2000) tako što će povećati produktivnost radnih kolega i menadžera, osloboditi resurse koji će se koristiti u produktivnije svrhe, smanjiti potrebu da se oskudni resursi koriste u funkciji održavanja, pomoći

koordinirati aktivnostima unutar i između radnih skupina, ojačati organizacijsku sposobnost da privuče i zadrži najbolje zaposlenike, povećati stabilnost rada organizacije i omogućiti organizaciji da se uspješno prilagodi promjenama u okolini.

S obrazovnoga stajališta istraživanje je važno jer može utjecati na primarni cilj sveučilišta koja bi trebala pripremiti svoje studente za uspješnu karijeru učitelja u određenome području. U idealnim uvjetima, kako su naveli Allison i sur. (2001), ta priprema manifestirala bi se kada diplomirani učitelji nađu dobro plaćen posao i pokažu izvanredan rad, brzo napredovanje u karijeri i uspjeh u ostalim mjerilima postignuća. Postoji nekoliko ključnih vještina i oblika ponašanja da bi se takvo postignuće ostvarilo. Neki su od njih povezani s tehničkim aspektima njihova područja, a neki su povezani s obvezama i odgovornostima na poslu. Odgovornosti u sveučilišnome obrazovanju, koje se mogu smatrati organizacijskim građanskim ponašanjem, općenito su bile zanemarene u kurikulumu.

Međutim, te vještine i oblici ponašanja, poznati kao organizacijsko građansko ponašanje, imaju ključnu ulogu u uspješnoj karijeri sveučilišnih studenata (Allison i sur. 2001). Zbog toga je važno da studenti budu svjesni organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja i njegove primjene u akademskom okruženju.

Cilj istraživanja i oblikovanje problema

Cilj ovoga istraživanja je ispitati organizacijsko građansko ponašanje koje pokazuju studenti Učiteljskoga fakulteta u akademskom okruženju. Imajući to na umu, u istraživanju su ispitani sljedeći problemi:

U kojoj mjeri studenti Učiteljskoga fakulteta pokazuju organizacijsko građansko ponašanje?

Postoji li statistički značajna razlika između organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja budućih učitelja s obzirom na njihov akademski uspjeh?

Postoje li statistički značajne razlike između subdimenzija organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja budućih učitelja s obzirom na njihov akademski uspjeh?

Metode

Populacija i uzorak

Populacija u istraživanju obuhvatila je studente upisane na državno sveučilište, na Učiteljski fakultet u jugoistočnoj Turskoj. Pri odabiru uzorka korištene su metode biranja namjernoga i slučajnoga uzorka. Smatralo se da se organizacijsko građansko ponašanje može jasnije promatrati kod studenata druge, treće i četvrte godine, budući da oni bolje poznaju svoj fakultet i njegove karakteristike. Zbog toga je uzorak obuhvatio 224 studenta Učiteljskoga fakulteta, izabrana metodom slučajnog odabira među studentima druge, treće i četvrte godine. Upitnici korišteni u istraživanju podijeljeni su među 254 studenta, a svi upitnici su vraćeni. 30 upitnika isključeno je iz istraživanja jer su neka pitanja ostala neodgovorena. Iskristivna stopa odaziva bila je 88.18%.

Uzorak se sastojao od 119 studentica i 105 studenata. 80 ispitanika pohađa studij za nastavnike turskoga jezika, 55 ih pohađa studij za nastavnike matematike, a 89 ih pohađa studij razredne nastave. Prije pripreme upitnika o demografskim podacima ispitanicima je postavljeno pitanje koliko njihove obitelji mjesečno zarađuju i kakav je akademski uspjeh ispitanika. Nakon što su analizirani odgovori ispitanika, određena su tri stupnja koja pokazuju socioekonomski status, tako što je u obzir uzet minimalni osobni dohodak u Turskoj (minimalni dohodak bio je 356,17 eura kada je istraživanje provedeno) i raspon osobnoga dohotka koji su studenti naveli. Taj raspon je sljedeći: "0-836 smatra se niskim socioekonomskim statusom; "837-1674 smatra se srednjim socioekonomskim statusom a "1675 i više smatra se visokim socioekonomskim statusom. 37 studenata ima nizak socioekonomski status, 177 ih ima srednji, a 10 studenata visok socioekonomski status. Da bi se odredio stupanj postignuća studenata, analiziran je akademski uspjeh (drugim riječima srednja ocjena) koji su studenti naveli, kao i raspon srednje ocjene studenata, a raspon srednje ocjene studenata podijeljen je na tri stupnja. Akademski uspjeh 81 studenta (njihova srednja ocjena) je između 0.00 i 2.49; akademski uspjeh 100 studenata je između 2.50 i 2.99, a akademski uspjeh 43 studenta je između 3,00 i 4,00.

Način prikupljanja podataka

Da bi se prikupili podaci, izrađena je skala koja se sastoji od 25 čestica, u skladu s literaturom o organizacijskom građanskom ponašanju (Graham, 1989; Organ, Podsakoff i MacKenzie, 2006; Smith, Organ i Near, 1983; Van Yperen, Berg i Willering, 1999) i analizom skala koje prikazuju organizacijsko građansko ponašanje (Khalid i sur. 2010; Organ, 1988; Podsakoff i sur. 2000; Somech i Ron, 2007). Nakon što je provjerena valjanost i pouzdanost skale, ona je primijenjena na 125 sveučilišnih studenata. Određena je Cronbach alfa interna vrijednost konzistencije na .92, a faktorska analiza korištena je pri provjeri valjanosti ideja.

Rezultat KMO testa bio je 91,7% (.917), a rezultat Bartlettova testa također je bio značajan. Prema dobivenim rezultatima, podaci su valjani za faktorsku analizu. U faktorskoj analizi provedena je analiza glavnih komponenata s varimax rotacijom. Kao rezultat faktorske analize skala je interpretirana kao petofaktorska. Prema analizi, struktura od pet faktora sa svojstvenim vrijednostima (eigenvalues) iznad 1 za svaki faktor prihvaćena je kao prikladna za skalu. Pri određivanju faktora točka reza bila je 0.35. Razlika u faktorskom opterećenju između faktorskih opterećenja svake čestice u različitim faktorima bila je barem .10. U skladu s literaturom, određeno je pet faktora koji su opisani kao altruizam, građanska vrlina, savjesnost, uljudnost i sportsko ponašanje. Svaka dimenzija obuhvatila je pet čestica. Faktorsko opterećenje čestica u subskali altruizma variralo je između .45 i .67; u subskali građanske vrline variralo je između .37 i .75; u subskali savjesnosti variralo je između .65 i .79; u subskali uljudnosti variralo je između .64 i .75, a u subskali sportskoga ponašanja variralo je između .52 i .68.

Analiza podataka

Pri analiziranju podataka korišteni su postotci, srednje vrijednosti, standardne devijacije, Levene i ANOVA testovi. Pojedinačne srednje ocjene studenata bile su uzete kao mjera akademskoga uspjeha. U turskom sveučilišnom sustavu ocjene od 0,00 do 0,99 i od 1,00 do 1,99 smatraju se nedovoljnim; ocjene između 2,00 i 2,99 smatraju se prolaznim ocjenama, a ocjene između 3,00 i 4,00 smatraju se uspješnim prolazom. Na početku istraživanja planirano je uzimati u obzir akademski uspjeh izražen u rasponu od 0,00 do 0,99, od 1,00 do 1,99, od 2,00 do 2,99 i od 3,00 do 4,00. Međutim, kada su analizirani podaci koji pokazuju akademski uspjeh, uočeno je da je broj srednjih ocjena bio najveći u rasponu od 2,50 do 2,99. Nije bilo studenata čija je srednja ocjena u rasponu od 0,00 do 0,99, a studenata čija je srednja ocjena u rasponu od 1,00 do 1,99 bilo je vrlo malo. Zbog toga razloga, da bi se smanjile razlike u broju studenata u grupama određenima prema akademskom uspjehu, kombinirani su početni rasponi uspjeha. Kao rezultat određena su tri raspona (grupe) akademskoga uspjeha, i to: od 0,00 do 2,49; od 2,50 do 2,99 i od 3,00 do 4,00. Raspon između 0,00 i 2,49 određen je kao grupa sa slabim akademskim uspjehom, raspon između 2,50 i 2,99 kao grupa sa srednjim akademskim uspjehom, a raspon između 3,00 i 4,00 kao grupa s boljim akademskim uspjehom.

Rezultati

Stupanj pokazivanja organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja kod studenata

Stupanj u kojemu studenti pokazuju organizacijsko građansko ponašanje analiziran je s obzirom na postotak srednje vrijednosti rezultata prema najvišoj srednjoj vrijednosti rezultata koja se mogla dobiti iz subskala. Pri interpretaciji srednjih vrijednosti s obzirom na stupanj u kojemu sveučilišni studenti pokazuju organizacijsko građansko ponašanje, raspon srednjih vrijednosti rezultata interpretiran je na sljedeći način: srednja vrijednost rezultata ispod 50% znači da studenti pokazuju nedovoljan/nezadovoljavajući stupanj organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja, srednja vrijednost rezultata između 50% i 70% znači da studenti pokazuju umjeren stupanj organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja, srednja vrijednost rezultata između 70% i 80% znači da studenti pokazuju odgovarajući/zadovoljavajući stupanj organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja, a srednja vrijednost rezultata iznad 80% pokazuje prilično zadovoljavajući /odgovarajući stupanj organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja.

U skladu s time, postotak srednje vrijednosti rezultata za altruizam bio je 71,3%, za savjesnost 73,56%, za uljudnost 73,53%, za građansku vrlinu 63,96%, a za sportsko ponašanje (voljnost) 73,32%. S obzirom na te rezultate možemo reći da studenti koji pohađaju Učiteljski fakultet općenito pokazuju zadovoljavajući stupanj organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja. No, s obzirom na dimenzije organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja građanska vrlina ima najnižu srednju vrijednost, dok savjesnost ima najvišu srednju vrijednost.

Razlika između organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja studenata s obzirom na njihov akademski uspjeh

Da bi se odredile statističke tehnike koje se mogu koristiti pri analizi razlika u rezultatima studenata koje su dobivene skalom organizacijskog građanskog ponašanja s obzirom na njihov akademski uspjeh, korišten je Levene test. Kao što se vidi u Tablici 1, budući da su dobiveni podaci bili normalno raspoređeni ($p > .05$), smatralo se da je ANOVA test prikladan za statističku analizu.

Tablica 1.

Tablica 2.

Prema dobivenim rezultatima, postoji razlika između oblika organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja studenata s obzirom na njihov akademski uspjeh [$f(2-221) = 9,63, P < .01$]. Prema rezultatima Tukeyova testa koji se koristio da bi se odredile grupe koje pokazuju razlike, grupa s akademskim uspjehom u rasponu od 3,00 do 4,00 imala je viši stupanj pokazivanja organizacijskog građanskog ponašanja nego grupa čiji je uspjeh varirao između 0,00 i 2,49 (srednja razlika bila je 13,29 $P = .00$). Grupa s akademskim uspjehom u rasponu od 3,00 do 4,00 ponovno je imala viši stupanj pokazivanja organizacijskog građanskog ponašanja od grupe s akademskim uspjehom u rasponu od 2,50 do 2,99

Razlika između ponašanja studenata koji pokazuju altruizam s obzirom na njihov akademski uspjeh

Tablica 3.

Prema dobivenim rezultatima, altruističko ponašanje studenata mijenja se s obzirom na njihov akademski uspjeh [$F(2-221) = 7.42, p < .01$]. Studenti koji imaju visoke akademske rezultate u rasponu od 3,00 do 4,00 pokazali su viši stupanj altruističkoga ponašanja od grupa koje su imale akademski uspjeh u rasponu od 2,50 do 2,99 (srednja razlika 2,98 i $p = .00$) i od 0,00 do 2,49 (srednja razlika 1,87 i $p = .035$).

Razlika između savjesnog ponašanja studenata s obzirom na njihov akademski uspjeh

Tablica 4.

Kao što se vidi u tablici, studenti koji imaju akademski uspjeh od 3,00 do 4,00 imali su viši stupanj savjesnoga ponašanja od grupa čiji je akademski uspjeh bio između 2,50 i 2,99 (srednja razlika: 1,95 i $p = .01$) i 0,00 i 2,49 (srednja razlika: 1,30 i $p = .045$). Između grupa koje su imale akademski uspjeh od 0,00 do 2,49 i od 2,50 do 2,99 uočena je statistički značajna razlika.

Razlika između uljudnog ponašanja studenata s obzirom na njihov akademski uspjeh

Tablica 5.

Kao što tablica prikazuje, uočena je statistički značajna razlika između uljudnog ponašanja studenata s obzirom na njihov akademski uspjeh [$F= 2-211=8.05, p<.01$]. Ponovno, kako rezultati pokazuju, studenti čiji je akademski uspjeh između 3,00 i 4,00 imali su viši stupanj uljudnoga ponašanja od grupe studenata čiji je akademski uspjeh između 0,00 i 2,49 (srednja razlika: 2,39 i $p=.001$).

Razlika između studenata čije ponašanje pokazuje građansku vrlinu s obzirom na njihov akademski uspjeh

Tablica 6.

Analizom rezultata može se vidjeti da je pronađena statistički značajna razlika [$F (2-221) =8.05, P<.01$]. Ponovno je grupa studenata čiji je akademski uspjeh u rasponu 3,00-4,00 imala viši stupanj organizacijskog građanskog ponašanja od ostale dvije grupe s akademskim uspjehom u rasponu 0,00-2,49 (srednja razlika: 2.78 i $p=.00$) i akademskim uspjehom u rasponu 2,50-2,99 (srednja razlika: 1.78 i $p=.023$).

Razlika između studenata čije ponašanje izražava voljnost, s obzirom na njihov akademski uspjeh

Tablica 7.

Uočena je značajna razlika između ponašanja studenata čije ponašanje pokazuje voljnost, s obzirom na njihov akademski uspjeh [$F (2-221) = 3.37, P<.01$]. Grupa studenata čiji je akademski uspjeh u rasponu od 3,00 do 4,00 pokazala je razliku s obzirom na grupu s akademskim uspjehom od 0,00 do 2,49 (srednja razlika: 1.89 i $p=.034$). Prva grupa pokazala je veći stupanj voljnosti.

Rasprava, zaključak i sugestije

U ovome istraživanju uočeno je da studenti s boljim akademskim uspjehom imaju bolje organizacijsko građansko ponašanje od ostalih studenata. Osjećaj motivacije i zadovoljstva zbog visokoga akademskog uspjeha omogućuje im da zavole i da se prilagode svojim fakultetima i sveučilištima. Ta bi moglo biti glavni uzrok tomu što oni češće pokazuju oblike organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja jer imaju pozitivnu sliku o svojem sveučilištu. Polat (2011) je, u prilog tome argumentu, ustvrdio da postoji veza između načina na koji studenti percipiraju sliku o organizaciji i njihova akademskog uspjeha. Istovremeno, činjenica da studenti s boljim akademskim uspjehom obično preuzimaju više odgovornosti, može biti učinkovit faktor pri njihovu pokazivanju oblika organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja. Allison, Voss i Dryer (2001) uočili su da organizacijsko građansko ponašanje ima pozitivan i značajan utjecaj na akademski

uspjeh. Organizacijsko građansko ponašanje u skladu s akademskim uspjehom može se vidjeti i u altruističkom ponašanju. Kada se posuđivanje bilješki s predavanja prijateljima gleda u altruističkoj dimenziji, potpuno je razumljivo da studenti s boljim akademskim uspjehom pokazuju veći stupanj altruističkoga ponašanja.

Razlika između studenata s osrednjim akademskim uspjehom i studenata sa slabim akademskim uspjehom uočena je u savjesnom ponašanju. Ta razlika može proizlaziti iz osjećaja odgovornosti. Budući da taj osjećaj odgovornosti može doprinijeti akademskom uspjehu studenata, studenti koji imaju veći osjećaj odgovornosti mogu češće pokazivati oblike savjesnoga ponašanja.

Kod dimenzije uljudnosti razlika je uočena između studenata s boljim akademskim uspjehom i studenata sa slabim akademskim uspjehom. Pokazatelj toga koliko studenti pokazuju uljudno ponašanje jest njihov bliski odnos s nastavnicima. Ako studenti neredovito pohađaju kolegije i ako imaju nedostatak samopouzdanja zbog svojega neuspjeha, to može utjecati na njihov odnos i komunikaciju s nastavnicima i kolegama studentima. Koç i sur. (2004) su u svojem istraživanju uočili da problemi u međusobnim odnosima uzrokuju nizak akademski uspjeh. Özerbaş i sur. (2007) došli su do sličnih rezultata, što upućuje na činjenicu da studenti s boljim akademskim uspjehom imaju pozitivnije komunikacijske vještine nego studenti sa slabim akademskim uspjehom. Zbog toga razloga neuspješnost u uljudnom ponašanju koje se temelji na međusobnoj komunikaciji može utjecati na akademski uspjeh studenata. Međutim, Somech i Ron (2007) su u svojem istraživanju pokazali da ne postoji veza između uljudnog ponašanja i podrške pružene od nastavnika.

S obzirom na pokazivanje oblika ponašanja u dimenziji građanske vrline, studenti s boljim akademskim uspjehom češće su pokazivali takvo ponašanje nego studenti s osrednjim i slabim akademskim uspjehom. To može proizlaziti iz predanosti pojedinca akademskom uspjehu. Studenti koji vole svoj fakultet i/ili sveučilište zbog svojega vlastitog uspjeha mogu imati značajnu ulogu u pridavanju više pažnje reputaciji svojega fakulteta/sveučilišta, pa će se upoznavati s drugim ljudima u društvu i češće sudjelovati u različitim aktivnostima i tako pomoći razvoju svojih fakulteta i/ili sveučilišta. Lizzio i sur. (2002) uočili su da pozitivna slika studenata o okruženju u kojemu uče ima izravan utjecaj na njihov akademski uspjeh. Stoga, građanska vrлина, zajedno s pozitivnom slikom studenata o okruženju u kojemu uče, može imati značajan utjecaj na akademski uspjeh.

U dimenziji voljnosti ili sportskoga ponašanja, studenti s boljim akademskim uspjehom pokazali su više voljnosti od studenata sa slabim akademskim uspjehom. Dok se oblici ponašanja u dimenziji uljudnosti temelje na učinkovitoj međusobnoj komunikaciji, oblici ponašanja u dimenziji voljnosti temelje se na rješavanju i sprečavanju problema. To može biti rezultat motivacije i osjećaja odgovornosti koji proizlazi iz osjećaja uspješnosti. U tom kontekstu može se reći da oni imaju visok stupanj svijesti o svojem društvenom okruženju.

Kao opći rezultat ovoga istraživanja, može se reći da studenti Učiteljskoga fakulteta pokazuju zadovoljavajući stupanj organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja, a studenti s

boljim akademskim uspjehom pokazuju i veći broj oblika organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja nego ostali studenti. Rezultat koji smo dobili ovim istraživanjem, a koji ukazuje na to da budući učitelji imaju zadovoljavajući potencijal organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja, obećavajući je u smislu poboljšanja školskoga uspjeha tako što se potiče organizacijsko građansko ponašanje učitelja.

Mogu se dati sljedeće sugestije koje se temelje na rezultatima istraživanja: budući da studenti koji imaju bolja akademska postignuća pokazuju i veći stupanj organizacijskoga građanskog ponašanja, trebalo bi ispitati na koje načine akademska postignuća utječu na organizacijsko građansko ponašanje. Organizacijsko građansko ponašanje sveučilišnih studenata može se oblikovati stvaranjem pozitivne slike o njihovim sveučilištima. Imajući to na umu, da bi se poboljšala akademska postignuća studenata u organizacijskom građanskom ponašanju, na sveučilištima bi se trebale organizirati društvene i orijentacijske aktivnosti.