

## Teachers' Psychological Contract Perceptions and Person-Environment Fit Levels\*

Nihan DEMIRKASIMOĞLU†

### Atıf:

Demirkasimoğlu, N. (2014). Teachers' psychological contract perceptions and person-environment fit levels. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 56 , 45-68.

### Abstract

*Problem Statement:* Modern management approaches attach great importance to both the informal and the economic aspects of the organizations. Identifying teachers' psychological contract types and fit levels of a work environment in terms of variables such as seniority, educational degree, and school type will lead to discovery of the motivational factors of the employment relationship in school organizations.

*Purpose of Study:* This research was aimed at determining the psychological contract perceptions and person-environment fit levels of public and private elementary school teachers.

*Methodology:* This study was designed with single and correlational survey models. Public school teachers were represented by 375 participants, and private school teachers were represented by 201 participants in the sampling. While determining teachers' psychological contract perceptions, the "Psychological Contract Inventory" developed by Rousseau (2000) was adapted to Turkish teachers. Teachers' "Person-Environment Fit" scale was developed by the researcher.

*Findings and Results:* The most dominant psychological contract type was the relational contract, followed by balanced, transitional, and transactional contracts. The highest level of person-environment fit was teacher-job fit, followed by teacher-group fit, teacher-supervisor fit, and teacher-school fit. Both public and private school teachers were fitted with

---

\* This article is a part of a PhD thesis supervised by Prof. Dr. İnyet Aydın in the Faculty of Educational Sciences, Ankara University.

† Asst. Prof. Dr. Ankara University, Faculty of Educational Sciences, 06590, Ankara, Turkey, e-mail: nihansal@yahoo.com

their “jobs” mostly. Teachers thought that they fit with their work environment highly in terms of its components.

*Conclusions and Recommendations:* Teachers had dominantly developed a relational psychological contract. School type, seniority, and educational degree were variables that made significant differences in transactional and relational contracts. Private school teachers’ scores were higher than the public school teachers in regard to relational contract type. Balanced contract perception was the highest type after the relational contracts. Private school teachers’ fit levels with “their jobs” are higher than public school teachers’, and they were also more positive than the public school teachers in balanced type. It was concluded that public and private school teachers in Ankara province developed a positive psychological contract and high level of person-environment fit. Public school teachers with associate degrees had higher levels of school fit than those with undergraduate and graduate degrees. In general, as the seniority increases, teacher-school fit increases as well. If shared expectancies will be negotiated between teachers and administrators, positive psychological contracts will be more common. A well-designed orientation process for new coming teachers will make the compliance process easier.

*Keywords:* Psychological contract, person-environment fit, public and private school teachers.

## Introduction

Despite earlier interest in the psychological contract (PC) phenomenon in organizational literature, it did not fully emerge nor was it deeply analyzed in management theory until the 1990s. Interest in the PC was driven by newer and more innovative people-management practices based on more competitive international market dynamics (Cullinane & Dundon, 2006). The PC has gained its construct status and has taken conceptual and empirical turns with the seminal works initiated by Rousseau since the 1990s (Sels, Janssens, & Van den Brande, 2004). Interpreting this construct with a new perspective, Rousseau (1989) defined the psychological contract by focusing on the individuality of the employee instead of focusing on the relationship between organization and employee, which is a bilateral exchange relationship. According to the author, PC is an *employee’s* individual beliefs related to the reciprocal responsibilities in the employer-employee relationship.

According to Schalk and Roe (2007), the existence of the PC is the indicator of the employee’s commitment to the organization. In the related literature, it has been proposed that PC is a very important motivator for employees, and if the responsibilities of the organization were neglected, the employees’ trust and organizational commitment decrease, while turnover rates increase (Coyle-Shapiro, 2002; Buyens & Schalk, 2005). These arguments were tested by several empirical studies, and it is evident that PC is related to variables such as performance,

commitment, trust, and employee status (Sturges, Conway & Guest, 2005; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2002; Castaing, 2006).

Rousseau (1995, p. 98) categorizes PC types as transactional, relational, balanced, and transitional. A transactional contract is a short-term contract which involves limited and specific employee responsibilities (Dabos & Rousseau, 2004). Employees' involvement is weak, and turnover is easy and high, so the employees' devotion is weak (Rousseau, 1995, 98). A relational contract is a type in which employees' commitment, stability, and trust are preliminarily based on emotional factors (Rousseau, 1995, p. 98). Since a balanced contract combines the relational and transactional contract characteristics, it is called *balanced* or *hybrid* (Yin & Xu, 2008). Transitional contract terms are not considered to be a PC form itself by Rousseau (2000), and it reflects cognitive statements composed of mistrust, uncertainty, and erosion dimensions. Mistrust indicates the employee's distrust of the organization; uncertainty indicates that the employee cannot predict the direction of the employment relationship, and erosion means that the employee has a loss of benefits compared to the past (McDonald & Makin, 2000).

#### *Person-Environment Fit*

Person-environment (P-E) fit is defined as the match between the individual and the work environment (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman & Johnson, 2005). Among the P-E fit levels, the most comprehensive is *person-job fit*, which is described as the match between the necessities or characteristics of a job and an individual's abilities (Kristof, 1996; Sekiguchi, 2004; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman & Johnson, 2005).

The newest form of P-E fit is person-group fit, which focuses on the relationships between individuals and their work groups (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman & Johnson, 2005). Researches have proved that employees accepting the group norms have more positive attitudes towards their work. The underlying idea here is that the weak aspects of members will be complemented by the strong aspects of the other group members (Edwards & Cooper, 1990; Werbel & Johnson, 2001). The third P-E fit level is one of the dyadic relationships between individuals and their work environments and is called the person-supervisor fit. Leader-follower value congruence, the degree of similarity of superior-subordinate personalities, and the goal congruence of supervisor-subordinate are the types of research included in this category. Person-organization fit occurs when an organization satisfies the needs and preferences of an employee (Kristof, 1996). Chatman defined (1991) person-organization fit as "the congruence between patterns of organizational values and patterns of individual values."

This research is an attempt to understand the under-researched topic of teachers' PC in the Turkish context and its relationship with their P-E fit levels, which seems to be an important instrument to analyze and interpret their work attitudes and behaviors. One reason that this topic is important is that the modern management approach also attaches importance to both the management of human resources and economic contracts. Teachers with a positive PC and higher P-E fit levels would be expected to be satisfied with their work and work environments. Despite intense

academic interest in the organization and management literature, its reflection in national and international educational research is very limited with focus on the academicians' PC perceptions (e.g. Aydin, Yilmaz, Memduhoğlu, Oğuz and Güngör, 2008; Zhang & Jiongliang, 2005). The aim of this research is to determine the PC perceptions and P-E fit levels of public and private elementary school teachers in Ankara province in relation to school type, seniority, and educational degree variables.

## Methodology

### *Research Design*

This study was designed with single and correlational survey models. With the single survey model, psychological contract perceptions and person-environment fit levels of teachers were determined. With the correlational survey model, the relationship between the psychological contract and person-environment fit was tested.

### *Research Sample*

The sample of this research consisted of two sub-populations. According to Sekeran and Bougie (2009), 10273 public school teachers would be represented by 375 and 866 private school teachers would be represented by 234 teachers in the sampling with 95% confidence interval. Stratified sampling was used for statistical data collection. 375 public school teachers were fully reached, while 85.89% of private school teachers were reached with 201 participants, because a limited number of private school administrators permitted the research instrument to be implemented.

The public (70%) and private (83%) school teachers were dominantly female. The public school sample tended to be predominantly middle-seniority range with 6% in the 1-5 year range, 14% in the 6-10 year range, 33% in the 11-15 year range, 24% in the 16-20 year range, and 23% in the 21+ year range. The private school participants' seniority ranges were as follows: 20% in the 1-5 years range, 21% in the 6-10 years range, 23% in the 11-15 years, 6% in the 16-20 years range, and 30% in the 21+ year range. The largest educational degree of public school participants was undergraduate (76%), followed by associate degrees (16%) and graduate (8%). Finally, 72% of the private school teachers had an undergraduate degree, followed by 19% associate and 9% graduate degrees.

### *Research Instruments and Procedure*

The Psychological Contract Inventory (PCI) developed by Rousseau (2000) was adapted to Turkish by the researcher. PCI includes subscales both under the dimensions of "Employer Obligations" and "Employee Obligations" with the transactional (8 items), relational (8 items), and balanced terms (12 items). "Transitional Contract" was composed of 12 items. The Person-Environment (P-E) Scale was developed by the researcher. A pilot study was undertaken with 140 teachers in total consisting of 70 private and 70 public schools teachers. Data analysis was made by means of the descriptive statistical techniques such as percentage, frequency, arithmetical mean, and standard deviation. A t-test was used to find out

whether school teachers' psychological contract perceptions and person-environment fit levels were significantly different in terms of their gender and school type. The Kruskal-Wallis H test was used in order to find out whether school teachers' psychological contract perceptions and person-environment fit levels were significantly different in terms of seniority and education level. Lastly, regression analysis technique was used to determine the predictivity level of the teacher-environment fit on psychological contract types. A significance level of .05 was used as a cut-off.

#### *Validity and Reliability Analyses*

*Transactional Contract Scale (TCS).* In the *employee responsibility* dimension, as a result of CFA, one item was excluded because its standardized path coefficient was not significant again. CFA showed a good fit for the measurement model ( $X^2=10.00$ ,  $p=.026$ ,  $Ss=8$ ). Other fit statistics were within the recommended ranges (RMSEA=.042, GFI=.98, AGFI=.94, CFI=.98, NNFI=.96). Cronbach's alpha for a two-factor scale is .67. In the *employer responsibility* dimension, CFA results for TCS were as follows:  $\chi^2=11.02$ ,  $p=.020$ ,  $sd=8$ , RMSEA=.052, GFI=.97, AGFI=.93, CFI=.98, NNFI=.97. These indices implied that the model had a good fit. This two-factor scale had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .67.

*Relational Contract Scale (RCS).* Fit indices provided by CFA results were found to be within the acceptable ranges ( $X^2=20.57$ ,  $df=8$ ,  $p=.00$ ; RMSEA=.10; GFI=.95; AGFI=.88; CFI=.97; NNFI=.95) for *employee responsibilities*. The scale had internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of .82. Fit indices provided by CFA results were found to be good for all the fit indices ( $X^2=20.57$ ,  $df=8$ ,  $p=.00$ ; RMSEA=.10; GFI=.95; AGFI=.88; CFI=.97; NNFI=.95). The scale had internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of .75 for *employer responsibilities*.

*Balanced Contract Scale (BCS).* The *external marketability* dimension was correlated with the other latent variables, so the analysis was performed again after excluding this sub-dimension. The CFA analysis results were as follows:  $X^2=8.79$ ,  $df=8$ ,  $p=0.36$ , RMSEA=.02, GFI=.98, AGFI=.95, CFI=1.00, NNFI=1.00. These fit indices show that  $X^2/df=1.09$  in particular had a good fit for *employee responsibilities*. CFA analysis results ( $X^2=8.79$ ,  $df=8$ ,  $p=0.36$ , RMSEA=.02, GFI=.98, AGFI=.95, CFI=1.00, NNFI=1.00) show that the model had a good fit. The reliability coefficient of the scale was .85 for *employer responsibilities*.

*Transitional Contract.* As a result of CFA, three items were removed, because the t-value was not significant at the level of .05, and the analysis was performed again. The indices related to the factor structure have good values:  $\chi^2/df=1.79$ , RMSEA=.07, GFI=.94, AGFI=.88, CFI=.98, NNFI=.96. Cronbach's alpha of the PCI was calculated as .89.

*P-E Fit Scale.* Before pilot testing, 32 items were subjected to the P-E Fit Scale (PEFS). KMO was found to be .88, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ( $p<.01$ ). PEFS resulted in four initial factors with eigenvalues greater than unity. Five items were omitted because of overlapping and low correlation (below .30). After factor rotation, the four-factor scale consisted of 22 items in total (Table 1).

**Table 1***Validity and Reliability Results of Teachers' P-E Fit Scale.*

| Factor                 | Number of items | Factor loadings | Corrected item correlation | Cronbach Alpha |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| Teacher-Supervisor Fit | 8               | .54-.86         | .65-.73                    | .91            |
| Teacher-Job Fit        | 5               | .72-.84         | .60-.71                    | .91            |
| Teacher-Group Fit      | 5               | .54-.81         | .46-.64                    | .86            |
| Teacher-School Fit     | 4               | .54-.78         | .37-.64                    | .83            |

Cronbach's Alpha = .94

These four factors respectively represented 24.73%, 18.58%, 15.78%, and 13.59% of the total variance, which was 72.70% in total. PEFS showed good internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .94).

### Findings

Teachers' perceptions related to psychological contract types are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2***Means and Standard Deviation Values Related to Psychological Contract Types.*

| Dimensions           |         | Transactional | SD  | Relational | SD  | Balanced | SD   | Transactional | SD  |
|----------------------|---------|---------------|-----|------------|-----|----------|------|---------------|-----|
|                      |         | M             |     | M          |     | M        |      | M             |     |
| Teachers' Obligation | Public  | 1.95          | .74 | 3.62       | .80 | 3.38     | .78  |               |     |
|                      | Private | 2.05          | .76 | 3.81       | .86 | 3.70     | .77  |               |     |
| Schools' Obligation  | Public  | 2.11          | .74 | 3.66       | .80 | 2.96     | .87  | 2.15          | .92 |
|                      | Private | 2.31          | .83 | 3.40       | .88 | 3.05     | 1.03 | 2.34          | .95 |

The most dominant PC type among public ( $M_{(\text{teachers' obligation})} = 3.62$ ;  $M_{(\text{schools' obligation})} = 3.66$ ) and private ( $M_{(\text{teachers' obligation})} = 3.81$ ;  $M_{(\text{schools' obligation})} = 3.40$ ) school teachers was the relational contract, followed by the balanced contract. Private school teachers ( $M_{(\text{teachers' obligation})} = 3.70$ ;  $M_{(\text{schools' obligation})} = 3.05$ ) were more positive than the public school teachers ( $M_{(\text{teachers' obligation})} = 3.38$ ;  $M_{(\text{schools' obligation})} = 2.96$ ) in the balanced type. The transactional contract was the type for which the teachers' fulfillment level

of their obligations was the lowest. The total scores from the subdimensions of “distrust, uncertainty, and erosion” showed that both public (M=2.15) and private (M=2.34) school teachers had low levels of transitional contract perception.

#### *Independent Variables Results Related to Transactional Contract*

*School type.* There was no difference between the public and private school teachers’ perceptions in the *employee obligations* dimension [ $t_{(574)}=1.49$ ;  $p>.05$ ], whereas there was a difference in the *employer obligations* dimension [ $t_{(574)}=2.97$ ;  $p<.05$ ].

*Seniority.* Perceptions of public [ $\chi^2(4)=10.96$ ,  $p<.05$ ] and private [ $\chi^2(4)=15.33$ ,  $p<.05$ ] school teachers related to transactional contract varied both in employer and employee obligations. Public (mean rank=216.50) and private (mean rank=123.69) school teachers with 21+ years of experience had a higher level of transactional contract perception compared with the other seniority groups. Private school teachers’ perceptions of the transactional contract was the highest in the most senior teachers in both employer and employee obligations.

In the *employer obligations* dimension, the transactional contract perceptions of both public [ $\chi^2(4)=44.37$ ,  $p<.05$ ] and private school teachers [ $\chi^2(4)=15.71$ ,  $p<.05$ ] were significantly varied. Among the private school teachers, the highest level of transactional contract perception belonged to the teachers with highest seniority (mean rank=122.29), while the lowest scores belonged to the teachers with lowest seniority (mean rank=88.17). Public school teachers with 1-5 years of seniority (mean rank=266.52) had a stronger transactional contract related to the school’s obligations.

*Educational Degree.* Perceptions of public [ $\chi^2(2)=22.93$ ,  $p<.05$ ] and private [ $\chi^2(2)=7.20$ ,  $p<.05$ ] school teachers related to the transactional contract varied in the employer obligations dimension but not in the employee obligations according to the public [ $\chi^2(2)=5.70$ ,  $p>.05$ ] and private [ $\chi^2(2)=3.44$ ,  $p>.05$ ] school teachers. Public (mean rank=242.73) and private (mean rank=215.25) school teachers with associate degrees had a higher level of transactional contract perception than the teachers with graduate degrees.

#### *Independent Variable Results Related to Relational Contract*

*School Type.* In the employee responsibility dimension, participants’ perceptions related to relational contract significantly varied [ $t_{(574)}=2.56$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Private school teachers’ scores (M=22.88) were higher than those of public school teachers (M=21.77) in relation to the relational contract type. This finding contradicts the theoretical assumption that permanent workers are more likely to have emotional attachment and relational contract. High levels of relational contract perceptions of private school teachers could be explained with their desire to keep their status in the school by displaying extra-role behaviors and their tendency to perform their duties more willingly. In the employer responsibility dimension, public school teachers

( $M=25.68$ ) were more positive about the school obligations than the private school teachers ( $M=28.83$ ) [ $t_{(574)}=3.65$ ;  $p<.05$ ].

*Seniority.* Teachers' opinions related to their relational obligations significantly varied among public school teachers [ $\chi^2(4)=44.37$ ,  $p<.05$ ] in terms of seniority, whereas private school teachers' perceptions did not vary [ $\chi^2(4)=4.20$ ,  $p<.05$ ]. Teachers with 21 years of seniority or more perceived that they fulfill *their* relational obligations more than the teachers with 6-10 years of seniority.

*Educational Degree.* Relational PC perceptions of teachers varied significantly among public school teachers in the employee obligations dimension [ $\chi^2(3)=33.20$ ,  $p<.05$ ], while they did not vary in employer obligations. Teachers with an associate degree (mean rank = 261.94) had a stronger relational PC perception than the teachers with a graduate degree (mean rank = 160.59).

#### *Independent Variables Results related to Balanced Contract*

*School type.* Teachers' perceptions were not significantly related to employers' BC type according to school type [ $t_{(574)}=1.05$ ;  $p>.05$ ]. Teachers' perceptions related to schools' balanced contract obligations varied significantly [ $t_{(574)}=4.75$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Private school teachers' perception levels [ $\chi^2(4)=5.83$ ,  $p>.05$ ] of BC fulfillment were higher than those of public school teachers [ $\chi^2(4)=2.98$ ,  $p>.05$ ].

*Seniority.* Teachers' balanced contract perceptions significantly varied among private school teachers [ $\chi^2(4)=20.64$ ,  $p<.05$ ] in terms of seniority, whereas public school teachers' perceptions did not vary [ $\chi^2(4)=4.20$ ,  $p<.05$ ]. Private school teachers with 1-5 years of seniority (mean rank = 129.46) had a higher level of fulfillment perception related to "adjusting changing performance demands," "seeking out developmental opportunities that enhance their value to their employer," and "actively seeking internal opportunities for training and development."

#### *Independent Variables Results related to Transitional Contract*

*School type.* Private school teachers' ( $M=21.10$ ) transitional contract scores were higher than the public school teachers' ( $M=19.37$ ), as expected [ $t_{(574)}=2.34$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. This finding implied that private school teachers distrust their employer more; they had difficulty in predicting the direction of employment relationship in the future and their benefits were decreased compared to the past.

*Seniority.* Public school teachers (mean rank=228.43) with 0-5 years of seniority had a stronger level of transitional contract than the teachers with 11-15 (mean rank=162.54) years of seniority [ $\chi^2(4)=12.9$ ,  $p<.05$ ], while private school teachers' perception did not significantly vary [ $\chi^2(4)=5.83$ ,  $p<.05$ ].

*Educational Degree.* Transitional PC perceptions of teachers did not show a significant difference related to the educational degree variable according to public [ $\chi^2(3)=2.45$ ,  $p>.05$ ] and private school teachers' views [ $\chi^2(4)=3.43$ ,  $p>.05$ ].



*Findings related to P-E Fit Levels of Teachers*

Both public and private school teachers fit with their jobs mostly ( $M_{(\text{public})}=3.86$ ;  $M_{(\text{private})}=4.20$ ), followed by teacher-group fit ( $M_{(\text{public})}=3.81$ ;  $M_{(\text{private})}=3.89$ ), teacher-supervisor fit ( $M_{(\text{public})}=3.58$ ;  $M_{(\text{private})}=3.72$ ) and teacher-school fit ( $M_{(\text{public})}=3.37$ ;  $M=3.57_{(\text{private})}$ ) respectively (Table 3).

**Table 3**

*Person-environment fit levels of teachers.*

| School type | Teacher-school fit<br>M | Ss  | Teacher-job fit<br>M | Ss  | Teacher-supervisor fit<br>M | Ss  | Teacher-Group fit<br>M | Ss  |
|-------------|-------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|-----------------------------|-----|------------------------|-----|
| Public      | 3.37                    | .87 | 3.86                 | .82 | 3.58                        | .86 | 3.81                   | .59 |
| Private     | 3.57                    | .93 | 4.20                 | .74 | 3.72                        | .98 | 3.89                   | .48 |

As seen in Table 3, teachers thought that they fit with their work environment highly in terms of its components.

*Independent Variable Results Related to Teacher-School Fit*

*School type.* Teachers' fit levels with their schools significantly among public and private school teachers [ $t_{(574)}= 2.58$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Private school teachers ( $M=14.30$ ) agreed more strongly than the public school teachers ( $M=13.48$ ).

*Seniority.* Teachers with 0-5 years of seniority (mean rank=139.75) had higher scores than the 11-15 and 21+ seniority groups. Teachers with 6-10 years of seniority had higher scores than the 21+ seniority group.

*Educational degree.* Public school teachers with associate degrees (mean rank=226.12) had a higher level of fit than those with undergraduate (mean rank=183.70) and graduate degrees (mean rank=152.97). This suggests that teachers' fit level decreases as the educational degree increases.

*Independent Variables Results related to Teacher-Job Fit*

*School type.* Private school teachers' fit levels with "their jobs" are higher than those of public school teachers [ $t_{(574)}= 4.64$ ,  $p<.05$ ]. This difference may have resulted from differences in the personnel selection processes.

*Seniority.* Public school teachers with 21+ years of seniority (mean=171.62) had higher scores than those with 1-5 years (mean=159.52), 11-15 years (mean rank =186.06), and 16-20 (mean rank =175.97) years of seniority [ $\chi^2(4)$ ]=11.82,  $p<.05$ ]. Private school teachers' perception did not significantly vary according to seniority [ $\chi^2(4)$ ]=3.19,  $p>.05$ ]. Public teachers with 21+ years of seniority had the highest level of job fit, while new teachers had the lowest job fit scores.

*Educational degree.* Private school teachers' job fit level [ $\chi^2(2)$ ]=3.13,  $p>.05$ ] had no difference related to the educational degree, whereas public school teachers' level varied significantly [ $\chi^2(2)$ ]=14.39,  $p<.05$ ]. Teachers with associate degrees (mean rank=236.95) had the highest level of fit with their jobs.

#### *Independent Variables Results Related to Teacher-Supervisor Fit*

*School type.* Teachers' fit levels did not significantly vary according to the school type variable [ $t(574)$ ]= 1.73,  $p>.05$ ].

*Seniority.* Teacher-supervisor fit levels of teachers showed a significant difference among private school teachers [ $\chi^2(4)$ ]= 13.65,  $p<.05$ ]. The highest level of supervisor fit belonged mostly to the 0-5 year seniority group followed by the 21+ year seniority private school teachers.

*Educational degree.* Educational degree was not a statistically significant variable for both public [ $\chi^2(2)$ ]=1.60,  $p>.05$ ] and private [ $\chi^2(2)$ ]=2.81,  $p>.05$ ] school teachers in terms of teacher-supervisor fit.

#### *Independent Variables Results Related to Teacher-Group Fit*

*School type.* There was no difference between the teachers' fit levels with their colleagues according to school type [ $t(574)$ ]= 1.73,  $p>.05$ ].

*Seniority.* Seniority was not a statistically significant variable for public [ $\chi^2(4)$ ]=6.88,  $p>.05$ ] and private [ $\chi^2(4)$ ]=4.62,  $p>.05$ ] school teachers.

*Educational degree.* There was no difference related to the educational degree of public [ $\chi^2(2)$ ]=4.35,  $p>.05$ ] and private [ $\chi^2(2)$ ]=.72,  $p>.05$ ] school teachers' fit levels with their colleagues.

#### *Regression Findings Related to PC and P-E Fit*

*Transactional Contract.* Multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict the P-E subscales on PC types (Table 4).

**Table 4***Regression of the types of P-E fit on transactional contract.*

|                      |  | Variables              | B                     | SE                 | $\beta$  | t     | p   |
|----------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|----------|-------|-----|
| Employee Obligations |  | Teacher-school fit     | -.15                  | .074               | -.12     | -2.08 | .03 |
|                      |  | Teacher-job fit        | -.02                  | .058               | -.02     | -.50  | .61 |
|                      |  | Teacher-supervisor fit | .00                   | .034               | .00      | .00   | .99 |
|                      |  | Teacher-group fit      | .05                   | .075               | .032     | .68   | .49 |
|                      |  | Teacher-school fit     | -.15                  | .074               | -.12     | -2.08 | .03 |
|                      |  | R = 0.13               | R <sup>2</sup> = 0.17 | F (4,571) = 2.506  | p = 0.41 |       |     |
|                      |  | Variables              | B                     | SE                 | $\beta$  | t     | p   |
| Employer Obligations |  | Teacher-school fit     | -.07                  | .07                | -.06     | -1.02 | .30 |
|                      |  | Teacher-job fit        | -.04                  | .05                | -.04     | -.83  | .40 |
|                      |  | Teacher-supervisor fit | -.11                  | .03                | -.17     | -3.22 | .00 |
|                      |  | Teacher-group fit      | -.02                  | .07                | -.01     | -.26  | .79 |
|                      |  | Teacher-school fit     | -.07                  | .07                | -.06     | -1.02 | .30 |
|                      |  | R = 0.24               | R <sup>2</sup> = 0.06 | F = (4,571) = 9.14 | p = .000 |       |     |

In the “*Employee Responsibilities*” dimension, the combined predictor set of teacher-environment fit was a significant predictor of transactional PC ( $R=0.131$ ,  $R^2 = 0.17$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Four subdimensions of P-E fit were positively related to the transactional contract at a low level ( $R = 0.131$ ) and explained 17% of the total variance. Only the teacher-supervisor fit of the P-E fit ( $\beta = .125$ ,  $p < .05$ ) predicted the transactional contract negatively and significantly.

In the “*Employee Responsibilities*” dimension, combined P-E fit dimensions accounted for significant variance in the transactional contract ( $R=0.24$ ,  $R^2 = 0.06$ ,  $p < .05$ ). These variables had a low-level relationship with transactional PC ( $R=0.24$ ), explaining .06% of the total variance. Only teacher-supervisor fit ( $\beta = 0.17$ ,  $p < .05$ ) of P-E types predicted the transactional contract significantly and negatively.

**Relational Contract.** Findings from the multiple regression of the P-E fit types on relational contract are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5**

*Regression of the types of P-E fit on relational contract*

|                      |  | Variables              | B                      | SE                             | $\beta$ | t      | p   |
|----------------------|--|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--------|-----|
| Employee Obligations |  | Teacher-school fit     | .48                    | .07                            | .35     | 6.99   | .00 |
|                      |  | Teacher-job fit        | .13                    | .05                            | .10     | 2.40   | .01 |
|                      |  | Teacher-supervisor fit | .03                    | .03                            | .04     | .99    | .32 |
|                      |  | Teacher-group fit      | .22                    | .07                            | .12     | 3.16   | .00 |
|                      |  | R = 0.52               | R <sup>2</sup> =0.27   | F = <sub>(4,571)</sub> = 54.35 |         | p= .00 |     |
|                      |  | Variables              | B                      | SE                             | $\beta$ | t      | p   |
| Employer Obligations |  | Teacher-school fit     | .32                    | .07                            | .20     | 4.20   |     |
|                      |  | Teacher-job fit        | -.21                   | .06                            | -.15    | -3.61  |     |
|                      |  | Teacher-supervisor fit | .41                    | .03                            | .51     | 11.79  |     |
|                      |  | Teacher-group fit      | .09                    | .07                            | .04     | 1.22   |     |
|                      |  | R = 0.61               | R <sup>2</sup> = 0.378 | F <sub>(4,571)</sub> = 86.69   |         | p= .00 |     |

In the “*Employee Responsibilities*” dimension, the combined predictor set of the teacher-environment fit was found to be a significant predictor of relational PC ( $R=0.52$ ,  $R^2 = 0.38$ ,  $p<.05$ ). P-E fit types had a moderate level of positive relationship ( $R= 0.525$ ) with relational contract and explained 28% of the total variance.

In “*Employee Responsibilities*” dimension combined P-E fit dimensions had a significant effect on relational contracts of teachers ( $R=0.61$ ,  $R^2= 0.37$ ,  $p< .05$ ). These variables had a moderate-level relationship with relational PC ( $R=0.61$ ), explaining 38% of the total variance. Examination of the unique effects of teacher-school ( $\beta= .20$ ,  $p< .05$ ) and teacher-supervisor fit ( $\beta=.51$ ,  $p<.05$ ) variables revealed that these variables predicted the relational PC perceptions significantly and positively, whereas the teacher-job variable ( $\beta= .15$ ,  $p<.05$ ) was a negatively significant predictor.

**Balanced Contract.** Findings from the multiple regression of the P-E fit types on balanced contract are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6***Regression of the types of P-E fit on balanced contract*

| Employee Obligations | Variables              | B                     | SE                             | $\beta$  | t    | p   |
|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|----------|------|-----|
|                      | Teacher-school fit     | .29                   | .06                            | .22      | 4.27 | .00 |
|                      | Teacher-job fit        | .22                   | .05                            | .18      | 4.08 | .00 |
|                      | Teacher-supervisor fit | .07                   | .03                            | .11      | 2.31 | .02 |
|                      | Teacher-group fit      | .09                   | .07                            | .05      | 1.33 | .18 |
| R = 0.47             |                        | R <sup>2</sup> = 0.22 | F = <sub>(4,571)</sub> = 41.18 | p = .00  |      |     |
| Employer Obligations | Variables              | B                     | SE                             | $\beta$  | t    | p   |
|                      | Teacher-school fit     | .70                   | .07                            | .39      | 9.02 | .00 |
|                      | Teacher-job fit        | .01                   | .06                            | .00      | .21  | .83 |
|                      | Teacher-supervisor fit | .33                   | .03                            | .37      | 9.23 | .00 |
|                      | Teacher-group fit      | -.06                  | .07                            | -.02     | -.80 | .42 |
| R = 0.24             |                        | R <sup>2</sup> = 0.06 | F = <sub>(4,571)</sub> = 9.14  | p = .000 |      |     |

The P-E fit levels of teachers predicted significant variance on balanced PC with a low-level relationship and explained 22% of the total variance ( $R=0.47$ ,  $R^2=0.22$ ,  $p<.05$ ). P-E fit levels also predicted the balanced contract perceptions of teachers ( $R=0.68$ ,  $R^2 = 0.47$ ,  $p<.05$ ) in the "Employer Obligations" dimension at a moderate level and significantly. It explained 47% of the total variance. Teacher-school fit ( $\beta= .39$ ,  $p<.05$ ) and teacher-supervisor fit ( $\beta= .37$ ,  $p<.05$ ) variables predicted the balanced contract perceptions of teachers positively and significantly.

**Transitional Contract.** The multiple regression analysis of the types of P-E fit on transitional contract is presented in Table 7.

**Table 7***Regression of the types of P-E fit on transitional contract*

|                       | Variables              | B                     | SE                          | $\beta$ | t     | p   |
|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---------|-------|-----|
| Transitional Contract | Teacher-school fit     | -.17                  | .13                         | -.07    | -1.33 | .18 |
|                       | Teacher-job fit        | .00                   | .10                         | .00     | -.00  | .99 |
|                       | Teacher-supervisor fit | .00                   | .06                         | .00     | .09   | .92 |
|                       | Teacher-group fit      | -.30                  | .13                         | -.10    | -2.27 | .02 |
|                       | R = 0.15               | R <sup>2</sup> = 0.02 | F <sub>(4,571)</sub> = 3.32 | p = .01 |       |     |

The combined predictor set of teacher-environment fit was a significant predictor of transitional PC ( $R=0.15$ ,  $R^2= 0.02$ ,  $p< .05$ ). P-E fit variables showed a low-level relationship ( $R=0.15$ ) and explained 2% of the total variance. Only teacher-group fit predicted the transitional contract significantly and negatively.

### Discussion and Conclusion

The most dominant PC type among public and private school teachers was the relational contract. Besides this, teachers' perceptions related to the relational contract fulfillment levels of teachers and schools were almost equal. This means that the cornerstone of the "mutuality principle" of PC in the relational contract existed in teacher-school relationships. This finding empirically proved Rousseau's arguments (1990) about the formation of PC indicating "what the employee feels she or he owes and is owed in turn by the organization." Also, in a study on public servants' PC perceptions in the United Kingdom, Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler (2003) asserted that organizational commitment would be achieved by the mutuality norm. Similarly, Brown and Roloff (2011) proved that as the school administrators' fulfillment level of the PC increased, the level of teachers' commitment increased.

The Balanced contract followed the relational type followed in turn by the transitional contract. Private school teachers were more positive than the public school teachers in the balanced type. The transactional contract was the type for which teachers' fulfillment levels of their obligations was the lowest. O'Donohue's (2007) finding that public sector teachers' PC perception was higher in the relational type than the transactional type was in accordance with the findings of this study. In another study conducted by Propp (2004) on school administrators, "short-term" and "narrow" employee responsibilities were rated with a low-level agreement.

Transactional contract perceptions of teachers were weak, which meant that their PC was strong. Teachers had dominantly developed a relational PC. Findings of these study suggested that teachers *did not* see their employment relationship as solely an exchange relationship based on "short-term" and "narrow" obligations. Scores were low. Since a transitional contract is not characterized by the desired

expectations in an employment relationship, low scores of distrust, uncertainty, and erosion subdimensions of the transitional contract implied a good PC.

Private school teachers had higher transactional perception than the public school teachers. This could be explained with the difference between public and private schools teachers' employment conditions. In Turkey, public school teachers are employed in a permanent status, while private school teachers work with one-year contracts. Private school teachers seemed to perceive their employment relationship as more economical and less guaranteed. De Cuyper, Rigotti, Witte, and Mohr (2008) asserted that a transactional contract is influenced by performance-based factors. So, the private school teachers were possibly influenced by performance-based factors such as losing their job and not exceeding their specifically limited obligations. This finding is parallel to the findings of Millward and Brewerton (2000), which proved that permanent employees have a stronger relational contract than temporary employees, and that fulltime employees have a stronger relational contract than part-time workers.

Public and private school teachers with 21+ years of seniority had a higher level of transactional contract perception in comparison to the other seniority groups. One possible reason for this might be teachers' retirement plans in the later years of working life. They might be avoiding from making long-term plans. Private school teachers' perceptions of a transactional contract is the highest in the most senior teachers in both employer and employee obligations. Bhattacharya, Rayton, and Kinnie (2009) similarly found that transactional contracts of employees increase as the employees' age increases. In a study by Rousseau (1990) with a sample of newly recruited MBA students, no correlation was found between participants' transactional contract type and intentions to stay with the recruiting organization. Similarly, in research by Mimaroglu (2008), medical sales people's transactional contract perceptions did not vary according to their working period in the sector or firm. This inconsistency may be linked to the fact that the research in different sectors had unique conditions.

Public school teachers with 1-5 years of seniority had a stronger transactional contract related to the school's obligations. In accordance with this data, Özkalp (2004) suggested that newcomers in organizations have a transactional contract type until they have the feeling of continuity. This situation could be expanded with Louis's (1980) sense-making approach, which asserted that newcomers' experiences in the orientation period and their start in the organization membership affect their PC.

Private school teachers' scores were higher than the public school teachers scores related to the relational contract type. This finding contradicts the theoretical assumption that permanent workers are more likely to have emotional attachment and relational contract. High levels of relational contract perceptions of private school teachers could be explained with their desire to keep their status in the school by displaying extra-role behaviors and their tendency to perform their duties more willingly.

In the employer responsibility dimension, public school teachers were more positive about the school obligations than the private school teachers, which contradicts with McDonald and Makin's findings that temporary workers have a higher level of relational contract than permanent workers. Oppositely, Milward and Brewerton (1999) did not find a difference between temporary and permanent workers. Lierich and Christine O'Connor (2009) reported that no difference was found between teachers' organizational commitment behavior and temporary or permanent status. Bellou (2007) also reported that workers in the private and public sector were almost the same in terms of the different subdimensions of a psychological contract.

Teachers with associate degrees had a stronger relational PC perception than the teachers with graduate degrees. As the educational degree decreases, the relational PC perception becomes stronger. This finding can be explained with the findings of Roehling (2008), who proved that employees' expectancies with higher educational degrees were not met satisfactorily by their employers in terms of interesting and meaningful work. It seems that employees with higher educational degrees expect much more than the others.

Private school teachers' balanced contract levels were higher than those of public school teachers. In a study by Jong, Schalk, and Cuyper (2009), it was found that employees with permanent status had higher balanced contract perceptions than the employees with temporary status. This difference occurs because of the competitive working conditions of private school teachers who are forced by schools to improve themselves continuously.

Private school teachers with 1-5 years of seniority had a higher level of fulfillment perception related to "adjusting changing performance demands," "seeking out developmental opportunities that enhance their value to their employer," and "actively seeking internal opportunities for training and development." Shuping (2009) also reported that knowledge workers at an iron ore mining company in South Africa had a level of balanced contract in employees with 0-5 years of seniority.

Teachers fitted with their "jobs," "colleagues," "supervisors," and "schools," respectively. Taken together, teachers generally tended to have a good fit perception with their work environments. Teachers thought that they fit with their work environment highly in terms of its components. Teachers with 0-5 years of seniority had higher school-fit than those with 11-15 and 21+ years of seniority. In general, as the seniority increases, teacher-school fit increases as well. Taşdan (2008) also proved empirically that teachers with 21+ years of seniority fit more than those with 1-5 and 6-10 years of seniority. In contrast, Sezgin (2006) reported that seniority was not a significant variable related to teacher-school fit.

Public school teachers with associate degrees had a higher level of school-fit than those with undergraduate and graduate degrees. It is possible to think that teachers' fit level decreases as their educational degree increases. Sezgin's (2006) findings support this finding in that he found the lowest value congruence level of teachers with their organizations belonging to those with associate degrees.



Private school teachers' fit levels with "their jobs" are higher than those of public school teachers. This difference may have resulted from the difference in personnel selection processes. Teachers in public schools were selected with a generalized written test administered by a central body called the Measuring, Selection, and Placement Center in Turkey. These tests include general ability and general culture tests in addition to field knowledge in teaching. Starting from the highest scores, applicants were assigned to the available positions based on their preferences. On the other hand, private school teachers select their candidates by interviews that enable the schools to acknowledge the applicants more closely and in detail. It is possible to think that private schools select more congruent individuals for the teaching profession.

In the shortest form, the findings provided from this study showed that public and private school teachers in Ankara province had a positive PC with their organizations and had a high level of fit with school environments. The following recommendations are proposed based on these findings:

1. As transactional contract perception was the highest in the new coming teachers, principals should be more careful about understanding the expectations of the new members of the profession. This kind of attempt will be successful in transforming their transactional contract into a relational contract. Furthermore, principals should be more helpful in the orientation processes of new teachers in the process of compliance to the work environment. Additionally, responsibilities should be given according to their competencies.
2. It is necessary for the teachers and administrators to negotiate their expectancies openly to shape teachers' psychological contracts positively.
3. Providing better opportunities to the public school teachers like personal and professional development and promotion will increase their performance and construct good relationships with their schools. Also, teachers with superior performance will be supported with performance pay or additional benefits.
4. This research reflects the subjective perception of teacher participants with a limited-employee perspective. Despite the fact that PC structure is mostly centered on employees' subjective perceptions so far, adding the employer perceptions as a complementary perspective is suggested in the literature as well. From this point of view, researchers could possibly analyze this dual structure by covering a complementing perspective in the further studies.

### References

- Aydin, İ., Yılmaz, K., Memduhođlu, H. B., Ođuz, E., & Gungör, S. (2008). Academic and non-academic staff's psychological contract in turkey. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62, 252-272.
- Bellou, V. (2007). Identifying employees' perceptions on organizational obligations: A comparison between the Greek public and private sector, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 20 (7), 608- 621.
- Bhattacharya, S,R, & Bruce, K. N. (2009). Evolution of the Psychological Contract in an Off-shored Outsourced Call Centre in India. Retrieved November, 20,2012 from [http://www.ileradirectory.org/15thworldcongress/files/papers/Track\\_5/Wed\\_W" 3\\_BHATTACHARYA.pdf](http://www.ileradirectory.org/15thworldcongress/files/papers/Track_5/Wed_W).
- Brown, L., &- Roloff, M. (2011). Organizational communication and burnout: The buffering role of perceived organizational support and psychological contract fulfillment as messages of employee value", Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Dresden International Congress Centre, Dresden, Germany.
- Buyens, D.,& Schalk, R. (2005). Making sense of a new employment relationship: Psychological contract-related information seeking and the role of work values and locus of control. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 13 (1), 41-52.
- Castaing, S. (2006). The effects of psychological contract fulfilment and public service motivation on organizational commitment in the French civil service. *Public Policy and Administration*, 21(1) 84-98.
- Chatman, J. A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 459-484.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J, A. (2002). a psychological contract perspective on organizational citizenship behavior". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23 (8), 927-946.
- Coyle-Shapiro, Jacqueline A-M - Kessler, Ian (2003). The employment relationship in the UK public sector: A psychological contract perspective. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13(2), 213-230.
- Cullinane, N, & Dundon, T. (2006). The psychological contract: A critical review. *International Journal of Management Review*, 8 (2), 113-129.
- Dabos, G. E., & - Rousseau, D. M (2004). Mutuality and reciprocity in the psychological contracts of employees and employers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89 (1), 52-72.
- Cuyper, N. D., Rigotti, T., Witte, H., & Mohr, G. (2008). Balancing psychological contracts: Validation of a typology. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19, 543-561.

- Edwards, J. R., & Cooper, C. L. (1990). The person-environment fit approach to stress: Recurring problems and some suggested solutions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*, 293-307.
- Jong, J., Schalk, R., & Cuyper, N. (2009). Balanced versus unbalanced psychological contracts in temporary and permanent employment: Associations with employee attitudes. *Management and Organization Review, 5*(3), 29-351.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49*, 1-49.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R.D., & Johnson, E.C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group. *Personnel Psychology, 58*, (2), 281-342.
- Lierich, D., & O'Connor, C. (2009). The effect of fixed-term contracts on rural secondary teachers. *International Employment Relations Review, 15* (2), 58-82.
- Louis, M.R. (1980). Surprise and sense-making: what newcomers experience and how they cope in unfamiliar organisational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 25*, 226-251.
- McDonald, D.J., & Makin, P.J. (2000). The psychological contract, organisational commitment and job satisfaction of temporary staff. *Leadership & Organization, 21*(2), 84-91.
- Millward, L. J., & Brewerton, P. M. (2000). Psychological contracts: Employee relations for the twenty-first century? *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 15*, 1-62.
- Mimaroglu, H. (2008). *Psikolojik sözleşmenin personelin tutum ve davranışlarına etkileri: Tıbbi satış temsilcileri üzerinde bir araştırma* [Effects of psychological contract on personnel attitudes and behaviors: A study on medical sales people] Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.
- O'Donohue, W. (2007). *Professional ideology and the psychological contract: an analysis of the psychological contracts of registered nurses. Research scientists and primary school teachers employed in public sector organisations*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Tasmania, Australia.
- Özkalp, E. (2004). *Örgütsel davranış* [Organizational Behavior]. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Rights and Responsibilities Journal, 2*, 121-139.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1990). New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: A study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*, 389-400.

- Rousseau, D. M. (1995), *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*, Sage Publications Inc, California.
- Rousseau, D.M. (2000). Psychological contract inventory. Technical Report. Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Mellon University.
- Schalk, R., & Roe, R. (2007). Towards a dynamic model of the psychological contract. *Journal of the Theory of Social Behavior*, 37, 2, 167-182.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2009). *Research methods for business: A skill building Approach*. J.Wiley, Chichester.
- Sels, Luc - Janssens, M., & Van Den Brande, I. (2004). Assessing the nature of psychological contracts: A validation of six dimensions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 461-488.
- Sezgin, Ferudun. (2006), "İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin bireysel ve örgütsel değerlerinin uyumu Ankara ili örneği [Individual and organizational value congruence of elementary school teachers] Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Shen, J. (2010). University academics' psychological contracts and their fulfilment. *Journal of Management Development*, 29(6), 575-591.
- Shuping, J.G. (2009). The impact of human resource practices on the psychological contract: A quantitative study. Unpublished Master Thesis, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.
- Sturges, J., Conway, N., Guest, D., & Liefoghe, A. (2005). Managing the career deal: The psychological contract as a framework for understanding career management, organizational commitment and work behavior, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26 (7), 821-838.
- Taşdan, M. (2008). *Türkiye'deki kamu ve özel ilköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin bireysel değerleri ile okulun örgütsel değerleri arasındaki uyum düzeyi, iş doyumu ve algılanan sosyal destek ilişkisi* [The congruence level between personal values of teachers and organizational values of schools at public and private schools in Turkey, its relations with job satisfaction and perceived social support]. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Yin, J., Lin, X., & Cong, W. (2008). The empirical research of the relationships between psychological contract types and organizational outcomes. *Wireless Communications, Networking and Mobile Computing*, doi:10.1109/WiCom.2008.1694.
- Zhang, J., & Jiongliang, Q. (2005). Structure of the teachers' psychological contracts and influential factors at primary and secondary schools in Guangdong province. *Educational Research*, 26 (4), 48-56.

## Kamu ve Özel Okul Öğretmenlerinin Psikolojik Sözleşme Algıları ve İş Çevresine Uyum Düzeyleri

### Atf:

Demirkasımoğlu, N. (2014). Teachers' psychological contract perceptions and person-environment fit levels. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 56 , 45-68. DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2014.56.1

### Özet

*Problem Durumu:* Rekabete dayalı ve değişen iş pazarı dinamiklerinin ön plana çıktığı modern çağda, yeni ve yaratıcı insan yönetimi uygulamalarının ortaya çıkmasıyla birlikte örgüt ve çalışan arasındaki ilişkiyi açıklamada yeni bakış açıları ortaya çıkarmıştır. Örgüt ve çalışan arasındaki ilişkiyi çift taraflı bir alış-veriş ilişkisi yerine, çalışanın bireysel öznelliğine odaklanarak açıklamak için analitik bir araç olarak öne sürülen psikolojik sözleşmenin çalışanlar için önemli bir motivasyon aracı olduğu, örgütsel güven iş doyumu ve örgütsel bağlılık gibi pek çok anahtar etken ile ilişkili olduğu alanyazındaki ampirik araştırmalarla ortaya konulmuştur. Psikolojik sözleşme kavramını öğretmenlerin perspektifinden anlamaya çalışmak, öğretmenlerin iş tutumu ve davranışlarını açıklamada önemli bir araç olarak görülmektedir. Çünkü modern yönetim anlayışı insan kaynağının yönetilmesinde örgütün formal yönü kadar informal yönünün de yönetilmesini önemsemekte, ekonomik sözleşmeler kadar psikolojik sözleşme olgusunu da işe koşturmaktadır. Olumlu bir psikolojik sözleşme geliştirebilen ve iş çevresiyle üst düzeyde bir uyum yakalayabilen öğretmenlerin işlerinden ve iş çevrelerinden memnun olması beklenebilir. Buradan hareketle bu araştırmanın problemi, öğretmenlerin okulları ile geliştirdikleri psikolojik sözleşme türlerinin neler olduğu ve bu psikolojik sözleşmelerinin iş çevresine uyum düzeylerinin bir yordayıcısı olup olmadığının belirlenmesidir.

*Araştırmanın Amacı:* Bu araştırmanın amacı, Ankara ili merkez ilçeleri kamu ve özel ilköğretim öğretmenlerinin psikolojik sözleşme algıları ve iş çevresine uyum düzeylerinin; okul türü, kıdem ve öğrenim durumu değişkenlerine göre belirlenmesidir.

*Araştırmanın Yöntemi:* Bu araştırma, tarama modellerinden tekil tarama ve ilişkisel tarama modelleri ile desenlenmiştir. Araştırma iki alt evrenden oluşmaktadır. Birinci alt evren, dokuz merkez ilçede 546 kamu okulunda görevli 10273 sınıf öğretmeninden; ikinci alt evren ise bu ilçelerdeki 58 özel okulda görevli 868 sınıf öğretmeninden oluşmaktadır. Kamu okulu öğretmenlerinin oluşturduğu 10273 kişilik evreni, %95 güven düzeyinde 375 katılımcı, 868 kişilik özel okul öğretmenlerinden oluşan evreni 234 katılımcı temsil edebilecektir. Araştırmanın kapsamında 375 kamu ve 201 özel okul öğretmenine anket uygulanmıştır.

Öğretmenlerin psikolojik sözleşme durumlarını belirlemek amacıyla Rousseau (2000) tarafından geliştirilmiş olan Psikolojik Sözleşme Envanteri (PSE), araştırmacı tarafından Türkçe'ye uyarlanmıştır. İş çevresine uyum düzeyleri ise araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilen ölçekle incelenmiştir. PSE'de sözleşme türleri hem "Çalışanın Yükümlülükleri" ve hem de "İşvenin Yükümlülükleri" boyutlarında işlemsel sözleşme (8 madde), ilişkisel sözleşme (8 madde) ve dengeli sözleşme (12 madde) türlerinden oluşan alt ölçekler bulunmaktadır. Geçişsel Sözleşme, 12 maddeden oluşmaktadır. PSE'de 64 madde yer almıştır. Ön denemede ölçek taslakları, 70 özel ve 70 kamu okulunda görevli 140 sınıf öğretmenine uygulanmıştır. Veri toplama araçlarının geçerlik analizlerinde açılımlayıcı ve doğrulayıcı faktör analizlerinden yararlanılmıştır. Güvenirlilik analizlerinde ise iç tutarlılık katsayısı ve madde toplam korelasyonları (.30 kesim noktası alınarak) hesaplanmıştır.

Psikolojik sözleşme ve iş çevresine uyum düzeylerinin eğitim durumu ve okul türü değişkenlerine göre test edilmesinde Kruskal Wallis-H testi, okul türü değişkenine göre test edilmesinde ise bağımsız örneklem için t-testi kullanılmıştır. Öğretmenlerin psikolojik sözleşme algılarının iş çevresine uyu türleri tarafından yordanıp yordanmadığının belirlenmesinde ise çoklu regresyon analizi tekniği kullanılmıştır.

*Araştırmanın Bulguları:* Kamu ( $M_{\text{(öğretmenin yükümlülüğü)}}=3.62$ ;  $M_{\text{(okulun yükümlülüğü)}}=3.66$ ) ve özel ( $M_{\text{(öğretmenin yükümlülüğü)}}=3.81$ ;  $M_{\text{(okulun yükümlülüğü)}}=3.40$ ) okul öğretmenlerinde en baskın olan psikolojik sözleşme algısı, ilişkisel sözleşmedir. Katılımcılar ile okul arasında oluşturulan psikolojik sözleşme türlerinden ilişkisel sözleşmeyi, ikinci sırada dengeli sözleşme izlemektedir. Bu sözleşme türünde özel okul öğretmenleri ( $M_{\text{(öğretmenin yükümlülüğü)}}=3.70$ ;  $M_{\text{(okulun yükümlülüğü)}}=3.05$ ), kamu okulu ( $M_{\text{(öğretmenin yükümlülüğü)}}=3.38$ ;  $M_{\text{(okulun yükümlülüğü)}}=2.96$ ) öğretmenlerine göre daha olumlu bir algıya sahiptir. Bu çalışmada, öğretmenlerin işlemsel sözleşme algılarının, psikolojik sözleşme türleri arasında en düşük katılım gösterdikleri sözleşme türü olduğu saptanmıştır. İşlemsel sözleşme türündeki bulgular göstermiştir ki öğretmenler hem kendi yükümlülüklerini hem de okulun yükümlülüklerini kısa dönemli ve salt ekonomik şartların yerine getirilmesine dayanan bir alışveriş ilişkisi biçiminde değerlendirmektedir. Geçişsel sözleşme algısını oluşturan "güvensizlik, belirsizlik ve aşınma" alt boyutlarının toplamından elde edilen puanlar, hem kamu ( $M=2.15$ ) hem de özel ( $M=2.34$ ) okul öğretmenlerinin düşük bir geçişsel sözleşme algısına sahip olduğunu göstermektedir.

Öğretmenlerin iş çevrelerine uyumlarına ilişkin görüşleri bütüncül değerlendirildiğinde, kamu ve özel okul öğretmenlerinin en yüksek uyum gösterdiği boyutlar sırasıyla; iş ( $M_{\text{(kamu)}}=3.86$ ;  $M_{\text{(özel)}}=4.20$ ), meslektaş ( $M_{\text{(kamu)}}=3.81$ ;  $M_{\text{(özel)}}=3.89$ ), yönetici ( $M_{\text{(kamu)}}=3.58$ ;  $M_{\text{(özel)}}=3.72$ ) ve okul ( $M_{\text{(kamu)}}=3.37$ ;  $M_{\text{(özel)}}=3.57$ ) boyutlarıdır. Başka bir ifade ile kamu ve özel okul öğretmenleri birinci sırada "iş" ile, ikinci sırada "meslektaşları" ile, üçüncü sırada "yöneticileri" ile ve son sırada "okulları" ile uyum içerisinde olduğunu düşünmektedir.

*Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri:* Kamu ve özel okul öğretmenleri ve okul yönetimi arasındaki işlemsel sözleşme zayıf, psikolojik sözleşme ise güçlüdür. İşlemsel sözleşme türünde okul türü, kıdem ve öğrenim durumu değişkenleri fark yaratan değişkenlerdir. Öğretmenler, okulları ile ağırlıklı olarak ilişkisel sözleşme geliştirmişlerdir. Katılımcıların ilişkisel sözleşmeye ilişkin görüşlerinde okul türü, kıdem ve öğrenim durumu değişkenleri fark yaratan değişkenlerdir. Öğretmenlerinin ikinci olarak en yüksek algıya sahip olduğu sözleşme türü, dengeli sözleşmedir. Özel okul öğretmenleri, okulun öğretmenlere sunduğu performans desteğini kamu okulu öğretmenlerine göre daha tatminkar bulmaktadır. Dengeli sözleşmeye ilişkin öğretmen görüşlerinde öğrenim durumu değişkenine göre anlamlı farklılık bulunmazken, okul türü ve kıdem değişkenlerinde anlamlı farklılık bulunmaktadır. Öğretmenler, düşük düzeyde bir geçişsel sözleşme algısına sahiptir. Öğrenim durumu değişkeni, öğretmenlerin geçişsel sözleşme algısında fark yaratan değişkenler değilken okul türü değişkenine göre öğretmen görüşleri anlamlı biçimde farklılaşmaktadır. Kamu ve özel okul öğretmenleri en çok “iş” leri ile; ikinci olarak “meslektaş”ları ile; üçüncü sırada “yönetici” leri ve son sırada “okul”ları ile uyum göstermektedir. Araştırma sonuçlarına dayalı olarak geliştirilen öneriler şöyledir.

1. İşlemsel sözleşme algısının mesleğe yeni başlayan ve mesleki kıdemi en fazla olan öğretmenlerde en yüksek olduğu hatırlanırsa, bunun ilişkisel sözleşme algısına dönüştürülebilmesi için, yöneticilerin bu grupta yer alan çalışanların gereksinimlerini ve beklentilerini karşılamak noktasında daha özenli davranması gerekmektedir. Ayrıca yöneticilerin, öğretmenlerin yeterliklerine uygun görevler vermesi, işlerine uyum sağlamalarını kolaylaştırabilir.
2. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre öğretmenler, okuldan sağladıkları yarar oranda okula katkı sunmaktadırlar. Okul yönetimlerinin, özellikle mesleğe ya da okulda yeni göreve başlayan öğretmenler ile beklentilerini açıkça paylaşması psikolojik sözleşme algısını olumlu yönde etkileyecektir.
3. Psikolojik sözleşme kavramının karşılıklılık algısına dayandığı hatırlanırsa, bu çalışmanın çalışanın öznel algısını sınırlı bir perspektiften yansıttığı ileri sürülebilir. Psikolojik sözleşme kavramının anlaşılmasında çalışanın algısını merkeze alan araştırmalar çoğunlukta olsa da, alanyazında karşılıklı tarafların algısının araştırılması da önerilmektedir. Bu önermeden hareketle, araştırmacılara okul yönetiminin ve çalışanların karşılıklı psikolojik sözleşme algısını kapsayan bir bakış açısını bir araya getirerek bu yapıyı çift yönlü analiz etmeleri önerilebilir.

*Anahtar Kelimeler:* Psikolojik sözleşme, iş çevresine uyum, kamu okulu öğretmenleri, özel okul öğretmenleri