



International Journal of Physical Education, Sports and Health

P-ISSN: 2394-1685
E-ISSN: 2394-1693
Impact Factor (ISRA): 5.38
IJPESH 2016; 3(5): 125-130
© 2016 IJPESH
www.kheljournal.com
Received: 23-07-2016
Accepted: 24-08-2016

M Zahit Serarslan
İstanbul Gelişim University,
School of Physical Education
and Sports, 34310, Istanbul,
Turkey

An examination of the levels of organizational citizenship of Istanbul youth services and sport directorate employees

M Zahit Serarslan

Abstract

The aim of this study is to determine the levels of organizational citizenship amongst the staff of Istanbul's Youth Services and Sport Directorate. The population for this study consists of the 380 employees of Istanbul's Youth Services and Sport Directorate, 297 of whom are male and 83 are female. The sample group for the purposes of this study comprises of 128 staff, 95 male employees and 32 female employees. The Organizational Citizenship scale adapted by H.N. Basım, H. Şeşen (2006) was used, in this study, in order to determine the organizational citizenship levels of staff. The scale consists of five primary dimensions and is in accordance with the organizational citizenship behaviours put forward by Organ in 1988. The "Yarimax" axis rotation technique was employed for factor analysis and the suitability of the data in accordance with the factor analysis was first determined. With this aim in mind, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett test was employed and these values indicate that both the sample size is adequate and the data demonstrates normal distribution. The Kruskal-Wallis Test, at a significance level of 0,05, was implemented in order to determine whether the organizational citizenship levels of staff differed in accordance with their demographic characteristics. The test results do not reveal a significant difference between the average levels when employees' gender, age and length of service is considered in line with organizational citizenship behaviours and its subdimensions such as altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy and civic virtue. Whereas a significant difference was determined between the educational attainment of staff and the subdimensions of organizational citizenship.

Keywords: Sports, sports management, organizational citizenship, organizational behavior

Introduction

Collective living has ensured that the distribution of labour and collaboration, acclimatizing to given environment, becoming organised and leading others has become a necessity. The end result of efforts to ensuring maximum utilisation from nature and its natural resources has resulted in the empowerment of the producer and the development of unique production relationships. The mode of production that arises from the power of the producer and production relations, is the primary determinant of societal configuration. In this also lies the explanation for the existence and development of various styles of organization and management.

The development of organization and management principles coincided with that of the beginning of collective living in society thus it is evident that management theories have a long and wide-ranging past that span a long period. The configuration of societal structure when certain periods of lifetime is concerned, has been the subject of debate. The existence of organizational and management theories and practices has not constituted a major problem for management and organization, especially for production entities. Thus during these period, practices relating to organization and management cannot be considered to have been of an advanced nature. This was the case until recently despite thousands of years of evolution. However, efforts to increase efficiency and productivity whether in the industrial sector or the service industry has gained force in terms of studies and research in both academia and in organizations themselves. One of the topics of such studies forms the basis of this study and is that of organizational citizenship behaviours.

Correspondence
M Zahit Serarslan
İstanbul Gelişim University,
School of Physical Education
and Sports, 34310, Istanbul,
Turkey

Conceptual Framework

For the purposes of this study, organizational behaviour and its subdimension behaviours such as altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, civic virtue and a contribution to an increase in productiveness and production have been taken in hand. These behaviours which can be affected by several factors and variables, form the constant variables of this study. However, independent variables that are thought to influence the constant variables like demographics such as gender, educational attainment, length of service and age have been taken into consideration.

Constant Variables of Study

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour can be defined as a set of discretionary workplace behaviours that exceed the basic job requirements of an employee. They are often described as behaviours that go beyond the call of duty (Jahangir *et al.* 2004:76) [11]. These behaviours, within the organization, exhibit behaviour that is in addition to their role and in contrast to defined role behaviours, are formal positive behaviours (Karakas, 2005:30) [14]. At the same time, organizational behaviour can be defined in line with the following concepts; “prosocial organizational behaviour, altruism, behaviour that exceeds formal behaviour and willingness” (Bolat and Bolat, 2008: 78) [4]. Consequently, these behaviours that exceed formal roles can be regarded as behaviours that are deemed desirable by the organization and are considered to be advantageous in organizational efficiency (Turnipseed ve Murkison 2000:281). In transmitting role awareness within the organization, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) serves to protect the organization from disruptive and unwanted behaviours and within its organizational structure serves to; listen to and embrace staff suggestions and feedback, develop the skills and qualities of staff, create an effective and widespread network and to ensure comprehensive participation of staff in such practices. This is why there is a direct link between OCB and organizational performance. According to Organ, organizational citizenship behaviours are discretionary individual behaviours which although are not direct behaviours or are not considered to be part of the formal award system, as a whole increase the productivity of the organization (Organ, 1997: 4) [18]. Organ defines discretionary behaviours as those that “are discretionary and constructive inclinations or acts that are not contractually enforced and carry no penalty in their non-exhibition.” Whereas Cetin differentiates organizational citizenship behaviour from other behaviours using the criteria below (Çetin, 2004:4) [5]:

- Assists in the realization of organizational targets as a whole and in formal role behaviours (Niehoff, 2000:3) [17]. In terms of employee behaviours, organizational citizenship behaviours can be explained as going beyond and exceeding job descriptions and formally written job roles and as ‘good soldier syndrome’ (Turnipseed ve Murkison 2000: 281).
- Organizational Citizenship Behaviours are not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system (Niehoff, 2000:3) [17]. Organizational citizenship behaviours are not influenced by the organization’s disciplinary or reward system (Turnipseed, 2002: 2). According to Organ, behaviours that are not rewarded by the formal award system contractually but depend on the discretion of managers and thus witness staff going beyond the call of duty because they are motivated by this method of award can be accepted to be OCBs (Organ,

1997: 86) [18]. In short, employees can exhibit such behaviours with the aim of securing an award or protecting themselves from disciplinary reprimand (Turnipseed, 2002: 2).

- Is discretionary and is exhibited voluntarily (Niehoff, 2000:3) [17]. The concept of organizational citizenship behaviour can be defined as follows, “is not recognized in the formal reward system but as a whole helps to ensure that organizational functions are fulfilled in an efficient manner and is based on the principle of discretion.” (Özdevecioğlu, 2003: 118) [20]. Organizational citizenship behaviours are discretionary and not a prerequisite of an individual’s role or formal job description and are a form of behaviour based on individual choice (Gündüz ve Keleş, 2009:590; Özdevecioğlu, 2003: 118) [20]. It is beneficial to list some of the characteristics of organizational citizenship behaviour briefly as follows (Karaaslan, Özler ve Kulaklıoğlu, 2009: 138-139) [13];
- Organizational citizenship behaviour does not fall directly within the formal reward or disciplinary
- Is behaviour that is related to the functioning of the organization and is exhibited within organizational activities.
- Organizational citizenship behaviours not included in job descriptions and job remits and is characterized by the employee going above and beyond in terms of behaviour.
- Organizational citizenship behaviour results in both the individual and the organization benefitting.

In summary, because of the characteristics it displays as a concept, “Organizational citizenship behaviour” is a phenomenon that should be taken seriously by organizations. This concept which encompasses behaviours that are not formally defined in job roles represents behaviours, which are not compulsory or enforced, but are exhibited by staff that supports the success and efficiency of an organization. The first studies relating to the dimensions of Organizational citizenship behaviour were published in 1983 by Organ, Near and Smith. These studies were subsequently followed by studies that examined the categorization of the qualities of organizational citizenship. At this point, the first study only considered the categorization of the dimensions of altruism and general conformity. The general dimension of conformity was later changed to that of “conscientiousness/pulsiveness.” With the addition of the dimension of civic virtue by Graham, the dimension of courtesy by Organ and the addition of the most recent concept of volunteering, the categorization of the behaviours reached a total of five dimensions (Kamer, 2001: 10) [12].

1.2. Altruism. This is considered to be the most important dimension of organizational citizenship behaviours. This comprises of the display of willingness towards certain individuals of those who interact face to face in the workplace (Öğüt *et al.* 2009:158) [19]. Examples of altruism include helping new employees, those who carry a heavy workload and helping those employees and customers unable to come to the workplace (Öğüt *et al.* 2009:158) [19]. Further examples include aiding employees in the use of equipment, completing tasks, securing particular information and assisting in ensuring that a project is completed or presented on time. According to Padsok off, altruism can be defined as behaviours that are aimed at employees assisting specialists in the workplace when a problem arises and which ensure that employees work more efficiently (Çetin, 2004: 20) [5]. The behaviour that is

most characterized by this dimension is “helpfulness” and because of this from time to time is used as a synonym to the term altruism (İşbaşı, 2000: 25) ^[10]. Whereas Goerge and Brief (1992) argue that the organizational spontaneity of altruism separates it from other helpfulness behaviours. In another study, Organ examines the dimension of altruism within the context of acts such as an employee helping another employee voluntarily with tasks such as teaching a new starter how to use equipment, helping to decrease the workload of a colleague and helping to procure materials that a colleague may not be able to secure alone (Kamer, 2001: 11) ^[12].

1.3. Conscientiousness consists of discretionary behaviours that go well beyond the minimum role and job requirements of the organization. A low rate of absenteeism is perhaps one of the most illustrative examples of this behaviour. Attending work is a contractual requirement of the employee’s terms of employment. Management can be receptive to extraordinary or special circumstances that prevent a member of staff from attending work such as dire weather conditions or problems of a personal nature. Despite the tolerance that management may display on such issues, employees that go above and beyond in terms of their efforts fit into Organ’s definition of being conscientiousness. It is not possible for all employees to adhere to an organization’s policies on implementation of regulations to the same faultless extent. This is why employees may feel the need to operate to a minimum level where unformalised, not directly voiced or rules not required contractually are in question. Those that operate above this level in their behaviours are characterized as exhibiting Conscientiousness (Gündüz, 2008: 26) ^[9]. The fact that most employees do not adhere to organizational rules, processes and regulations, despite an expectation that they do so, is the reason why this behaviour is accepted as an organizational citizenship behaviour. (Erdem, 2000: 26). Conscientiousness comprises of a set of characteristics such as being trustworthy, willingness to succeed, and exhibiting a protective nature. An employee who exhibits such behaviors is can be deemed to be obedient in the workplace but at the same time does not monitor the obedience of others and even when non-adherence to rules is witnessed, this employee tends to continue with adhering to organizational rules and regulations (Bingöl, 1998: 476) ^[3]. Conscientiousness is beneficial to the organization as a whole and can be considered to be more of an indirect behaviour. The most distinct difference between conscientiousness and altruism is that altruism is aimed at helping a particular individual whereas conscientiousness is a behaviour that is aimed at being beneficial to the organization as a whole rather than to the individual. In addition to this, it should not be expected of an employee who exhibits behaviour of a conscientious nature to also exhibit altruistic behaviour. This is because situations that may give rise to altruistic behaviour in an organization becoming public knowledge, do not necessarily work in the same way for conscientiousness behaviour. Recent studies conscientiousness demonstrate a link between this behaviour and work (Loğa, 2003: 55) ^[16].

1.4. Courtesy was first introduced into the field by Organ in 1988 and refers to the positive behaviour exhibited by those individuals in the workplace who due to work responsibilities interact constantly with others in the course of their duty in a mutually receptive and positive manner (İşbaşı, 2000: 29) ^[10]. Such behaviours can also centre on being informative to others or warning individuals in the workplace against threatening behaviour (Sabuncuoğlu and Tüz, 2003: 80) ^[21]. That who exhibit courteous behaviours play an important role in

preventing such problems and ensure that time is used in a constructive manner. A courtesy based approach that is forward thinking and aims to prevent problems from arising or takes precautions to allievate the problem, are characteristics of sportsmanship behaviour.

1.5. Sportsmanship can be said to be a willingness on behalf of an employee to tolerate less than ideal work circumstances. Behaviours that may arise in organizational conflict are avoided. This behavioural style can also be defined as not complaining about unavoidable work issues or difficulties. If colleagues continuously complain and focus on the negative rather than the positive side of a work issue and blow up problems out of proportion, it is not possible for organizational contentment and a positive working environment to be realized. (Bingöl, 2003: 496). Such behaviours are called Sportsmanship or Willingness. Behaviours that display willingness are those that aim to resolve problems with colleagues without conflict and the skill of perseverance. Due to increased stamina when faced with adversity, organizational efficiency is increased. Whereas sportsmanship behaviours in organizations tend to focus on problem solving, organizational analysis and intensive planning which in turn improve the effectiveness of the organization. In addition, such employees are willing to protect organizational products and are bearers of good news to the markets and are adept at rectifying misunderstandings.

1.6. Civic Virtue as a dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour is defined by Graham as “organizational participation.” Graham developed this concept based on classical political philosophy and explains civic virtue in terms of, “active and responsible participation in the organization’s political life.” According to Graham, a good organizational citizen should not only concern them with adapting to the everyday running of the organization but should also try to create new ideas and not be afraid of expressing these ideas (Gündüz, 2008: 29) ^[9]. Qualities which fall within the behaviours characterized by civic virtue include but are not limited to the following; regular attendance at internal corporate meetings and active participation in debate, adapting to organizational change, generating ideas in relation to issues concerning the organization and sharing ideas with colleagues. The term “responsible” used by Graham in his explanation of civic virtue is the key definer of this concept. This is because actively participating in organizational functions does not constitute displaying an undisciplined or unconstructive attitude. Such negatives behaviours are not part of civic virtue behaviours and are contrary to sportsmanship. Civic virtue requires sacrifice on behalf of the employee in terms of time and effort. These behaviours which stem from employees being part of the decision making process and the consciousness of being “organizational citizen,” are not well received by many managers. Civic virtue is accepted as the most difficult type of citizenship behaviour because of the low probability of being embraced by senior management and the associated employee costs (İşbaşı, 2000: 30) ^[10].

2. Independent Variables of Study

2.1. Demographic variables: Despite not being direct variables, demographic variables can have an effect on some of the dimensions of citizenship behaviour and therefore can affect the exhibiting of certain behaviours. When examined from this perspective, it was found that educational attainment was clearly linked to general social responsibility and that this was a variable that influenced the behavior of altruism. At the

same time, a study concluded that order of birth affected citizenship behaviour and those that were first born generally displayed more altruistic characteristics (Kamer, 2001: 17) [12]. This study will also consider the other demographic variables such as gender and age. Within this context, the hypothesis in relation to the demographic variables is stated below.

H1: The organizational citizenship levels and six subdimensions of citizenship of Istanbul Youth Services and Sport Directorate Employees differ according to gender

H2: The organizational citizenship levels and six subdimensions of citizenship of Istanbul Youth Services and Sport Directorate Employees differ according to educational attainment

H3: The organizational citizenship levels and six subdimensions of citizenship of Istanbul Youth Services and Sport Directorate Employees differ according to age

Length of Service: The feeling of belonging to an organization can increase with length of service. Those employees who have been in service for longer can be considered to be more experienced and therefore find themselves in more desirable corporate positions. Identifying with the organization and commitment to the workplace increases the level of the feeling of belonging to the organization. Thus those employees who adapt the most to the organization are more inclined to work in favour of the organization. According to Morrison, trust and commitment of the employee towards the organization increases with seniority and in line with this, the individual who feels more responsibility towards the organization perceives this in terms of being active in their role and therefore exhibits behaviours linked to organizational citizenship (Ünal, 2003: 29) [24]. Within this context, the other hypothesis of the study is stated below.

H4: The organizational citizenship levels and six subdimensions of citizenship of Istanbul Youth Services and Sport Directorate Employees differ according to length of service

Method

The population of the study comprised of a total of 380 Istanbul Youth Services and Sport Directorate Employees, 297 male and 83 female. The study sample group consisted of 128 employees, 95 male and 32 female. The Organizational Citizenship scale adapted by H.N. Basım, H. Şeşen was used, in this study, in order to determine the organizational citizenship levels of staff. The scale consists of five primary dimensions and is in accordance with the organizational citizenship behaviours put forward by Organ in 1988. The "Yarimax" axis rotation technique was employed for factor analysis and the suitability of the data in accordance with the factor analysis was first determined. With this aim in mind, the Kaiser Mayer Orkin (KMO) and Bartlett test was employed and the result of the KMO sample suitability test was found determined to be 0.883. The standard Barlett distribution test result also produced significant results (p<0.05). These values indicate that both the sample size is adequate and that the data demonstrates normal distribution. The Kruskal-Wallis Test, at a significance level of 0,05 was implemented in order to determine whether the organizational citizenship levels of staff differed in accordance with their demographic characteristics.

Findings

In terms of determining the relationship between gender and organizational citizenship behaviour and the subdimensions of altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue, the results of the hypothesis test are shown in Table 1. Calculations were made within this context, as can be seen from Table 1 and the values of "p" as evident from Table 1 show that the total of organizational citizenship behaviourism calculated at (>0,05). The values of the subdimensions of organizational citizenship behaviours are as follows; altruism (>0,05), conscientiousness (>0,05), courtesy (>0,05), sportsmanship (>0,05), and civic virtue (>0,05). Therefore the H1 hypothesis was rejected. In other words, the organizational citizenship levels and its subdimensions (altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue) did not differ according to gender amongst Istanbul Youth Services and Sport Directorate Employees.

Table 1: Kruskal-Wallis Test results on the difference between gender and the levels of organizational citizenship and the organizational citizenship behaviour subdimensions of Istanbul Youth Services and Sport Directorate Employees.

	Altruism	Conscientiousness	Courtesy	Sportsmanship	Civic Virtue	Org. Cit Tot.
Chi-Square	3,408	,424	,016	,424	,457	,013
Df	1	1	1	1	1	1
Asymp. Sig.	,065	,909	,895	,515	,499	,909

Table 2 shows the results of the hypothesis test for the relationship between educational attainment and organizational citizenship behaviour and respectively for each subdimension

of organizational citizenship behaviour (altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship, civic virtue).

Table 2: Kruskal-Wallis Test results on the difference between educational attainment and the levels of organizational citizenship and the organizational citizenship behaviour subdimensions of Istanbul Youth Services and Sport Directorate Employees.

	Altruism	Conscientiousness	Courtesy	Sportsmanship	Civic Virtue	Org. Cit Tot.
Chi-Square	12,742	13,972	19,241	13,972	16,475	17,902
Df	4	4	4	4	4	4
Asymp. Sig.	,013	,007	,001	,007	,002	,001

Within this context a relationship of a significance degree of 5% is evident for both educational attainment and organizational citizenship behaviour and the subdimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour. Therefore the calculated

"p" values as can be seen in Table 2, reveal the total of organizational citizenship behaviour to be calculated as (<0,05), whereas the values for the subdimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour are as follows; altruism

(.013<.05), conscientiousness (.007<.05), courtesy (.001<.05), sportsmanship (.007<.05), and civic virtue (.002<.05). Therefore the H2 hypothesis is valid. In other words, the organizational citizenship levels and its subdimensions (altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue) did differ according to educational attainment amongst Istanbul Youth Services and Sport Directorate Employees. Table 3 reveals according to which educational

attainment level, the levels of organizational citizenship behaviour witnessed higher levels. Accordingly, the organizational citizenship behavioural levels of primary school graduates and that of its subdimension behaviours were recorded at being at its lowest level. Whereas, whereas the level of organizational citizenship behavior rose in line with educational attainment. Thus the highest level can be seen amongst postgraduates.

Table 3: Distribution of Organizational citizen behaviour levels according to educational attainment

Educational Attainment	N	Mean Rank					
		Altruism	Conscientiousness	Courtesy	Sportsmanship	Civic Virtue	Org. Cit Tot.
Primary School	13	37,85	30,58	27,35	30,58	29,21	26,17
High School	25	53,56	66,4	62,94	66,4	58,1	60,14
Vocational College	6	64,5	58	56,17	58	60,17	58,33
Graduate	66	70,45	67,5	68,21	67,5	68,17	68,16
Postgraduate	18	77,11	77,53	82,67	77,53	81,39	81,22
Total	128						

In terms of determining the relationship between age and organizational citizenship behaviour and the subdimensions of altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue, the results of the hypothesis test are shown in Table 4. Therefore the calculated “p” values as can be seen in Table 4, reveal the total of organizational citizenship behaviour to be calculated as(.805>.05), whereas the values for the subdimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour are as

follows; altruism (.316>.05), conscientiousness (.841>.05), courtesy (.958>.05), Sportsmanship (.841>.05), and civic virtue (.535>.05). Therefore the H3 hypothesis is rejected. In other words, the organizational citizenship levels and its subdimensions (altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue) did not differ according to age amongst Istanbul Youth Services and Sport Directorate Employees.

Table 4: Kruskal-Wallis Test results on the difference between age and the levels of organizational citizenship and the organizational citizenship behaviour subdimensions of Istanbul Youth Services and Sport Directorate Employees.

	Altruism	Conscientiousness	Courtesy	Sportsmanship	Civic Virtue	Org. Cit Tot.
Chi-Square	4,732	1,420	,643	1,420	3,141	1,620
Df	4	4	4	4	4	4
Asymp. Sig.	,316	,841	,958	,841	,535	,805

Table 5 shows the results of the hypothesis test for the relationship between length of service and organizational citizenship behaviour and respectively for each subdimension of organizational citizenship behaviour (altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship, civic virtue). In terms of determining the relationship between length of service and organizational citizenship behaviour and the subdimensions of altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue, the results of the hypothesis test are shown in Table 5. Therefore the calculated “p” values as can be seen in Table 4, reveal the total of organizational

citizenship behaviour to be calculated as(.591>.05) whereas the values for the subdimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour are as follows; Altruism, (.220>.05), conscientiousness (.578>.05), courtesy (.864>.05), sportsmanship (.578>.05), and civic virtue (.567>.05). Therefore the H4 hypothesis is rejected. In other words, the organizational citizenship levels and its subdimensions (altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue) did not differ according to length of service amongst Istanbul Youth Services and Sport Directorate Employees.

Table 5: Kruskal-Wallis Test results on the difference between age and the levels of organizational citizenship and the organizational citizenship behaviour subdimensions of Istanbul Youth Services and Sport Directorate Employees.

	Altruism	Conscientiousness	Courtesy	Sportsmanship	Civic Virtue	Org. Cit Tot.
Chi-Square	4,416	1,972	,737	1,972	2,027	1,911
Df	3	3	3	3	3	3
Asymp. Sig.	,220	,578	,864	,578	,567	,591

Conclusion and Recommendations

A significant difference in the levels of organizational citizenship behavior and the levels of its subdimensions (conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship and civic virtue) is not evident when we consider gender, age and length of service out of the employees’ demographic variables. A significant difference in the averages is not evident. Therefore it could be argued that variations in age and gender did not impact on or diversify the levels of employees’ organizational citizenship behaviours. However a relationship between the educational attainment of employees and organizational

citizenship behaviour is identifiable. Findings show that the more educated an employee was (in terms of formal education) that it had a positive impact on levels of organizational citizenship behaviour. It is recommended that the Istanbul Youth Services and Sport Directorate takes into account the findings of this and other studies in this field in terms of recruitment and making decisions with regard to the required level of staff educational attainment.

References

1. Acar AZ. Örgütsel Yurttaşlık Davranışı: Kavramsal Gelişimi İle Kişisel ve Örgütsel Etkileri. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 2006; 7(1):1-14.
2. Basım HN, Şeşen H. Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Ölçeği Uyarlama ve Karşılaştırma Çalışması. *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*. 2006; 61:83-10.
3. Bingöl D. İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi, 4. Ed. Beta Basım. İstanbul, 1998.
4. Bolat O, Bolat İT. Otel İşletmelerinde Örgütsel Bağlılık ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı İlişki. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*. 2008; 11(19):75-94.
5. Çetin MÖ. Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık, 2004.
6. Derdiman CR. Özel Güvenlik Anlayışı Ve 5188 Sayılı Kanunun Uygulanmasından Doğan Sorunlara İlişkin Değerlendirmeler. Paper Presented AtII. Ulusal Özel Güvenlik Sempozyumu, Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Kocaeli, 3 Aralık, 2005.
7. Çolak İ. Genel kolluk ve Özel Güvenlik İlişkileri. Paper Presented AtII. Ulusal Özel Güvenlik Sempozyumu, Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Kocaeli, 3 Aralık, 2005.
8. Ekinci S. Devletin Dönüşümünün Güvenlik Alanına Yansması: Türkiye’de Güvenlik Yönetişimi, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, 2011.
9. Gündüz G. İşletmelerde Kurumsallaşma Uygulamalarına Yönelik Çalışan Tutumlarının Örgütsel Vatandaşlık İle İlişkisine Yönelik Bir Uygulama, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Unpublished Master’s Thesis, 2008.
10. İşbaşı JÖ. Çalışanların Yöneticilerine Duydukları Güvenin Ve Örgütsel Adalete İlişkin Algılamalarının Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışının Oluşumundaki Rolü: Bir Turizm Örgütünde Uygulama. Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Unpublished Master’s Thesis, 2000.
11. Jahangir N, Akbar MM, Haq M. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Its Nature and Antecedents, *BRAC Universtiy Journal*. 2004; 1(2):75-85.
12. Kamer M. Örgütsel Güven, Örgütsel Bağlılık Ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışlarına Etkileri. Marmara Üniversitesi, Unpublished Master Thesis, 2001.
13. Karaaslan A, Özler DE, Kulaklıoğlu AE. Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı ve Bilgi Paylaşımı Arasındaki İlişkiye Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 2009; 11(2):135-160.
14. Karakaş M. İnsan Kaynakları Uygulamalarının Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Üzerine Etkisi Üzerine Bir Araştırma. Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Unpublished Master’s Thesis, 2005.
15. Köse S, Kartal B, Kayalı N. Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Ve Tutuma İlişkin Faktörlerle İlişkisi Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*. 2003; 20:1-19.
16. Loğa A. Çalışanların Demografik Özelliklerinin Örgütsel Özdeşim, Örgütsel Bağlılık ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışlarına Etkileri: Askeri Birimlerde Bir Araştırma. *Başkent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü*, Unpublished Master’s Thesis, 2003.
17. Niehoff BP. A Motive-Based View of Organizational Citizenship Behaviours: Applying an Old Lens to a New Class of Organizational Behaviours. Paper Presented At The Midwat Academy Of Management Behaviour Conference, 2000, 1-16.
18. Chicago Organ DW. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: It’s Construct Clean-Up Time, *Human Performance* 1997; 10(2):85-97.
19. Ögüt A, Kaplan M, Biçkes DM. Algılanan Örgütsel Adalet İle Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Arasındaki İlişkinin Otel İşletmeleri Örneğinde Bir Analizi. 17. Ulusal Yönetim Ve Organizasyon Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı. 21-23 Mayıs. Eskişehir: Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2009, 162.
20. Özdevecioğlu M. Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışları İle Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Demografik Özellikleri ve Akademik Başarıları Arasındaki İlişkilerin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Araştırma. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20, Ocak-Haziran 2003, 117-135.
21. Sabuncuoğlu Z, Tüz M. Örgütsel Psikoloji. (4. Edition) Furkan Ofset. Bursa, 2003.
22. Sezgin F. Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışları: Kavramsal Bir Çözümleme Ve Okul Açısından Bazı Çıkarımlar. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2005; 25(1):317-339.
23. Turnispeed D, Murkison G. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour An Examination of Influence the Workplace. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*. 1996; 17(2):42-47.
24. Ünal Z. Öğretmenlerde İş Doyumu ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü*, Unpublished Master’s Thesis, 2003.
25. Ünüvar TG. An Integrative Model of Job Characteristics, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü*, Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, 2006.
26. Walter CB, Penner LA, Allen TD, Motowidlo SJ. Personality Predictors of Citizenship Performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assesment*. 2001; 9(1-2):52-69.
27. Williams S, Pitre R, Zainuba M. Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Intentions: Fair Rewards versus Fair Treatment. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 2002; 142(1):33-44.
28. Yücel C, Kaynak S. Öğretmenlerin Kişilik Özellikleri ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı. Paper Presented At Eğitim Yönetimi Kongresi. Ankara, 2007.