

# **Organizational Stress in Health Care Workers Organizational Citizenship Behavior to Predict Impact Research**

Emel ÖZCAN

PhD student Program «Management in Healthcare»

SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY (IMBL)

[emeluzunozcan@gmail.com](mailto:emeluzunozcan@gmail.com)

## **ABSTRACT**

### **1. Problem and Contribution**

Stress as a result of the damage to the employees of the organization are informed about organizational stress, be able to keep control of stress and stress the optimum level of stress management aims to take necessary measures to enable them to keep, psychological and organizations and aiming to achieve the objectives of the organization by providing benefits to both the social environment and organizational citizenship behavior has examined the effects that occur over.

### **2. Method**

In order to measure this effect in March 2016 working in Samsun Education and Research Hospital it consists of 301 health care workers. The data collection tools, organizational citizenship scale consists of 18 statements, organizational stress questionnaire consisting of 44 statements and data collection form consisting of 70 questions, including demographic questions 8 is used. Data for the analysis of, respectively, the demographic characteristics of frequency tables of the respondents, reliability testing, variables means and standard deviations including correlation analysis and t for testing the research hypothesis-test, ANOVA and regression analysis will be done.

### **3. Results**

Organizational stress has been found to have any significant impact on organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational stress in this regard can be said to show a negative impact on organizational citizenship behavior.

**Keywords:** Stress, Organizational Stress, Organizational Citizenship Behavior

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

There have been many research on today's industries. This sector stands out in particular in the health sector research. The research has been directed to generally improve the quality of health service delivery in the health sector and increasing patient satisfaction. The health sector is also affected by the individual affects the health service delivery and the health service. For this reason, the individual is considered to be the most important part of the health sector.

Our life covers a very important place in the life of the employees we encountered frequently during the stress concept. People are spending the majority of the work they do everyday of their lives and the responsibilities were identified goals should be expected from them in order to make real. Working only in the psychological aspects of individuals is not economically levels of emphasis in their own world. Examining the concept of stress from an organizational perspective, they continue to work employees to work, change jobs, they are inefficient, they ignore the rules, not positive about the study subjects' attitudes and behaviors develop, they work for the type of behavior as they show faith in the objectives of the work suggests that high levels due to organizational stress. optimally fulfill the jobs of workers in health institutions and in terms of the sustainability of a happy life has an important place in the study of organizational stress.

Organizational citizenship behavior, which is another variable of the study, identification made job descriptions, ahead of role responsibilities that are required and expected from this responsibility, the role that employees have shown regardless of money in terms of benefit to the organizations responsible are held

by definition. Concept, in addition to providing sociability and psychology of organizations, represents the personal act which is based on that provision to provide support to achieving the objectives of the organization (Sezgin, 2005: 319).

## **2. Organizational Stress**

Conceptually stress, although examined in studies of organizational stress and job stress, work stress in general, are used interchangeably in the literature of occupational stress and organizational stress. Therefore, this concept was evaluated as similar concepts (Arslan, 2004: 16). Personal stress, revealing the source of people's affairs, that the stress resulting from work affects themselves and their organizations to be undergoing stress, revealing element in people and jobs related organizations are normally met (Doby and Caplan, 1995: 1106). To work with each organization made use of the technology is made, the conditions related to the environment, the organization of the trends they show their work and experience, to move groupings formed within the organization, conflict status, according to the organization, atmosphere and other factors constitute itself to the original sources of stress (Ertekin, 1993: 7) .

Although there is the stress arising out of or resulting from the organization because of work, the stress resources are scarce in the literature showing defines different from each other. Besides, work stress, poor individual and workplace threatening the employees are made conscious of the suitability or quality of work that occurs in the form of risk definition (Rahim and Psenicka, 1996: 69).

Working concerned, it covers the complex and bring the business maintains her weight factor stress. Besides good working definition yet subject covers more different sources of stress (Ertekin, 1993: 25).

The presence of the employees' work done very little control of the subject possibility status, physical conditions indicating danger assurances that individuals and financial resources for the continuation of the work with no role in the high level issues reveals the very effective work stress (Balci, 2000: 11-14).

Accordingly, all of the work while he accepts responsibility laid down in the organization and, therefore, are made on the basis of the definitions of the responsibilities for aspects related to the organization. Uncertainty of the boundaries of organizational stress and job stress arises from this situation.

In the studies, studies of stress brought workload, lack seen in person, there has been no complete description of the study subjects were evaluated responsibility and conflict elements (Rahim and Psenicka, 1996: 70).

The study brings out the sources of stress has been recognized as four classes. These; Chronic-generic, chronic studies of subjects with acute-generic, acute stress of work issues. These types of people are the stress factors related to the environment in the work place and most power will lead to loss of vision inspection responsibilities conflict who studies stress the point of departure is the work area with state of the uncertainty of the situation. stress related organizations to be more determined which concepts they use to describe the situation they are in positions of employees who come forward with is a situation where the individual assessment of the situation. Accordingly, instead of the stress of the stress related issues that should be examined is the organization explained that stem from (Beehr and others, 2000: 391).

### **3. CITIZENSHIP ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR**

Human element of social, political and economic development in the show, is very important in enabling their organizations to be effective and efficient. Regards their ability to successfully complete under circumstances that indicate a continuous change of the organization, without being constrained by formal

working definition, beyond the job requirements, the need employees who show desire to provide additional benefits to show inactivity and developments about the organization day is increasing day (Sezgin, 2005: 318).

Today's managers are given the most importance issues to awaken their desire to work together in order to show the success of employees with work. Wait for their money from individuals who have been employed, they are not incompatible, non-formal working agreements with are expectations behave ahead of the movement detected (Ünüvar, 2006: 177).

When present responsibilities include the organization is very sensitive to good governing and for that matter, care work, showing dedication in work, surveillance and control that in the time when acting within the framework defined rules, even if that help people with their job, they assumed responsibility for additional even where not to do, not gossipy, confidant that employees who are more needs than in the past (Karaman et al., 2008: 50).

The more competitive situation seen in today's workplace, it is not enough to ensure the continuity of their business establishments to set their employees' job responsibilities. Accordingly, it depends on the behavior and response of the display without waiting for formal mandate for the success of the organization. Such behavior is considered as organizational citizenship behavior. Attracting the attention of those who study on organizational citizenship behavior in recent years, both the national and the state has become a common topic in the international arena (Gürbüz, 2006: 49).

## **4.MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **4.1. Purpose Of The Study**

This research, Samsun education and research hospital, 301 health workers who are working in order to identify the effect of organizational stress on organizational citizenship behavior levels was carried out as an identifier.

#### **4.2. The Universe Of The Research**

The population of the study is located in the province of Samsun, Samsun education and research hospital under the Ministry of Health, Health care workers (N=1380) comprise of.

#### **4.3. The Sample Of The Study**

The sample of the study, 95% confidence interval of  $\pm 5$  error was calculated as share with 301. Simple random sample using the sampling method were determined. Sample Samsun education and research hospital, 301 health workers in the month of March consists of running menstrual 2016. 213 the number of distributed questionnaires has made a comeback. Our research of these health workers, which constitute the main mass of the mass of the sample ratio % 21,8.

#### **4.4.Evaluation Of Data**

As a data collection Tool, the scale of expression, the literature of organizational citizenship in support of 18 to 44 questions, including 8 demographic questions and the scale of organizational stress statements, consisting of 70 data collection form was used.

The first section of the data collection form organizational stress and organizational citizenship perceptions of healthcare workers thought to affect their views on the factors that influence are age, level of Education, multiple choice questions have been given for the duration of the study.

In the second chapter, Samsun education and research hospital, their views of health workers on the relationship between organizational stress and organizational citizenship scales were used to determine the expression 62.

All likert-type scale in which validity and reliability has been proven in different studies prepared by the use of SPSS 19 for Windows statistical package with a program called data obtained from questions 62 were evaluated. The analysis of the data, respectively, in the survey of demographic characteristics of respondents frequency tables, reliability tests, including averages and standard deviations of variables, correlation analysis and the testing of research hypotheses for t-test, ANOVA and regression analyses were conducted.

## 5. RESULTS

In this research, after collecting data by using questionnaire technique, statistical analysis using the program, the following findings were reached.

### 5.1. Findings In Relation To Demographic Characteristics

Some of the demographic characteristics and distributions of the employees surveyed are presented below.

**Table 1: Demographic Characteristics Of Participants Distribution According To**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Gender	Woman	102	47,9	49,3	49,3
	Male	105	49,3	50,7	100,0
	Total	207	97,2	100,0	
	Missing	6	2,8		
	Total	213	100,0		
Age	17-24	14	6,6	6,7	6,7
	25-34	100	46,9	48,1	54,8
	35 and above	94	44,1	45,2	100,0
	Total	208	97,7	100,0	
	Missing	5	2,3		
	Total	213	100,0		
Marital Status	Married	106	49,8	52,0	52,0
	Single	98	46,0	48,0	100,0
	Total	204	95,8	100,0	
	Missing	9	4,2		
	Total	213	100,0		
Educational Status	Vocational School of Health	34	16,0	16,0	16,0
	Associate	101	47,4	47,6	63,7

	License	45	21,1	21,2	84,9
	Graduate	28	13,1	13,2	98,1
	PhD	4	1,9	1,9	100,0
	Total	212	99,5	100,0	
	Missing	1	,5		
	Total	213	100,0		

102 of the 213 employees surveyed 105 women are men. Total distribution among the participants 47.9% were female, 49.3% male emerges. The value of women in our society be close together suggests that the active participation in working life. When we consider the sectoral point of view; It is observed that health care is a workplace where employees participate much in women.

The employees who participated in the study; 14 (6.6%) in the 17-24 age range, 100 (46.9%) in the 25-34 age range, 94 (44.1%) seems to be in the age range 35 years and older. The majority of the employees participating in the survey, as apparent from the above table is made up of young people.

106 of the participants (49.8%) were married, 98 (46.0%) are single. The reason for this stems from the fact table of young employee profile, as seen in 1.

34 of the employees surveyed (16.0%), Health Professions High School, 101 (47.4%) and 45 (21.1%) licenses, 28 (13.1%), 4 (1.9%) is a doctoral-level education.

**Table 2: Demographic Characteristics Of Participants Distribution According To (Continued)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Time position working in	0-5 year	59	27,7	27,8	27,8
	6-10 year	96	45,1	45,3	73,1
	11-15 year	32	15,0	15,1	88,2
	16-20 year	16	7,5	7,5	95,8
	21 year and above	9	4,2	4,2	100,0
	Total	212	99,5	100,0	
	Missing	1	,5		
	Total	213	100,0		
Total professional experience	0-5 year	56	26,3	27,2	27,2
	6-10 year	80	37,6	38,8	66,0
	11-15 year	43	20,2	20,9	86,9
	16-20 year	18	8,5	8,7	95,6



	21 year and above	9	4,2	4,4	100,0
	Total	206	96,7	100,0	
	Missing	7	3,3		
	Total	213	100,0		

Working hours of employees in the positions they participated in the study, 59 (27.7%), 0-5 years, 96 in (45.1%) 6-10 years, 32 (15.0%), 11-15 years, 16 's (7.5%), 16-20 years, and 9 (4.2%) were found to be 21 years and above.

A total of 56 professional experience of the employees surveyed (26.3%), 0-5 years, 80 (37.6%) 6-10 years, 43 (20.2%), 11-15 years, 18 ' i (8.5%), 16-20 years, and 9 (4.2%) were found to be 21 years and above.

## 5.2. Survey Findings on the scale Lera

Some related to research scale properties is presented below.

**Table 3: Scale Reliability Analysis of Results**

Scale Name	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of variables
Organizational Citizenship Scale	,844	18
Organizational Stress Scale	,929	44

Cronbah's Alpha value on all scales, as shown in Table 3 is over 0.70. In this context, the scale of it is reliable, it is seen that there is any expression that negatively affect the reliability of the scale.

**Table 4: KMO values**

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,819
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	5557,757
	df	1891
	Sig.	,000

Is one of the KMO value of the variables shows that perfectly fit with each other.

KMO values are shown in Table 4.

**Tablo 5: Ölçeklerin Standart Sapmaları ve Aritmetik Ortalamaları**

Scale Name	Mean	Standard deviation	The sample
------------	------	--------------------	------------

Organizational Citizenship Scale	2,4345	,64132	205
Organizational Stress Scale	3,0209	,67866	205

Table 5 shows the average variable related to the organizational citizenship behavior and organizational stress variable. When we examine the table, organizational citizenship behavior of employees indicate that undecided employees have an average of 2.43 of the general perception. human factors of high rise an average of 3.02 is due to the perception of organizational stress working in a busy environment.

### 5.3.Korelasyo Analysis

Research results regarding the correlation analysis is presented below.

**Table 6: Survey of Variable Correlation**

<b>Correlations</b>			
		Organizational citizenship behavior	Organizational stress
Organizational citizenship behavior	Pearson Correlation	1	-,439**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	N	211	211
Organizational stress	Pearson Correlation	-,439**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	211	211

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 6 in the context of the findings obtained from the correlation analysis examined the correlation between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational stress, the correlation coefficient (-0.439) as seen. Negative correlation between the two global variables in this context may be the existence of a weak relationship.

### 5.4. Regression Analysis

Survey results for the regression analysis is presented below.

**Table 7: Model Summary**

<b>Model Summary</b>				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,439 <sup>a</sup>	,193	,189	,57966

a. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational stress

Model summary of the case the argument of the value of R Square column in the table "organizational stress" in the case of the dependent variable "organizational citizenship behavior" of the variance of the variables explained 19%, the 19'n% of organizational citizenship behavior in other words, is understood to be due to organizational stress.

**Table 8: Anova table**

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	16,761	1	16,761	49,884	,000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	70,226	209	,336		
	Total	86,987	210			
a. Dependent Variable: Organizational citizenship behavior						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational stress						

The value in the column of the ANOVA table significance of the relationship between these variables  $p < 0.01$  level shows that significant. If the relationship were meaningless in this column over 0.05 (random) would do that review. If the relationship in a table to be formulated;  $F(1,20) = 49.884$ ;  $p < 0.01$  equations can be created.

**Table 9: Coefficient Table**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3,670	,181		20,244	,000
	Organizational stress	-,412	,058	-,439	-7,063	,000
a. Dependent Variable: Organizational citizenship behavior						

Coefficient (Coefficients) the table, the regression coefficients used for the regression equation and gives their significance. The coefficient of organizational stress variable (-0.412), and the constants of the equation is 3.670.

When we face these values into the equation  $Y = a + bX$ ;  $Y = (-0.412) X + 3.670$  we get the equality. This equality of organizational citizenship behavior that gets us the value of organizational stress (-0.412) showed the effects.

According to a 99% confidence level in the results of tests performed regression  $p < 0.05$  H1 hypothesis is accepted. So; H<sup>1</sup>: Organizational stress has a significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior. **H<sup>1</sup> hypothesis is supported.**

### 5.5. Analysis of Perception Differences Arising from Demographic Characteristics

This section of the demographic characteristics of employees surveyed are examined whether they show differences in responses to stress and organizational citizenship behavior organizational variables. t-tests for gender and marital status variables employees; education, age, analysis of variance is applied to the industry in working time and working time in the institution variables. Participants examined the organizational stress and organizational citizenship behavior variables which varies according to the gender of the answers given to t-test and the results are shown in Table 10.

**Table 10: Gender T Test results for Variable**

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	p
Organizational citizenship behavior	Woman	100	2,4265	,69758	,06976	-,174	,862
	Male	105	2,4421	,58601	,05719		
Organizational stress	Woman	100	3,0821	,65606	,06561	1,260	,209
	Male	105	2,9627	,69764	,06808		

H<sup>2</sup>: Does not show a significant difference according to the gender of organizational citizenship behavior of employees. **H<sup>2</sup> hypothesis is not supported.**

H<sup>3</sup>: Does not show a significant difference according to the gender of organizational stress employees. **H<sup>3</sup> hypothesis is not supported.**

**Table 11: Results Of T Test For The Variable Marital Status**

	Marital status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	p
--	----------------	---	------	----------------	-----------------	---	---

Organizational citizenship behavior	Married	105	2,4546	,69604	,06793	,377	,707
	Single	97	2,4206	,56994	,05787		
Organizational stress	Married	105	3,1276	,64728	,06317	1,653	100
	Single	97	2,9674	,72974	,07409		

H<sup>4</sup>: Organizational citizenship behavior of the employees did not show a significant difference according to marital status. **The hypothesis H4 was not supported.**

H<sup>5</sup>: Organizational stress of the employees did not show a significant difference according to marital status. **The hypothesis H5 was not supported.**

**Table 12: Results Of Analysis Of Variance For The Age Variable**

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	F	p
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound				
Organizational citizenship behavior	17-24	14	2,5873	,44749	,11960	2,3289	2,8457	1,67	3,17	2,534	,082
	25-34	99	2,4816	,64695	,06502	2,3526	2,6106	1,00	4,06		
	35 and above	93	2,3018	,64191	,06656	2,1696	2,4340	1,00	3,94		
	Total	206	2,4076	,63846	,04448	2,3199	2,4953	1,00	4,06		
Organizational stress	17-24	14	2,9107	,78464	,20970	2,4576	3,3637	1,91	4,20	9,593	,000
	25-34	99	2,8401	,63400	,06372	2,7136	2,9665	1,75	4,34		
	35 and above	93	3,2539	,67404	,06989	3,1150	3,3927	1,66	4,73		
	Total	206	3,0317	,69008	,04808	2,9369	3,1265	1,66	4,73		

H<sup>6</sup>: Organizational citizenship behavior of employees according to age did not show a significant difference. **Hypothesis H6 was not supported.**

H<sup>7</sup>: Organizational stress of the employees indicate significant differences according to the age. **Hypothesis H7 was supported.**

Employees ' organizational citizenship behaviors of the variables led to the conclusion that it does not vary depending on age. However, organizational stress of the employees ' age has shown that under the influence of changes.

**Table 12: Results Of Variance Analysis For The Education Variable**

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	F	p
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound				
Organizational citizenship behavior	Vocational School of Health	34	2,7208	,48012	,08234	2,5533	2,8883	1,00	3,61	5,474	,000
	Associate	11	2,3991	,58098	,05781	2,2844	2,5138	1,00	4,06		
	License	43	2,4968	,82426	,12570	2,2432	2,7505	1,00	3,94		
	Graduate	28	2,0000	,50421	,09529	1,8045	2,1955	1,28	3,33		
	PhD	4	2,3472	,64530	,32265	1,3204	3,3740	1,39	2,78		
	Total	210	2,4170	,64274	,04435	2,3295	2,5044	1,00	4,06		

Organizational stress	Vocational School of Health	34	2,8020	,38268	,06563	2,6685	2,9355	2,05	3,84	12,197	,000
	Associate	101	2,9846	,73669	,07330	2,8392	3,1300	1,66	4,34		
	License	43	2,8634	,52914	,08069	2,7006	3,0263	2,23	4,20		
	Graduate	28	3,7805	,51705	,09771	3,5801	3,9810	2,32	4,73		
	PhD	4	2,8826	,78668	,39334	1,6308	4,1344	1,92	3,82		
	Total	210	3,0344	,68812	,04748	2,9408	3,1280	1,66	4,73		

H<sup>8</sup>: Organizational citizenship behavior of employees shows a significant difference compared to the schools they graduated from. **Hypothesis H<sup>8</sup> was supported.**

H<sup>9</sup>: Organizational stress of the employees indicate a significant difference according to the Graduate School. **Hypothesis H<sup>9</sup> was supported.**

**Table 13: Results Of Analysis Of Variance Of The Task Variable To The Location Of Organizational Citizenship**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	F	p
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound				
Organizational Anesthesia	2	2,4722	,58926	,41667	2,8220	7,7665	2,06	2,89	,814	,727
Urology (Urology)	7	2,0952	,44987	,17003	1,6792	2,5113	1,61	2,72		
Biochemical	5	2,2778	,96785	,43283	1,0760	3,4795	1,22	3,83		

Dermatology	11	2,36 75	,53146	,160 24	2,01 05	2,72 45	1,67	3,06		
Internal Medicine	7	2,44 64	,42887	,162 10	2,04 98	2,84 31	1,78	2,83		
Endocrinolog y	6	2,37 96	,44224	,180 54	1,91 55	2,84 37	1,78	3,00		
Infectious Diseases	7	2,21 71	,53695	,202 95	1,72 05	2,71 37	1,28	2,83		
Physical therapy and rehabilitation	1	2,88 89	.	.	.	.	2,89	2,89		
Gastroenterol ogy	1	3,05 56	.	.	.	.	3,06	3,06		
General Surgery	6	2,21 30	,64062	,261 53	1,54 07	2,88 52	1,44	2,89		
Thoracic Surgery	6	2,59 26	,43838	,178 97	2,13 25	3,05 26	2,00	3,11		
Eye Diseases	11	2,41 41	,52432	,158 09	2,06 19	2,76 64	1,44	3,33		
Emergency and first aid	8	2,77 78	,38490	,136 08	2,45 60	3,09 96	1,89	3,11		
Obstetrics and Gynecology	1	2,55 56	.	.	.	.	2,56	2,56		
Cardiovascul ar Surgery	8	2,41 67	,65195	,230 50	1,87 16	2,96 17	1,39	3,33		
Cardiology	8	2,30 99	,51987	,183 80	1,87 53	2,74 45	1,72	2,81		
ENT	16	2,72 98	,64513	,161 28	2,38 61	3,07 36	1,67	4,06		
Microbiolog y	7	2,56 26	,61341	,231 85	1,99 52	3,12 99	1,94	3,53		
Nephrology	6	2,32 41	,50359	,205 59	1,79 56	2,85 26	1,56	2,89		
Neurology	4	2,64 62	,24123	,120 62	2,26 24	3,03 01	2,39	2,94		
Neurosurger y (Brain Surgery)	1	2,50 00	.	.	.	.	2,50	2,50		
Radiology	1	2,33 33	.	.	.	.	2,33	2,33		





Endocrinology	6	3,2083	,84665	,34564	2,3198	4,0968	2,05	4,02		
Infectious Diseases	7	3,0487	,79247	,29952	2,3158	3,7816	2,09	4,16		
Physical therapy and rehabilitation	1	2,7727	.	.	.	.	2,77	2,77		
Gastroenterology	1	2,1818	.	.	.	.	2,18	2,18		
General Surgery	6	3,1476	,76289	,31145	2,3469	3,9482	2,09	4,02		
Thoracic Surgery	6	3,0981	,81135	,33123	2,2466	3,9496	2,27	3,88		
Eye Diseases	11	2,9261	,82879	,24989	2,3693	3,4829	1,75	4,25		
Emergency and first aid	8	2,6957	,20563	,07270	2,5238	2,8676	2,41	3,07		
Obstetrics and Gynecology	1	3,8182	.	.	.	.	3,82	3,82		
Cardiovascular Surgery	8	3,3011	,67701	,23936	2,7351	3,8671	2,09	3,93		
Cardiology	8	3,2447	,88995	,31464	2,5007	3,9887	2,20	4,23		
ENT	16	2,9638	,61578	,15395	2,6357	3,2919	1,91	4,00		
Microbiology	7	3,1938	,87731	,33159	2,3825	4,0052	2,00	4,11		
Nephrology	6	3,0691	,81442	,33248	2,2144	3,9238	2,23	4,20		
Neurology	4	2,7078	,21771	,10885	2,3614	3,0543	2,55	3,02		
Neurosurgery (Brain Surgery)	1	2,9318	.	.	.	.	2,93	2,93		
Radiology	1	3,2727	.	.	.	.	3,27	3,27		
Orthopedics and Traumatology	7	3,1158	,75054	,28368	2,4216	3,8099	2,20	3,93		

General practice.	1	3,9302	.	.	.	.	3,93	3,93		
Psychiatry	3	2,5227	,48105	,27773	1,3277	3,7177	2,16	3,07		
Rheumatology	3	2,8788	,97100	,56061	,4667	5,2909	2,32	4,00		
Sports physician	2	3,5227	1,70348	1,20455	11,7825	18,8279	2,32	4,73		
Other	11	3,1570	,35927	,10832	2,9157	3,3984	2,73	3,98		
Total	157	3,0838	,70308	,05611	2,9729	3,1946	1,66	4,73		

H<sup>11</sup>: organizational stress of the employees indicate a significant difference according to the Graduate School. **Hypothesis H<sup>11</sup> was supported.**

**Tablo 15: Görev Değişkeni İçin Varyans Analizi Sonuçları**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	F	p	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound					
Organizational citizenship behavior	Doctor	3	2,2222	,72648	,41944	,4175	4,0269	1,39	2,72	1,462	,156
	Chief Deputy	1	2,5000	.	.	.	.	2,50	2,50		
	Nurse	61	2,4684	,57829	,07404	2,3203	2,6165	1,00	3,61		
	Medical officer	16	2,5545	,76266	,19066	2,1481	2,9609	1,00	3,61		
	Workers	5	1,8353	,54185	,24232	1,1625	2,5081	1,31	2,71		
	Dietitian	1	2,6667	.	.	.	.	2,67	2,67		
	Data Preparation	65	2,5350	,61377	,07613	2,3829	2,6871	1,00	4,06		

	Lab assistant	5	2,38 17	,57891	,258 90	1,66 29	3,10 05	1,89	3,33		
	Technician	24	2,10 08	,60714	,123 93	1,84 44	2,35 71	1,22	3,83		
	Secretary	24	2,32 34	,75900	,154 93	2,00 29	2,64 39	1,39	3,94		
	Midwife	1	2,38 89	.	.	.	.	2,39	2,39		
	Total	20 6	2,41 60	,64034	,044 61	2,32 81	2,50 40	1,00	4,06		
Organizational stress	Doctor	3	3,60 55	,46872	,270 62	2,44 12	4,76 99	3,07	3,93	11,6 33	,00 0
	Chief Deputy	1	1,65 91	.	.	.	.	1,66	1,66		
	Nurse	61	3,09 57	,61888	,079 24	2,93 72	3,25 42	2,05	4,73		
	Medical officer	16	2,81 12	,43812	,109 53	2,57 77	3,04 46	2,25	3,93		
	Workers	5	2,83 36	,63012	,281 80	2,05 13	3,61 60	2,27	3,80		
	Dietitian	1	2,40 63	.	.	.	.	2,41	2,41		
	Data Preparation	65	2,62 69	,53913	,066 87	2,49 33	2,76 05	1,75	4,20		
	Lab assistant	5	2,84 92	,78856	,352 65	1,87 00	3,82 83	2,00	3,81		
	Technician	24	3,83 54	,30566	,062 39	3,70 63	3,96 44	3,08	4,25		
	Secretary	24	3,48 94	,62260	,127 09	3,22 65	3,75 23	1,98	4,34		
Midwife	1	2,95 45	.	.	.	.	2,95	2,95			
Total	20 6	3,04 18	,68382	,047 64	2,94 79	3,13 58	1,66	4,73			

H<sup>12</sup>: Organizational citizenship behavior did not show a significant difference according to the duties of the employees. **The hypothesis H<sup>12</sup> was not supported.**

H<sup>13</sup>: Organizational stress of the employees indicate a significant difference according to the duties. **Hypothesis H<sup>13</sup> was supported.**

**Table 15: Results Of Variance Analysis For The Variable Position, The Duration Of The Study**

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	F	p
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound				
Organizational citizenship behavior	0-5 year	58	2,5713	,67779	,08900	2,3931	2,7496	1,00	3,89	1,826	,125
	6-10 year	96	2,3917	,60265	,06151	2,2696	2,5138	1,00	4,06		
	11-15 year	32	2,2416	,64637	,11426	2,0086	2,4747	1,25	3,94		
	16-20 year	15	2,3245	,75085	,19387	1,9087	2,7403	1,31	3,83		
	21 year and above	9	2,6358	,49854	,16618	2,2526	3,0190	1,78	3,44		
	Total	210	2,4241	,64332	,04439	2,3366	2,5116	1,00	4,06		
Organizational stress	0-5 year	58	2,6908	,52701	,06920	2,5523	2,8294	1,91	4,34	7,481	,000
	6-10 year	96	3,1009	,71018	,07248	2,9570	3,2448	1,75	4,73		
	11-15 year	32	3,4395	,60758	,10741	3,2205	3,6586	2,37	4,25		
	16-20 year	15	3,0767	,64200	,16576	2,7212	3,4323	2,23	4,00		

	21 year and abo ve	9	2,98 23	,80464	,268 21	2,36 38	3,60 08	1,66	4,16		
	Tot al	21 0	3,03 25	,68724	,047 42	2,93 90	3,12 60	1,66	4,73		

H<sup>14</sup>: Organizational citizenship behavior of employees in their current position did not show a significant difference according to the operating time. **The hypothesis H<sup>14</sup> was not supported.**

H<sup>15</sup>: Organizational stress of the employees working in their current position, according to show a substantial difference. **H<sup>15</sup> hypothesis was supported.**

**Table 16: Analysis Of Variance Results For The Variable Total Duration Of Professional Experience**

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimu m	Maximu m	F	p
						Low er Boun d	Uppe r Boun d				
Organizational citizenship behavior	0-5 year	55	2,539 9	,68253	,0920 3	2,355 4	2,724 4	1,00	3,89	2,05 9	,08 8
	6-10 year	80	2,412 8	,58780	,0657 2	2,282 0	2,543 6	1,00	4,06		
	11- 15 year	43	2,206 0	,65917	,1005 2	2,003 1	2,408 8	1,25	3,94		
	16- 20 year	18	2,378 5	,70566	,1663 3	2,027 6	2,729 4	1,31	3,83		
	21 year and abov e	9	2,668 2	,48095	,1603 2	2,298 5	3,037 9	1,78	3,44		
	Tota l	20 5	2,411 7	,64303	,0449 1	2,323 2	2,500 3	1,00	4,06		

Organizational stress	0-5 year	55	2,713 2	,55609	,0749 8	2,562 9	2,863 6	1,91	4,34	7,46 8	,00 0
	6-10 year	80	3,042 2	,72543	,0811 1	2,880 8	3,203 7	1,75	4,73		
	11-15 year	43	3,422 8	,62296	,0950 0	3,231 1	3,614 5	1,66	4,25		
	16-20 year	18	3,175 0	,65379	,1541 0	2,849 8	3,500 1	2,23	4,05		
	21 year and above	9	2,888 9	,63631	,2121 0	2,399 8	3,378 0	1,98	4,16		
	Total	205	3,038 7	,69234	,0483 6	2,943 4	3,134 0	1,66	4,73		

H<sup>16</sup>: Organizational citizenship behavior of employees according to total length of professional experience did not show a significant difference. **H<sup>16</sup> hypothesis was not supported.**

H<sup>17</sup>: Total of employees indicate a significant difference according to length of professional experience of organizational stress. **H<sup>17</sup> hypothesis was supported.**

## 6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of the correlation analysis of the study, participants' perceptions of organizational citizenship behavior and perception of organizational stress is weak. Organizational stress perceptions and organizational citizenship behavior also has been identified as having a relationship in the negative direction.

Perceptions of organizational stress, organizational citizenship behavior, regression analyses were conducted to determine the effect on as a result of perceptions of organizational stress have been found to have a significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior. In this context, makes a positive contribution of organizational stress on organizational citizenship behavior that can be said.

Organizational stress and organizational citizenship behaviors depending on demographic variables to examine the differences, t-test analyses as a result of organizational stress, age, education, job, position, work duration, total of the period of the demographic variables differ depending on professional experience, gender, marital status, shows the distribution of the variables it is concluded that depending on the position. Education variables is set to vary depending on organizational citizenship behaviors and gender, age, marital status, task, task, position the work in the duration of the period of professional experience that shows the distribution of the demographic variables depending on it is concluded. All these results, according to health workers increase the level of organizational citizenship behavior and organizational stress in the direction of beneficial training is recommended to be used.

## **REFERENCE**

1. Arslan, S. (2004). *İş Stresi ve İş Doyumu: K. K. K. lığında Görev Yapan Muvazzaf Subay ve Astsubaylar Üzerine Uygulamalı Bir Çalışma* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Ankara, KHO Savunma Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Savunma Yönetimi Ana Bilim Dalı.
2. Balcı, A. (2000). *Öğretim Elemanının İş Stresi Kuram ve Uygulama*, Ankara Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
3. Beehr, T, A., Jex, S, M., Stacy, B. A. ve Murray, M.A. (2000). “Work Stressors and Coworker Support as Predictors of Individual Strain and Job Performance”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21 (1): 391-405.
4. Doby, V. J. ve Caplan, R. D. (1995). “Organizational Stres as Threat to Reputation: Effects on Anxiety at Work and at Home”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(4): 1105-1123.
5. Ertekin, Y. (1993). *Stres ve Yönetim*, Ankara, Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü (TODAİ) Yayınları No: 253.



6. Gürbüz, S. (2006). “Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı ile Duygusal Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişkilerin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma”, *Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 3(2): 48-75.
7. Karaman, K., Yücel, C., Dönder, H. (2008). “Öğretmen Görüşlerine Göre, Okullardaki Bürokrasi ile Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Arasındaki İlişki”, *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 53(1): 49-74.
8. Rahim, M. A.ve Psenicka, C. (1996). “A Structural Equations Model of Stress, Locus of Control, Social Support, Psychiatric Symptoms, and Propensity to Leave Job”, *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 136 (1): 69-84.
9. Sezgin, F. (2005). “Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları: Kavramsal bir çözümleme ve okul açısından bazı çıkarımlar”, *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(1), 317-339.
10. Ünüvar, T., G. (2006). *An Integrative Model Of Job Characteristics, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment. And Organizational Citizenship Behavior*, Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara