Effect of Informal Communication Levels of Teachers on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Celal Teyyar Uğurlu

Faculty of Education, University of Cumhuriyet, Sivas, Turkey

Abstract: Informal communication displays itself with the network of relationships between individuals affecting the decisions-making within an institution. Formal networks of an organization are affected by the nature of informal networks. Organizational citizenship behaviors are informal behaviors expected by organizations from employees. Informal communication and the informal structures of organizational citizenship behavior, strengthen the relation between them. This creates a mutual relation between informal communication and organizational citizenship behavior. This relation was tested with the data gathered from 362 teachers among 665 working in 15 secondary schools in Sivas, Turkey. 155 of the teachers are women and 207 are men. T test, Anova and multiple regression analysis techniques were used for research data analysis. As a result of the research, informal communication levels were rated highly by the teachers in terms of general and sub dimensions. Similarly, organizational citizenship behaviors were also rated highly by the teachers. In terms of the relation between informal communication and organizational citizenship behaviors; informal communication and the sub-dimensions of informal communication, friendship, fun, influence and information dimensions are together are defined as the priorities of organizational citizenship.

Key words: İletişim · Formal communication · Informal communication · Organizational citizenship

INTRODUCTION

A human being, as a social entity, has to share its emotions and thoughts. Fine human relations are based on fine communication elements. Continuation of the existence of organizations can be possible with the healthy operation of communication cycle. Quality of the communication process affect an organization in different dimensions and also affect the quality of relations of organization members with their organizations. An efficient and effective organization, first of all, must remove communication barriers and have a management understanding, which creates an effective communication cycle, as the organization's way of life. Fine coding of meanings, while sharing emotions, thoughts and information, increases the quality of communication results. A healthy communication process results with individuals, who establish good relationships and understand each other; the connection of individuals with their organizations are also positively affected by this.

The quality of organizational communication process increases the structure and operation level of organizations. Communication is useful for empowering shared goals with effective communication, eliminating misunderstandings and increasing the quality of decision-making behaviors [1]. Communication affects the management of organizational behavior area. Organizational citizenship behaviors within an organizational behavior area are created by the voluntary behaviors of organization members. The question "Does the communication quality of the organization, especially the informal communication levels of organization members in their organizations affect their organizational citizenship behaviors?" emphasizes the importance for organizations of these two concepts and their relationship. For organizations, some behavior types and administrative applications are as the causes and results of each other. Some concepts at organizations, related to communication, informal communication and organizational citizenship concepts are; Work satisfaction

Corresponding Author: Celal Teyyar Uğurlu, Faculty of Education, University of Cumhuriyet, Sivas, Turkey.

[2], motivation [3], loyalty [4-7] leadership and leadership behavior [8, 9], trust [6, 10], organizational justice [4, 6, 11] communication [5]. As we see, communication and organizational citizenship affect and get affected by many concepts within organizational behavior area. Organizational efforts related to communication as well as organizational citizenship strengthen the operation of administrative processes of organizations. Is informal dimension of communication a antecedent for organizational citizenship? How does Informal communication affect organizational citizenship? Revealing the relation level between two concepts will contribute to organization managements in terms of knowing what affects organizations' human nature [*employees*] and what this nature affects Especially, if we look at schools, what do teachers do other than their formal duties? How are teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors relation according to their informal communication levels and informal communication dimensions? Do informal communication and organizational citizenship behaviors differ according to some variables? This study looks for answers for such questions.

Importance of Communication and Informal Communication Concepts and Other Related Concepts:
Communication is the process of sharing common meanings and transferring thoughts, orders and information. Kayaalp [12] defines communication as "sharing of emotions and thoughts between individuals-in its narrow context-or masses-in its wider context". Similar characteristics of different definitions emphasize the information production, transfer, interpretation, sharing, explanation, interaction, etc. content of communication [13-15]. In this context, existence of organizations must be defined by their communication systems. Therefore, *communication* is accepted and studied as an element of management processes. As an element of Management processes, communication actually increases the operation quality of other management processes.

Communication is accepted as a dimension within an organizational structure [16-20]. Communication plays an important role in organizational performance and the quality of work life [21]. To produce and realize their social functions within their organizations, individuals need to be in communication with other individuals and groups. This communication can be formal or informal. Especially, when we look around inside an organization, we see that informal communication is displayed as a dominant behavior. If we think about the nature of informal communication, we can see that it has a structure that develops automatically [22]. Undisputedly, communication is defined as the constitution of being human [23] and informal communication is one of its different dimensions. Informal communication provides sharing of information when made face to face and in small groups [24]. Both communication types have their own characteristics. Kraunt, *et al.* [22] define these characteristics as follows.

Informal communication is related to out-of-the-rule organization within an institution and displays itself with the network of relationships between individuals [25]. Formal networks of an organization are affected by the nature of informal networks [26]. If organization management is unaware of organization's informal nature, this can decrease organization's performance [27]. Managers can learn about events more easily through informal networks. Information gathered this way can help solve many problems as well as increase organizational performance. According to Groat [28], informal organization is not affected by neither formal structure nor organizational culture. Informal organization changes quickly according to conditions. However, organizational culture changes slowlier. Fast changing informal organization plays an important role in the transfer and

Table 1: Characteristics of Formal and Informal Communication

Formal communication	Informal communication
Programmed	Non-programmed
Arrangement and participation	Participant by chance
Designated role	Indefinite roles
One-way influence	Mutual interaction
Designated content	Indefinite and rich content
Formal language	Informal language

handling of information within the organization. Informal communication can affect said characteristics and other applications that have different importance for the organization.

Informal communication can be utilized for different purposes. For example, informal communication can sometimes be at the center of human relations for gathering information, building friendships, having fun and sometimes for influencing others. In this study, informal communication is handled in the dimensions of information, friendship, fun and influence as defined by the researcher.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Concept: Besides legal orders and rules, the willingness to do a job in an organization can be accepted as an important factor in terms of the dynamism and health of organizations. Today, most of the efforts spent by organization managements to create an effective and efficient organization are based on the human factor. Humans are the main instruments of the existence of organizations. Organizations legally or as a rule, state their expectations from employees in the organization and try to fulfill their goals. However, in order to fulfill their goals, beyond the legality and organization's rules, organizations care more about employees that would voluntarily provide the desired contribution to the organization to fulfill purposes of the organization.

Efforts by employees for their organizations are defined as their duties plus role behavior and organizational behavior [29]. If an employee organization willingly performs his duty due to his/her position and performs this duty by thinking of the purposes of the organization, this means that he/she displays organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational citizenship requires volunteering, dedication and working with high motivation beyond organizational processes. They will not have additional expectations while doing these duties. This work is done as a necessary of the duty. This situation can be defined as the height of psychological contract level between the organization and the employee. According to Organ [30] ganizational citizenship concept means employees perform duties voluntarily without being formally imposed by the organization. This means that organization's employees are not motivated to do a job based on a penalty or reward. Award and penalty effect is not present in displaying organizational citizenship behaviors [31]. According to George [32], organizational citizenship behaviors are behaviors that are not covered by roles and

organization's formal reward system. Individuals decide themselves which organizational behaviors they will display or not within the organization. According to Organ and Ryan [33], it is a behavior type that work as based on a kind of volunteering principle.

According to Organ [30], three characteristics come forward in organizational citizenship behavior definitions [6].

- Displaying an organizational citizenship behavior is in the discretion of the individual and there are no rewards or penalties when shown.
- Organizational citizenship behavior is not included in employee's work definitions.
- Employees are not trained for displaying organizational citizenship behavior.

According to Formal role behavior, when employees do not fulfill the duties they are supposed to do, they cannot receive rewards to be given by the organization, they can even lose their jobs [34]. However, informal behaviors may not provide additional contribution for employees. However, organizations expect such informal behaviors from employees. Informal behaviors expected by organizations from employees are defined with names such as organizational citizenship behavior, good soldier behavior, extra role behavior, etc. [8, 35, 36]. According to Krackhardt and Hanson [37], for an organization formality is the skeleton while informality is the central nerve system of an organization, managing its actions and processes. Information is an important asset for organizations. Information changes by passing through an informal process [38]. At this point, quality of organization's informal communication and organizational citizenship behavior relation as the feature of displaying voluntary behaviors set can be accepted as two concepts affecting each other. Schools are organizations with loose structured systems [39, 40], where informal communication is experienced intensely. Loose-structure characteristics of schools can create opportunities for teachers to display organizational citizenship behaviors.

A teacher giving a lesson in his/her class, can fulfill the routines of the lesson. He/she may begin and end the lesson on time. He/she may work on the subject of the lesson. However, some teachers may use different methods and techniques to increase the effects their students in the lesson, direct them to different sources, establish close relationships with families and provide information about the student. They do some of these duties voluntarily. The behaviors, shown by teachers

although not requested or expected by school administration or parents, can be defined as organizational citizenship behavior. Behaviors named by Organ [30] as "good soldier behavior" include volunteering to help. As well as meaning to do more than asked, organizational citizenship also includes fulfilling the requirements of organizational duties in a proper manner. Teachers undertake their formal duties as well as informal duties voluntarily.

Organ [30] defines organizational citizenship behavior as five elements. Similarly, Moorman, [41] and Niehoff and Moorman [2] have accepted this definition. Organ's [30] organizational citizenship dimensions are listed as follows: Courtesy, Helping Each Other, Conscience, Gentleness and Civil Virtue.

Helping Each Other is defined as behaviors shown to help other employees of the organization in actions and transactions related to their organizations [30, 42].

Courtesy is defined as behaviors of employees in the organization that prioritize informing each other of their works and decisions. Consulting a friend and asking his/ her opinion while doing a job can be an example [30, 43].

Conscience consists of behaviors such as punctuality, orderliness, fulfilling responsibilities, obeying rules, etc. [30, 44].

Gentleness is defined as not exaggerating the problems faced while performing the duties in the organization and avoiding negative behaviors that might create tension within the organization [6, 30].

Civil Virtue is defined as behaviors of employees as responsible and constructive individuals in the organization, caring about what is going on inside the organization, improving personally, assisting the improvement organization with ideas, etc. [6, 30].

Informal Communication and Organizational Citizenship Relations: Quality of human relations within a working environment can sometimes be the determinant for the relations employees with their organizations. According to Çelik [45], when we look at organizations as a whole; relations of employees with each other in the organization contribute to the quality of organizational citizenship behaviors.

In relations inside the organization; leadership behaviors, high moral levels of employees, appreciation for employees influence organizational citizenship behaviors [45]. The effect of the nature of informal relations on the quality of human relations as revealed by

the researches of Hawthorn and Harwood [15, 46] also influences organizational citizenship behaviors of employees within an organization. Again, similarly, supportive leaders' attitude and behaviors that encourage two-way communications, quality of subordinate-superior relations between employees, perception of equality among employees [45] and similar factors also strengthen the occurrence of organizational citizenship behaviors. Paine and Organ [47] emphasize the influence of the informal structure in an organization on the dedication and citizenship behaviors of employees of the organization. Organ and Lingl [48] express that interpersonal satisfaction affect organizational citizenship behaviors. According to Rousseau [49], height of psychological contract level of an organization also influence organizational citizenship behaviors. In their studies, which they researched the relations of organizational communication and organizational citizenship; Demirel, Seçkin and Özçınar [50] revealed that there is a relation between the sub dimensions of organizational communication and sub dimensions of organizational citizenship. Borman [51] stresses the relation between the informal side of a work and its voluntary behaviors. When we look at it as a whole, quality of relations employees in an organization with each other, their satisfaction status, their work satisfaction and communication levels affect organizational citizenship behaviors.

Schools are organizations where informal relations are experienced intensely. Every teacher must be in an informal interaction with another teacher colleague or with the managers, officers and other employees of the school. Especially the chats in teachers room, small talks at school yard, school meals, drinking tea with each other, etc. are informal situations which teachers face at school within their living areas. The human relations teachers experience in their working areas can be the determinant of their relations with the school. Especially, the quality of informal communication cycle can cause teachers to display a more desirable and voluntary behavior for their jobs, colleagues and schools. This research discusses the relation of the quality of informal communication levels and the organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers at schools. Especially, as the sub dimensions of informal communication; explanation of the organizational citizenship behavior as a whole by information, friendship, influence and fun sub dimensions was researched. For this purpose, the answers to the following questions have been sought:

- On what level are teachers' opinions on informal communication levels and organizational citizenship behavior?.
- Do teachers' opinions on informal communication levels and organizational citizenship behavior differ according to certain variables (gender, seniority)?.
- Is there a predicting relation between teachers' informal communication levels including their alt dimensions and organizational citizenship behavior?.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Scanning model is used for the research. Scanning models aim to describe a situation that existed in the past or that currently exists as it is. Subject of the research may be an event, individual or an object [52, 53]. The research aims to describe the informal communication levels and organizational citizenship behaviors of primary school teachers and reveal the relation between these.

Participants: Research universe is 665 secondary school teachers, who worked at general academic high-schools in 2011-2012 educational year. According to Yazıcıoğlu and Erdoğan [52], at an $\alpha = 0,05$ significance level and with a d=±0,05 sampling error; it will be deemed sufficient to reach 254 teachers in a population with mass of 750. Scales are distributed to all 665 secondary school teachers, 222 women and 443 men, working at 15 secondary schools within Sivas central county borders.

However, especially, teachers were requested to fill in the scales only if they were going to do it voluntarily. Data analysis was performed over 362 scales; which were returned by the teachers, who filled in the scales voluntarily and which were suitable for processing. It is clear that this number represents the universe. Among the teachers in the sampling, 57% (207) were men and 43% (155) were women. Distribution of participants according to seniority status: 27.9% (101) of teachers with 1-5 years of experience, 46.7% (169) of teachers with 6-11 years of experience and 25.4% (92) of teachers with an experience of 12 years and over.

Data Gathering Tools: In order to reveal teacher's opinions on informal communication levels, the researcher used "Informal Communication Scale", for which validity and reliability studies had been performed. Sub-dimensions of the scale, which was developed in four dimensions, were named as *"friendship", "fun", "influence" and "information".* Article load values of the

scale vary between 0.55 and 0.73. Cronbach's Alpha value of the scale was calculated as .89. Informal communication scale sub-dimensions Cronbach Alpha values are calculated as; Friendship, .81; Fun, .82; Influence, .71 and Information, .87. Explained total variance of the scale is 54.47. Explained variances of the sub-dimensions are; Friendship, 16.78; Fun, 15.42; Influence, 13.87; Information, 8.09. According to the results of the Verifying Factor Analysis performed for the Informal Communication Scale; $X^2 < 5$ (2.39); RMSEA=0.07; GFI=0.83; CFI= 0.93; NFI= 0.90; NNFI=0,95; AGFI=0.80; these values are within acceptable range and the model is verified. In this form, the Informal Communication Scale can be accepted as a valid and reliable scale.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Scale consists of 12 Likert type articles. The Scale is accepted as a single dimension scale. The original form of the Scale has one dimension. Total Cronbach's Alpha value of the scale was calculated as 0.86. The Scale was adapted to Turkish by Taşdan and Yılmaz [54]. Original value of the scale is 5.48. Factor load values of the articles included in the scale vary between 0.31 and 0.82. The variance explained by the Scale singlehandedly is 45.66%. As a result of multiple reliability analysis, Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient was calculated as $\alpha = .87$ [54].

Data Analysis: SPSS statistical software package was used to analyze the data gathered in the study. In the Research, arithmetic average and standard deviation values were used to determine the opinions of teachers on informal communication levels and organizational citizenship behaviors. In the interpretation of arithmetic averages, ranges were defined as; 1.00-1.79 "very low", 1.80-2.59 "low", 2.60-3.39 "medium", 3.40-4.19 "high", 4.20-5.00 "very high".

First, the normality hypothesis was used to make any processes on the data. For this, skewness and flatness coefficients were examined and it was seen that the distribution is normal. Also, Kolmogrov Smirnov test was made and because normality hypothesis was provided, t parametric test and one-way variance analysis were performed. Since the ANOVA test had a significant result; in order to determine the source of difference between the groups, the data were examined according to a post hoc test, the Bonferroni test, in the dimensions where the variances are homogenous.

Correlation analysis was made for all variables. A correlation defines the direction and force of the relation between two variables. Whether the coefficients of a

correlation are "+" or "-" defines the direction and force of the relation between two variables. While evaluating correlation coefficients, values are accepted as "high" if between 0.70 and 1.00, "medium" if between 0.69 and 0.30 and "low" if equal to or lower than 0.29. It is accepted that there is no relation as values come closer to 0.00. In the research model, multiple regression analysis was made to explain the effect of teachers' informal communication levels to organizational citizenship behaviors [55].

RESULT

In this section; the average, the standard deviation values and the correlation relations are described regarding the informal communication levels and organizational citizenship behaviors of secondary school teachers. Then, the differences between teacher opinions are examined according to gender and seniority variables. Finally, multiple regression analysis are shown to explain the effect of teachers' informal communication levels to organizational citizenship behaviors.

Table 1 gives data regarding informal communication and its sub-dimensions as well as organizational citizenship levels. The average point of the opinions of teachers on informal communication levels are described as a "high" level corresponding to ($\square\chi$= 3.75) "I agree" answer. Informal communication sub-dimensions also

similarly are defined as: friendship dimension $\square\chi$= 3.90; fun dimension $\square\chi$= 3.86; influence dimension χ= 3.41; information dimension χ= 3.77. Opinions on organizational citizenship behavior have an average of ($\square\chi$= 3.63).

The Research shows that there is a high relation (over r=0.70) between the total point of informal communication and its sub-dimensions, friendship, fun, influence and information. We see that the sub-dimensions have medium level relations among them (0.30 to 0.69). Informal communication and organizational citizenship; there appears to be a medium level relation between informal communication sub-dimension "friendship" and organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 2 shows the *t test* results for participants' opinions on informal communication and organizational citizenship behaviors according to gender variable. As we see on Table 2, participants' opinions on informal communication and organizational citizenship behaviors do not create a significant difference according to gender variable (p> ,05).

Table 3 shows the *one way ANOVA* results for participants' opinions on informal communication and organizational citizenship behaviors according to seniority variable. As we see on Table 3, participants' opinions on informal communication and organizational citizenship behaviors do not create a significant difference according to gender variable, except for the *influence*

Table 1: Results regarding the averages, standard deviation and correlation values of informal communication and organizational citizenship behaviors

	$\square\bar{x}$	SD	1	2	3	4	5
Informal communication	3.75	.44					
Friendship	3.90	.59	.797**				
Fun 3.86		.62	.682**	.378**			
Influence	3.41	.56	.693**	.325**	.576**		
Information	3.77	.61	.784**	.468**	.338	.392**	
Organizational citizenship	3.63	.46	.104*	.147*	.025	.080	.032

** P< .01 * P< .05

Table 2: Comparison of opinions on informal communication and organizational citizenship behaviors according to gender variable

	Gender	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	t	p
Informal Communication	Male	207	3.75	.42	-.051	.959
	Female	155	3.75	.47		
Friendship	Male	207	3.90	.56	.019	.985
	Female	155	3.90	.62		
Fun	Male	207	3.90	.61	1.113	.266
	Female	155	3.82	.62		
Influence	Male	207	3.39	.56	1.042	.298
	Female	155	3.45	.56		
Information	Male	207	3.77	.59	-.107	.915
	Female	155	3.77	.64		
Organizational Citizenship	Male	207	3.63	.47	.239	.811
	Female	155	3.62	.44		

Table 3: Comparison of opinions on informal communication and organizational citizenship behaviors according to seniority variable

Variables	Seniority	n	Mean	SD	F	p	Benforonni
Informal Communication	5 years and less	101	3.79	.42	3.128	.054	
	6-11 years	169	3.79	.46			
	12 years +	92	3.65	.45			
	Total	362	3.75	.44			
Friendship	5 years and less	101	3.96	.57	1.923	.148	
	6-11 years	169	3.91	.60			
	12 years +	92	3.80	.57			
	Total	362	3.90	.59			
Fun	5 years and less	101	3.93	.56	2.601	.076	
	6-11 years	169	3.89	.64			
	12 years +	92	3.74	.63			
	Total	362	3.86	.62			
Influence	5 years and less (1)	101	3.47	.52	4.562	.011	1 > 3
	6-11 years (2)	169	3.46	.54			2 > 3
	12 years + (3)	92	3.26	.62			
	Total	362	3.41	.56			
Information	5 years and less	101	3.74	.66	.990	.373	
	6-11 years	169	3.82	.60			
	12 years +	92	3.72	.57			
	Total	362	3.77	.62			
Organizational citizenship	5 years and less	101	3.70	.37	1.714	.182	
	6-11 years	169	3.69	.48			
	12 years +	92	3.69	.49			
	Total	362	3.63	.46			

Table 4: Multiple regression analysis results for informal communication and organizational citizenship behaviors

Model	Predicted Variable: Organizational citizenship						
Predicting Variable	B	ShB	β	T	p	Dual r	Partial r
Constant	3.232	0.203		15.886	.000		
Friendship	.135	0.048	0.174	-2.829	.005	.147	.148
Fun	-.052	0.049	0.071	-1.070	.285	.025	-.057
Influence	.071	0.054	0.087	1.319	.188	.080	.070
Information	-.044	0.046	-0.059	-.955	.340	.032	-.051

R = 0.170 $R^2 = 0.029$

$F_{(4.356)} = 2.645$ p = .033

dimension [F = 4.562, p<.05] of informal communication. According to the result of the *Benforonni* test that was made to determine the direction of the meaningful difference in the *influence* dimension of informal communication; we see that opinions of teachers with 5 years and less seniority, as well as 6-11 years, significantly differ from the opinions of teachers with 12 years and more seniority.

Table 4 gives the analysis results regarding the prediction of organizational citizenship by informal communication's sub-dimensions; friendship, fun, influence and information. When we examine the dual and partial correlations between the predicting variables and the dependent (predicted) variable, we see that friendship dimension and organizational citizenship have a positive and low (r= .147) relation but when other variables are

checked, correlation between the two variables are calculated as r= .148. When we examine the dual and partial correlations between fun and organizational citizenship; influence and organizational citizenship; information and organizational citizenship behaviors, we see that there is no significant relation.

Informal communication's sub-dimensions; friendship, fun, influence and information together give a very low level of significant relation to organizational citizenship of teachers (R=0,170, $R^2 = 0,029$, p< .05). Four variables together explain the 3% of the variance in the change of organizational citizenship behavior.

According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), relative importance rank of predicting variables over organizational citizenship behavior is as; friendship, influence, fun and information. When we examine the

t-test results regarding the significance of regression coefficients, we see that friendship sub-dimension is a significant predictor over the organizational citizenship variable.

DISCUSSION

This study aims to reveal the effect of informal communication levels of teachers on their organizational citizenship behaviors. It was seen that informal communication levels of teachers had a low effect for predicting their organizational citizenship behaviors. Teachers stated high level (greater than χ= 3.41) opinions in terms of both informal communication levels and organizational citizenship behaviors. We see that informal communication and organizational citizenship are related in the relationship of informal communication levels predicting organizational citizenship behaviors. In similar researches of the literature, parallel findings are seen to reveal that organizational communication and organizational citizenship are related. Quality of communication levels increase loyalty and satisfaction while lack of them influence situations such as stress and quitting [16, 56]. In this context, the height of informal communication levels influence organizational citizenship behaviors.

In the Research, the low level relation between informal communication and organizational citizenship behavior can also be seen between informal communication sub-dimension friendship and organizational citizenship behavior. Informal communication's friendship dimension affects organizational citizenship behaviors. Organizational citizenship behaviors containing voluntary behaviors towards organization are affected by the quality of friendship relations within an organization. Di Paola and Hoy [57] especially see it necessary to encourage informal groups within organizations to for the occurrence of organizational citizenship behaviors. A research by Çelik [58] in business administration sector reached findings stating that organization culture explains organizational citizenship at a high level.

It was seen that informal communication and organizational citizenship behaviors do not have a differ significantly according to gender variable. Among these results, especially the results, regarding the perception of organizational citizenship behavior at a high level, show similarities with researches in the literature [16, 59].

It was seen that informal communication and organizational citizenship behaviors do not have differ significantly according to seniority variable, except for the *influence* dimension of informal communication. In the influence dimension of informal communication, it was seen that the significant difference varied in favor of teachers with 5 years and lower seniority as well as 6-11 years of seniority, against 12 years and over seniority. In different researches [42, 60, 61]; seniority has been determined as a variable that influences organizational citizenship. However, in this study, seniority did not create a significant difference in terms of organizational citizenship behavior.

After the examination of the multiple regression analysis results for whether teachers' informal communication levels predict their organizational citizenship behaviors; it was determined that the *friendship* dimension of informal communication has a significant relation with organizational citizenship behavior and informal communication *fun, influence and information* dimensions do not have a significant relation for predicting organizational citizenship. When we examination informal communication dimensions as a whole; friendship, fun, influence and information dimensions together explain 3% of organizational citizenship. Friendship sub-dimension is a significant predictor over organizational citizenship behavior. This reveals the relation between the quality of informal communication levels and organizational citizenship behavior. Teachers' informal relations with each other can sometimes determine their voluntary behaviors towards their schools. According to Gorse and Emmitt [24], the social interaction within a group determines the social structure of that group. Informal communication has an important effect on increasing the quality of group relations. Informal groups interact face to face. According to Krant, Fish, Roof and Cholfante [62], informal communication helps employees understand each other and learn in organizations. Social relations are instruments of getting stronger. Without informal relations, performance of many common works can get harder. In this research, especially the result, regarding the prediction of organizational citizenship by the *friendship* dimension of informal communication, reveals the importance of the relations between individuals in an organization environment. Relations between individuals influence voluntary behaviors of employees towards their duties in the organization. For an organization to fulfill purposes, organization members must inevitably have formal or informal communications. The similarity between the nerve system of a living organism and informal networks in organizations, as shown by Krackhardt and Hanson [37], emphasize the importance of the nature of informal communication [27]. The dynamism of an

organization can increase and decrease based on the quality of informal networks. Lack of informal communication in organizations impact the performance of organizations. The research by Kandlousi, Ali and Abdollahi (2010) concluded that informal communication is the predictor of organizational citizenship and communication satisfaction. Achieved results bear similarities with this research.

CONCLUSION

This research concludes that informal communication levels together explain organizational citizenship behavior at a low level (3%). It can be expected that communication would affect the organizational factors at work environment, such as satisfaction and loyalty. This study also shows that, especially, informal communication predicts organizational citizenship behavior. We see that particularly the literature does not necessarily distinguish formal communication and informal communication and that it mostly focuses on relations between communication and various organizational variables. In this context, this study contributes to and enriches the literature.

In terms of schools, informal communication is important for the relationships of teachers with each other. Teachers, who use informal communication, such as friendship, fun, influence and information at different levels in schools, will increase the qualities of their relations with the school. Among the results of this research, especially the prediction relation between informal communication's sub-dimension friendship and organizational citizenship behavior can be accepted as an important result. Human relations and friendship relations encouraged at schools will be able to strengthen the organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers.

REFERENCES

1. Rimm-Kaufman, E. Sara and C. Pianta Robert, 2005. Family-school communication in preschool and kindergarten in the context of a relationship-enhancing intervention. Early Education and Development, 16(3): 287-316.

2. Niehoff, B.P. and R.H. Moorman, 1993. Justice as a Mediator of the Relationship Between Methods of Monitoring and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Academy of Management Journal, 36(3): 527-556.

3. Folger, R., 1993. Justice, motivation and performance beyond role requirements. Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 6(3): 239-248.

4. Uğurlu, C.T., 2009. Effect of ethical leadership and organizational justice behaviors of managers to organizational loyalty levels of primary school teachers (İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeylerine yöneticilerinin etik liderlik ve örgütsel adalet davranışlarının etkisi). Non-Published Doctoral Thesis, İnönü University, Malatya.

6. Polat, S., 2007. Teacher perceptions regarding organizational trust, justice and citizenship behaviors (Örgütsel güven, adalet ve vatandaşlık davranışlarına ilişkin öğretmen algıları). Non-published doctoral thesis, Hacettepe University, İzmit.

7. O'Reilly, C. and J. Chatman, 1986. Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification and internalization on prosocia behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(3): 492-509.

8. Erçetin, S., 1998. Spiral of leadership vision (Liderlik sarmalinda vizyon).Ankara: Onder.

9. Sahin, S., 2011. The relationship between instructional leadership style and school culture (Izmir Case) (Ögretimsel liderlik ve okul kültürü arasindaki iliski). Educational Sciences: Theory& Practice, 11(4)1909-1927.

10. Podsakoff, P.M., S.B. MacKenzie and W.H. Bommer, 1996. Transformational leaders' behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust and organizational citizenship behaviors. Journal of Management, 22(2): 259-98.

11. Polat, S. and C. Celep, 2008. Perceptions of secondary school teachers regarding organizational justice, organizational trust, organizational citizenship behaviors (Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel güven, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına ilişkin algıları). Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 14(54): 307-331.

12. Kayaalp, I. 2002. Egitimde iletisim dili [Communicative language in education]. Istanbul: Bilge yayincilik

13. Dökmen, Ü., 2003. Communication Conflicts and Empathy (İletişim Çatışmaları Ve Empati), Istanbul: Sistem.

14. Zıllıoğlu, M., 1996. What is communication? (İletişim Nedir?). Cem yayınevi, 2. Baskı, Istanbul.

15. Aydın, 1994. Education Management (Eğitim Yönetimi), Ankara: Hatipoğlu.

16. Cüceloğlu, D. (1997) Human and humans (Yeniden insan insana). Istanbul: Remzi.

17. Aylor, B. and P. Oppliger, 2003. Out-of-class communication and student perceptions of instructor humor orientation and socio-communicative style, Communication Education, 52(2): 122-134.

18. Timmerman, C.E., 2003. Media selection during the implemantation of planned organizational change. Management Communication Quarterly, 16(3): 301-340.

19. Crampton, S.M., J.W. Hodge and J.M. Mishra, 1998. The informal communication network: Factors influencing grapevine activity. Public Personnel Management, 27(7): 569-584.

20. Hage, J. and M. Aiken, 1971. Organization structured communications, American Sociological Review, 36: 860-871.

21. Mark, G. and V. Wulf, 1999. Changing interpersonal communication through groupware use. Behavior and İnformation Tecnology, 18(5): 385-395.

22. Kraunt, R.E., R.S. Fish, R.W. Roof and B.C. Cholfante, 2002. Informal communication in organizations: Form, function, and technology. Bellcore Morristown, NJ 07962

23. Strauss, D., 2008. Scholarly communication. Communication, 34(1): 113-129.

24. Gorse, C.A. and S. Emmitt, 2009. Informal interaction in construction progress meetings, Construction Management and Economics, 27: 983-993.

25. Erdoğan, İ., 2005. Understanding communication (İletişimi anlamak). Ankara: Erk.

26. Hollingsworth, A.T., 1974. Perceptual accuracy of the informal organization as a determinant of the effectiveness of formal leaders. Journal of Economics and Business, 27(1): 75-78.

27. Waldstrom, 2001. Informal networks in organizations: A literature review. www.org.hha.dk/org/dd (erişim:01/08/2012).

28. Groat, M., 1997. The Informal Organization: Ride the Headless Monster. Management Accounting, 75(4): 40-42.

29. Katz, D. and R.L. Kahn, 1977. Örgütlerin toplumsal psikolojisi. (Çev: H. Can ve Y. Bayar). Ankara: TODAİE.

30. Organ, D.W., 1988. Organizational citizenship behavior: the good soldier syndrome. Canada: Lexington Books.

31. Turnipseed, D.L., 2002. Exploring the link between organization citizenship behavior and personel ethics. Journal of Business Research, 55: 1-15.

32. George, J.M., 1992. The role of personality in organizational life: Issues and evidence. Journal of Management, 18: 185-213.

33. Organ, D.W. and K. Ryan, 1995. A Meta-Analytic Review of Attitudinal and Dispositional Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Personnel Psychology, 48: 775-802.

34. Kidwell, R.E., K.W. Mossholder and N. Bennett, 1997. Cohesiveness and organizational citizenship behavior: A multilevel analysis using work group and individuals. Journal of Management, 23(6): 775-793.

35. Schnake, M., 1991. Organizational citizenship: A review, proposed model and research agenda. Human Relations, 44(7): 735-59.

36. Van Dyne, L. and J.A. LePine, 1998. Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. Academy of Management Journal, 41: 108-119.

37. Krackhardt, D. and J.R. Hanson, 1993. Informal net-works: the company behind the charts. Harvard Business Review, 71(4): 104-111.

38. Fishbach, K. and D. Schoder, 2009. Analysis of informal communication networks-A case study. Business and Information Systems Engineering, 2: 140-149.

39. Weick, K.E., 1976. Educational Organizations as Losely Coupled Systems, Administrative Science Quartely, 21: 1-9.

40. Weick, K.E., 1982. Administering education in loosely coupled schools. JSTOR: The Delta Kapan, 63(10): 673-676.

41. Moorman, R.H., 1991. Relation between organizational justice and organizational Citizenship behaviors: Do equity perceptions influence employee citizenship?, Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(6): 127-33.

42. Titrek, O., M. Bayrakçı and D. Ve Zafer, 2009. Opinions of Teachers on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışlarına İlişkin Görüşleri). Akademik Bakış, 17: 1-28.

43. Çetin, M.Ö., 2004. Organizational citizenship behavior (Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı). Ankara: Nobel.

44. Bolat, O.İ. and T. Bolat, 2008. Organizational loyalty and organizational citizenship behavior at hotel administrations (Otel İşletmelerinde Örgütsel bağlılık ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı İlişkisi). Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 11(19): 75-94.

45. Çelik, M., 2007. Organization culture and organizational citizenship behavior. An Application. (Örgüt kültürü ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı. Bir uygulama). Atatürk University, Institute of Social Sciences. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, Erzurum.

46. Toprakçı, E., 2008. Class-based management (Sınıfa dayalı yönetim). Ankara: Pegem.

47. Paine, J.B. and D. ve Organ, 2002. The culturel matrix of organizational citizenshio behavior: Some preliminary conceptuel and empirical observation. Human Reseach Management Review, 10(1): 45-59.

48. Organ, D.W. and A. Lingl, 1995. Personality, Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior, The Journal of Social Psychology, 135(3): 339-350.

49. Rousseau, D.M., 1989. Psychological and Implied Contracts In Organizations, Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 2: 121-139.

50. Schnake, M., 1991. Organizational citizenship: A review, proposed model and research agenda. Human Relations, 44(7): 735-59.

51. Borman, W.C., 2004. The concept of organizational citizenship. American Psychology Society, 13(6): 238-241.

52. Yazıcıoğlu, Y. and S. Ve Erdoğan, 2004. SPSS aplied scientific research methods (SPSS uygulamalı bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri). Ankara: Detay yayıncılık.

53. Karasar, N., 1995. Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi. Ankara: 3A Araştırma Eğitim Danışmanlık.

54. Taşdan, M. and K. Yılmaz, 2008. Organizational citizenship and organizational justice scales' adaptation to Turkish. TED Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi, 33(150): 87-96.

55. Büyüköztürk, Ş., 2007. Data Analysis Manual for Social Sciences (Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı). Ankara: Pegem.

56. Lin, C.P., 2008. Clarifying the Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, Gender and Knowledge Sharing in Workplace Organizations in Taiwan, J. Bus. Psychol., 22(3): 241-250.

57. DiPaola, M.F. and W.K. Hoy, 2005. Organizational citizenship of faculty and achievement of high school students. The High School Journal, 88: 35-44.

58. Çelik, M., 2007. Organization culture and organizational citizenship behavior. An Application. (Örgüt kültürü ve örgütsel vatandaslik davranisi. Bir uygulama).Atatürk University, Institute of Social Sciences. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, Erzurum.

59. Baş G. and C. Ve Şentürk, 2011. Perceptions of primary school teachers regarding organizational justice, organizational citizenship and organizational trust (İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel vatandaşlık ve örgütsel güven algıları). Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 17(1): 29-62.

60. Samancı-Kalaycı, G., 2007. Organizational trust and organizational citizenship behavior. (Örgütsel güven ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı). Unpublished Postgraduate Thesis, Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyon.

61. Ay, B., 2007. Self-sufficiency of teachers and organizational citizenship behavior (Öğretmenlerin öz-yeterlikleri ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı). Unpublished Postgraduate Thesis, Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyon.

62. Kraunt, R.E., R.S. Fish, R.W. Roof and B.C. Cholfante, 2002. Informal communication in organizations: Form, function, and technology. Bellcore Morristown, NJ 07962

63. Kandlousi, N.S.A.E., A.J. Ali and A. Ve Abdollahi, 2010. Organizational citizenship behavior in concem of communication satisfaction: The role of the formal and informal communication, Intemational Joumal of Business and Management, 5(10): 51-61.