



## Examining the level of organizational uncertainty perceived by teachers in their schools

Esef Hakan TOYTOK<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Assoc.Prof. Dr., Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Univercty, Faculty of Education*

*Email: hakantoytok@hotmail.com*

*Orcid Id= 0000-0003-3638-1901*

Halil TANIR<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>*Ministry of Education*

[haliltanir46@gmail.com](mailto:haliltanir46@gmail.com)

*Orcid Id=0000-0002-3089-8304*

### Abstract

In this study, the perceived level of organizational uncertainty of teachers working in public and private schools has been attempted to be determined. In this study, the quantitative research method of the descriptive survey model has been used. The data collection tools used in this research were the 'Organizational Uncertainty Level Determination Scale' and the 'Personal Information Form.' The population of the study consists of 5895 teachers working in the Onikişubat district center of Kahramanmaraş province. A total of 370 teachers were determined using stratified sampling method. The data was analyzed using appropriate analysis software. Outliers were examined in data analysis, and the validity and reliability analysis of the scale were performed. Skewness coefficient was examined to check the normality of the distribution, and Levene's Homogeneity Test was conducted to determine whether the distribution was homogenous. For descriptive analysis, percentages, frequencies, and means were calculated. Appropriate statistical tests such as t-test, ANOVA, and Mann-Whitney U test were used for group comparisons, and the findings were interpreted. The research revealed a significant difference in the perception of the sub-dimension of individual negatives regarding the organizational uncertainty level among teachers based on gender, with females having a higher perception. Additionally, a significant difference was found in the perception of administrative negatives among teachers based on the type of school, with public schools showing a higher perception.

**Keywords:** Organizational uncertainty, level of uncertainty, private school, public school.

### 1.Introduction

The effectiveness of schools as educational organizations is crucial for achieving distant, close, and specific objectives, as well as for nurturing happy individuals. Schools are open-system organizations that are both influenced by and have an impact on the society they are a part of. Therefore, changes occurring in educational institutions, as indicated by Hofstede (2011), can lead to various issues affecting both the individuals comprising the organization and its functioning. For instance, such changes may result in negative emotional states like stress or anxiety among the individuals in the organization. The state of uncertainty can disrupt order in schools, creating an environment of chaos and ambiguity.

#### 1.1 Chaos Theory

Chaos is considered a concept that represents undesirable and disordered situations (Cramer, 1998). In other words, chaos entails complexity, uncertainty, and unpredictable change (Öge, 2005). According to Gleick (2003), chaos theory provides an endless field of research by bringing an end to the process of explaining complex phenomena using simpler and fundamental building blocks. In the definitions made within chaos theory, concepts such as disarray, unpredictability, uncertainty, and complex phenomena are frequently encountered.

#### 1.2. Concept of Uncertainty

Uncertainty is a concept inherent in the essence of the universe, influencing all aspects of organizational life (Neyişçi, 2008). Çamlıbel (2003) defines uncertainty as the difficulty in interpreting and perceiving cause-effect relationships between events. In another definition, Karavadar (2011) describes uncertainty as a state of complete inability to structure and classify due to a lack of information. Based on all these definitions, the concept of uncertainty arises when future events cannot be predicted in advance, and it is believed that the perceived difference between the current situation and the potential outcomes in the future is due to the existing stimulus. Uncertainty is a situation characterized by the ambiguity of expressions, variability of conditions, or the existence of various opinions and thoughts that can lead to contradictions. In this sense, uncertainty is considered as a contextual concept (Polat, 2015). According to Tınaztepe (2010), the concept of uncertainty consists of three sub-dimensions: individual uncertainty, group uncertainty, and organizational uncertainty.

### **1.2.1 Individual Uncertainty**

Individuals may not always have sufficient knowledge about matters concerning themselves. In some cases, the information they can access on a subject becomes disorganized (Gifford, Bobbitt, & Solum, 1979). Complex processes with insufficient or ambiguous information, as well as periods of rapid and unpredictable changes, are perceived as threats by individuals (Sargut, 2015). A person's experiences, knowledge, ability to establish cause-and-effect relationships, classification skills, and cognitive abilities determine their level of individual uncertainty that they will experience and perceive (Jackson, 1989).

### **1.2.2 Group Uncertainty**

According to Eren (2020), a group refers to a collection of individuals who psychologically acknowledge each other's presence, interact with one another, have their distinct personalities, and perceive themselves as a group. Groups within an organization not only influence and are influenced by the organization itself but also affect each other. Similarly, there is a relationship among individuals within the group (Jackson, 1989). To define uncertainty, the concepts of complexity, disorganization, insufficiency, and contradictions of information within the group have been utilized (Norton, 1975).

### **1.2.3 Organizational Uncertainty**

Organizational uncertainty is the state in which decision-makers in organizations lack the necessary information about the direction of change and the environment (Daft, 2010). According to Beraha (2014), organizations must continuously obtain their material resources from environments that are constantly changing and a source of uncertainty to carry out their activities. In this sense, organizational uncertainty refers to decision-makers in organizations not having sufficient time to predict the changes occurring in their environments and acquire enough information about their environments. From this standpoint, the perception of decision-makers about organizational uncertainty affects the decisions they make (Freel, 2005). Unforeseen situations that occur within the organization are perceived as organizational uncertainty. In an environment of chaos within the school, making correct decisions is only possible through a thorough understanding of uncertainty and a careful analysis of previous uncertain situations. The behaviors exhibited by school administrators and teachers in response to evolving uncertain situations during the decision-making process can influence the outcomes of subsequent stages. As every decision made in the chaotic environment can impact the course of school operations significantly, even a small decision holds considerable importance. School administrators and teachers can minimize uncertainties by evaluating the current situation not only based on present conditions but also considering the future and being flexible in their actions (Yavuz, 2019). To prevent potential issues that may arise during this process, it is crucial for school administrators and teachers to be aware of the possible effects of their decisions."

The desired outcome is for schools to successfully complete the process of change by adapting to the newly formed situation in the best possible way. To achieve this, education provided in schools is expected to be systematic and well-planned. Additionally, schools inherently exhibit dynamic and highly active organizational characteristics. In schools, the occurrence of unforeseen events and situations is considered an inevitable circumstance. The

unpredictability of changes that may arise due to their structural systems in schools can also lead to negative emotional states such as anxiety and fear among teachers and administrators.

When faced with a new situation in the education process, the uncertainty of school administrators and teachers about what to do can lead to negative consequences, causing disruptions in planning and programs and creating uncertainty within the organization (Clampitt, DeKoch, & Cashman, 2000). In such situations, teachers' and administrators' knowledge, experience, and problem-solving abilities come to the forefront. As mentioned before, uncertainties arising from these and similar change situations lead to negative impacts both on the interpersonal communication among individuals forming educational organizations and on the functioning and operations of the organizations. Disruptions may prevent the organization from achieving its intended goals as planned and in a timely manner. Therefore, addressing and analyzing uncertainties that arise in organizations is crucial.

### **1.3. Research Objective**

Experiencing uncertainty in schools, which are one of the most common types of organizations, can disrupt their functioning and operations. Moreover, it is possible that it may have negative effects on the individuals comprising the school organization from a psychological perspective. Disruptions in operations can make it difficult for schools to achieve their goals and fulfill their missions in society. Therefore, it is crucial to determine the level of uncertainty perceived by teachers and administrators in schools and measure their reactions to uncertain situations. Based on this point, the aim of this research is to determine the level of uncertainty perceived by teachers and administrators in the school environment and their responses to uncertain situations. In this study, it is aimed to describe the organizational uncertainty perceptions of teachers working in public and private schools in the central district of Kahramanmaraş, Onikişubat, based on demographic variables, and to compare the perceptions between teachers in public and private schools. The following research questions were addressed in line with this general objective:

1. Is there a difference in the level of organizational uncertainty perceived by teachers in schools concerning the sub-dimension of organizational negatives based on gender, age, professional experience, working school level, and school type?
2. Is there a difference in the level of organizational uncertainty perceived by teachers in schools concerning the sub-dimension of individual negatives based on gender, age, professional experience, working school level, and school type?
3. Is there a difference in the level of organizational uncertainty perceived by teachers in schools concerning the sub-dimension of administrative practices based on gender, age, professional experience, working school level, and school type?

## **2. Method**

This section includes information about the research model, population and sample, measurement tools used in data collection, validity and reliability studies of the scales, and the techniques used in the analysis of research data.

### **2.1. The Research Model**

This research is a quantitative study conducted in the descriptive survey model. Survey research aims to describe the opinions, characteristics, and current state of a large population or a specific situation related to the research topic as it is (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, and Demirel, 2018: 15; Karasar, 2012: 77). In this context, the organizational uncertainty levels of teachers and administrators working in public and private schools were attempted to be determined.

### **2.2. Population Sample**

The population of this study consists of 6,593 teachers working in public and private schools in the central district of Kahramanmaraş, Onikişubat. Among them, 5,895 teachers work in the district center. According to Can (2016),

when the total number of entities in the population is known, the sample size that can be accepted based on the margins of error is estimated. For a population of up to 6,000, the required sample size for a 95% confidence level ( $p = .05$ ) has been determined to be 361 individuals (Büyüköztürk et al., 2018). In this study, a stratified sampling method was used to select 500 teachers from public and private schools out of the 5,895 teachers. Out of the prepared scales for implementation, 370 scales were returned. Since 6 of these scales were partially completed and some were left blank, only 364 scales were subjected to data analysis in the research. The aim of stratified sampling is to ensure that subgroups in the population are represented in the sample in proportion to their weights (Arastaman, 2022). This method was chosen for this study since it compares the level of organizational uncertainty among teachers working in private and public schools. Schools in the subgroups were determined using simple random sampling method to select the schools to be included in the study. Table 2.1 presents the characteristics of the participating teachers in the research.

**Table 2.1. Statistics regarding the participating teachers in the research**

Type of School	N	%
Private School	30	8.3
Public School	332	91.7
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	159	43.9
Male	203	56.1
<b>Age</b>		
22-30	30	8.3
31-40	150	41.4
41-50	141	39.0
51 and above	41	11.3
<b>Years of Professional Experience</b>		
1-10 year	89	24.6
11-20 year	149	41.2
21 and above	124	34.3
<b>School Level</b>		
Kindergarten and Elementary School	109	30.1
Secondary School	165	45.6
High School	88	24.3

### 2.3. Data Collection Instrument

In this research, the data collection instrument consisted of the "Personal Information Form" to determine the participants' demographic characteristics and the "Organizational Uncertainty Scale in Schools (OÖBÖ)" developed by Toytok and Yavuz (2020) to determine the level of organizational uncertainty in schools. The Personal Information Form collected information about the participants' school type, professional seniority, age, and gender. The OÖBÖ consists of 25 items, categorized into three sub-dimensions: administrative practices (6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20), organizational difficulties (1, 2, 3, 4, 5), and individual difficulties (21, 22, 23, 24, 25).

### 2.4. Validity and Reliability Studies

In this research, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was used to determine the construct validity of the scale, and Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was used to assess the reliability properties of the scale.

Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to confirm the construct validity of the Organizational Uncertainty in Schools scale. In this context, goodness-of-fit statistics were examined, and the results showed a good fit with a chi-square value of 762.099, degrees of freedom (df) of 272, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) of .92, Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) of .91, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) of .058-.066 within a confidence interval of .07, and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) of .05 (Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003). Based on these results, it was concluded that the three-factor structure of the scale was confirmed, and the scale was found to be valid.

For the evaluation of Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, different classifications exist, but the commonly accepted approach is as follows: values between 0.50 and 0.60 are considered weak, between 0.60 and 0.70 are considered acceptable, between 0.70 and 0.90 are considered good, and above 0.90 are considered excellent (George and Mallery, 2003: 231). In the development phase of the Organizational Uncertainty in Schools scale, the Cronbach's Alpha values were found to be 0.926 for the administrative practices sub-dimension, 0.837 for the organizational negatives sub-dimension, and 0.837 for the individual negatives sub-dimension.

However, in this study, the Cronbach's Alpha value for the administrative practices sub-dimension of the Organizational Uncertainty in Schools scale was found to be 0.950, 0.825 for the organizational negatives sub-dimension, and 0.905 for the individual negatives sub-dimension. Since the calculated Cronbach's Alpha value is above 0.70 for all three sub-dimensions, it can be concluded that the scale is reliable.

## 2.5. Data Analysis

In the first stage of data analysis, the dataset was examined for missing data. Missing values were replaced by the mean values. Subsequently, the dataset was examined for outliers. During the outlier analysis, two scales were identified to have extreme values outside the range of -3.00 to +3.00 in standardized z-scores. These scales were excluded from the study.

The data obtained from the research participants were analyzed using appropriate statistical software. Total scores for each of the three sub-dimensions were calculated based on the collected data. Then, the skewness and kurtosis coefficients were examined separately for each sub-dimension to assess whether the data followed a normal distribution. The findings are presented in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2. Normality Test of Distribution

Variables		Skewness	Std.	Kurtosis	Std.
Organizational Negativities	362	.149	.128	-.179	.256
Individual Negativities	362	.688	.128	.171	.256
Managerial Negativities	362	-.118	.128	-.644	.256

In a study, the skewness coefficient is examined to determine whether the data follows a normal distribution. If this value falls between -1 and +1, the distribution is considered to be normal (Büyüköztürk et al., 2022). When examining the table, it can be observed that the skewness and kurtosis coefficients for the sub-dimensions are within the desired range, indicating a normal distribution.

If the distribution is parametric, Independent Samples t-test is used to determine whether there is a significant difference between two categorical variables, and One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is used for comparing more than two categorical variables (Yazıcıoğlu and Erdoğan, 2004). In this study, Levene's test for homogeneity of variances was applied to check the homogeneity between independent variables and organizational uncertainty sub-dimensions. The results are presented in Table 2.3

**Table 2.3 presents the results of the homogeneity test for independent variables based on organizational uncertainty sub-dimensions.**

		Gender	Age	Years of Professional Experience	School Level	Type of School
Organizational	p	.452	.166	.150	.335	.818
Negativities	levne	.567	.618	1.416	5.030	.329
Individual Negativities	p	<b>.008</b>	.374	.645	.361	.503
	levne	3.463	.989	.236	.348	.766
Managerial Negativities	p	.184	.763	.211	.317	<b>.013</b>
	levne	.257	.370	.209	.104	2.019

The distribution of individual uncertainties sub-dimension according to gender was found to be non-homogeneous ( $p < .05$ ) in teachers' perceived organizational uncertainty levels in schools. Since the distribution is non-parametric, the Mann Whitney-U test will be applied to examine whether there is a significant difference based on gender. The distribution of managerial uncertainties sub-dimension according to school type was found to be non-homogeneous ( $p < .05$ ). For independent groups showing parametric distribution, t-test and One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were performed.

### 3. Findings

This section presents the findings regarding the levels of uncertainty in schools based on the perceptions of teachers working in official state/private schools in the central district of Kahramanmaraş, Onikişubat. For the analysis of the obtained data, arithmetic mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) and standard deviation (SD) values were calculated. Since the organizational uncertainty scale does not produce a total score, the total score of the sub-dimensions was calculated.

**Table 3.1 presents descriptive statistics for the sub-dimensions of the organizational uncertainty scale.**

Sub-Dimensions	$\bar{X}$	SS
Organizational Negativities	12,10	3,26
Individual Negativities	10,49	3,59
Managerial Negativities	43,79	9,29

When examining Table 3.1, it is observed that the perceptions of administrative uncertainties ( $\bar{X}=43.79$ ) among teachers working in public and private/state schools are higher than their perceptions of individual uncertainties ( $\bar{X}=10.49$ ) and organizational uncertainties ( $\bar{X}=12.10$ ).

The findings of the t-test results for the sub-dimensions of the perceived organizational uncertainty level according to the gender of the teachers are presented in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.2 presents the t-test results for the sub-dimensions of the perceived organizational uncertainty level according to the gender variable of the teachers.**

Variables	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	SS	sd	t	p
Organizational Negativities	Female	159	12,17	3,35	0,27	0,333	0,739
	Male	203	12,05	3,20	0,22		
Managerial Negativities	Female	159	43,06	8,97	0,71	-1,331	0,184
	Male	203	44,36	9,51	0,67		

Table 3.2 presents the t-test results for the sub-dimensions of the perceived organizational uncertainty level according to the gender variable of the teachers. There is no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of organizational disadvantages ( $t = 0.333$ ,  $p > .05$ ) and managerial disadvantages ( $t = -1.331$ ,  $p > .05$ ) based on gender.

The findings of the Mann Whitney-U test for the sub-dimension of individual disadvantages in relation to the perceived organizational uncertainty level according to the gender of the teachers are provided in Table 3.3.

**Table 3.3 presents the Mann Whitney-U test results for the sub-dimensions of individual disadvantages in relation to the perceived organizational uncertainty level according to the gender of the teachers.**

Variables	Gender	N	S.O	S.T	U	p
Individual Negativities	Female	159	194,29	30892,50	14104,50	0,038
	Male	203	171,48	34810,50		

According to the Mann Whitney-U test results from Table 3.3, a statistically significant difference was found ( $U=14104.50$ ;  $p<.05$ ) between the perceived organizational uncertainty sub-dimension of individual disadvantages and gender. Female teachers had higher mean scores in individual disadvantages compared to male teachers.

Table 3.4 presents the t-test results for the sub-dimensions of perceived organizational uncertainty level according to the variable of the type of official school where the teachers work.

**Table 3.4 presents the t-test results for the sub-dimensions of perceived organizational uncertainty level according to the variable of the type of school where the teachers work.**

Variables	Type of School	N	$\bar{X}$	SS	sd	t	p
Organizational Negativities	Private School	30	12,23	3,72	0,68	0,230	0,818
	Public School	332	12,09	3,22	0,18		
Individual Negativities	Private School	30	10,07	3,59	0,66	-0,670	0,503
	Public School	332	10,53	3,59	0,20		

Table 3.4 provides the t-test results for the sub-dimensions of perceived organizational uncertainty according to the variable of the type of school where the teachers work. There is no significant difference in the organizational negatives sub-dimension ( $t=0.230$ ,  $p>.05$ ) and the individual negatives sub-dimension ( $t=-0.670$ ,  $p>.05$ ) based on the type of school where they work.

The Mann Whitney-U test results for the perceived organizational uncertainty level related to the administrative negatives sub-dimension, according to the variable of the type of school where the teachers work, are presented in Table 3.5.

**Table 3.5 provides the Mann Whitney-U test results for the perceived organizational uncertainty level related to the administrative negatives sub-dimension, according to the variable of the type of school where the teachers work.**

Variables	Type of School	N	S.O	S.T	U	p
Managerial Negativities	Private School	30	140.18	4205.50	3740.50	.024
	Public School	332	185.23	61497.50		

According to the Mann Whitney-U test results presented in Table 3.5, there is a statistically significant difference ( $U=3740.50$ ;  $p<.05$ ) between the perceived organizational uncertainty level related to the administrative negatives sub-dimension and the type of school where the teachers work. The rank averages of teachers working in state schools are higher than those of teachers working in private schools.

The results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the perceived organizational uncertainty level related to the years of professional experience variable are provided in Table 3.6.

**Table 3.6 presents the results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the perceived organizational uncertainty level related to the years of professional experience variable among teachers.**

Sub-dimension	Years of professional experience	N	$\bar{X}$	SS	F	p	Post-Hoc
Organizational Negativities	1-10 year	89,00	11,88	2,96	1.908	0.150	
	11-20 year	149,00	12,50	3,30			
	21 and above	124,00	11,79	3,39			
Individual Negativities	1-10 year	89,00	10,31	3,78	0.439	0.645	
	11-20 year	149,00	10,70	3,57			
	21 and above	124,00	10,36	3,48			
Managerial Negativities	1-10 year	89,00	42,35	9,02	1.562	0.211	
	11-20 year	149,00	44,53	9,27			
	21 and above	124,00	43,93	9,47			

When examining Table 3.6, it is observed that there is variation in the perceived organizational uncertainty levels among teachers based on their years of professional experience. However, there is no statistically significant difference between the organizational negativity sub-dimension ( $F=1.98$ ,  $p>.05$ ), individual negativity sub-dimension ( $F=.439$ ,  $p>.05$ ), and managerial negativity sub-dimension ( $F=1.562$ ,  $p>.05$ ) and the variable of professional experience.

The results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the perceived organizational uncertainty levels related to the variable of school level among teachers are presented in Table 3.7.

**Table 3.7 presents the results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the perceived organizational uncertainty levels among teachers based on the variable of school level where they work.**

Sub-dimension	School Level	N	$\bar{X}$	SS	F	p	Post-Hoc
		Organizational Negativities	Kindergarten and Elementary School	109	11,72	3,14	1,097
	Secondary School	165	12,28	3,61			
	High School	88	12,24	2,68			
Individual Negativities	Kindergarten and Elementary School	109	10,39	3,54	1,022	0,361	
	Secondary School	165	10,30	3,80			
	High School	88	10,96	3,22			
Managerial Negativities	Kindergarten and Elementary School	109	43,84	9,40	1,153	0,317	
	Secondary School	165	44,41	9,18			
	High School	88	42,55	9,33			

In Table 3.7, changes in the perceived organizational uncertainty levels among teachers based on the variable of school level where they work are examined. There were no statistically significant differences found between the school level variable and the sub-dimensions of organizational concerns ( $F=1.097$ ,  $p>.05$ ), individual concerns ( $F=1.022$ ,  $p>.05$ ), and managerial concerns ( $F=1.153$ ,  $p>.05$ ).

Table 3.8 presents the results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the perceived organizational uncertainty levels among teachers based on the age variable.

**Table 3.8 presents the results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the perceived organizational uncertainty levels among teachers based on the age variable.**

Sub-dimension	Age	N	$\bar{X}$	SS	F	p	Post-Hoc
Individual Negativities	22-30	30	11,27	2,60	1,703	0,166	



	31-40	150	12,51	3,30		
	41-50	141	11,86	3,29		
	51 and above	41	12,05	3,36		
Individual Negativities	22-30	30	11,00	4,18	1,041	0,374
	31-40	150	10,75	3,55		
	41-50	141	10,27	3,70		
	51 and above	41	9,88	2,80		
Managerial Negativities	22-30	30	43,20	8,63	0,386	0,763
	31-40	150	43,27	9,19		
	41-50	141	44,30	9,37		
	51 and above	41	44,34	10,03		

When examining Table 3.8, it is observed that there is no statistically significant difference between the age variable and the sub-dimensions of perceived organizational uncertainty levels among teachers, including organizational negatives ( $F=1.703$ ,  $p>.05$ ), individual negatives ( $F=1.041$ ,  $p>.05$ ), and managerial negatives ( $F=0.386$ ,  $p>.05$ ).

## 4. Results, Arguments and Recommendations

### 4.1. Arguments

In the research conducted to determine teachers' perceived organizational uncertainty levels, when examining the total scores of the sub-dimensions, it was observed that the total scores of managerial negatives were higher than those obtained from individual negatives and organizational negatives sub-dimensions. Based on this finding, it is assumed that the majority of uncertainty perception in schools might originate from the management. In this context, teachers might have presumed that the unit responsible for intervention in chaotic situations in schools is the management. Bakioğlu and Demiral (2013) found in their research that according to the views of school administrators, the reasons for uncertainty include planning errors, instability, and reasons based on top executives. Accordingly, teachers might have perceived the source of uncertainty to be the educational planners, i.e., the administrators. The presence of uncertain and chaotic environments in schools may affect the functioning of educational organizations. In cases of uncertainty, teachers not perceiving themselves as responsible may be the reason why the perception of uncertainty related to individual negatives is low. Yavuz (2019) also found parallel results that support the outcome of this research. In his study, the perception of managerial negatives was the highest, while the perception of individual negatives was the lowest. The perception of uncertainty due to organizational negatives was higher than the perception of uncertainty due to individual negatives and lower than the perception of uncertainty due to managerial negatives.

In the research conducted to determine teachers' perceived organizational uncertainty levels, the total scores of the sub-dimensions were compared based on gender. The results revealed a significant difference in the perception of individual uncertainty favoring female teachers. Male teachers exhibited lower levels of uncertainty related to individual concerns. However, no statistically significant differences were found in the perception of organizational and managerial uncertainties based on gender. This finding is consistent with Yamen's (2021) study. In contrast, Yavuz (2019) found a significant difference favoring male teachers regarding organizational uncertainty in a study conducted in Siirt province. This result contradicts our research, where no significant differences were observed in the sub-dimensions of individual and managerial uncertainties based on gender. Furthermore, the total scores of the sub-dimensions were compared based on the type of school. The research revealed a significant difference in the perception of organizational uncertainty due to managerial concerns, favoring public schools. The higher level of managerial uncertainty perceived in public schools might be attributed to the fact that managers in these institutions are more engaged with the environment and, therefore, influenced by external factors more than in private schools. Additionally, it is speculated that managers in private schools might

make faster decisions to resolve uncertainties, following formal regulations, while managers in public schools might face delays in decision-making due to the hierarchical structure, leading to higher levels of uncertainty.

Regarding the variable of professional seniority, no significant differences were found among the sub-dimensions of perceived organizational uncertainty. It is possible that uncertainty situations create anxiety, stress, and shock effects on individuals, leading to variations in their perception and tolerance of uncertainty. Supporting this notion, (Bloom, 2017; Gökçe, 2017) studies can be consulted, which have investigated similar phenomena.

Similarly, no significant differences were found in the perception of organizational uncertainty based on the level of school education. The analysis was conducted separately for three groups: preschool and elementary school, middle school, and high school. The higher levels of parent-student-teacher communication in each level might contribute to a lower sense of uncertainty in the respective school levels.

Lastly, there were no significant differences in the perception of organizational uncertainty based on teachers' age. As teachers gain more experience, their responses to uncertainty situations might mitigate the effects of uncertainty. Therefore, age might not show a consistent pattern in relation to the perception of uncertainty. Existing studies emphasize the significance of effective communication in dealing with uncertainties (Clampitt & Williams, 2000; Duncan, 1972).

## **4.2. Results**

This research examines teachers' perceptions of organizational uncertainty in the context of gender, type of school, professional seniority, school level, and age variables. The findings indicate that the perception of uncertainty arising from individual concerns is higher for females. However, no significant differences were found in the perception of uncertainty related to organizational and managerial factors based on gender.

Regarding the type of school, the results show that the perception of uncertainty arising from managerial practices is higher in public schools compared to private schools within the educational organizations. However, no significant differences were observed in the perception of uncertainty related to organizational and individual factors based on the type of school.

The study found no significant differences in the perception of uncertainty based on professional seniority, school level, and age variables.

Uncertainty and chaotic situations are not desired in educational organizations. However, understanding the sources and causes of uncertainty, how it arises, proposing solutions, and identifying influential factors are crucial. In this regard, it is believed that this research contributes valuable insights to the field.

## **4.3. Recommendations**

In this section, recommendations have been presented for researchers and practitioners.

### **6.1 Recommendations for Researchers**

1. After conducting the same research using quantitative methods, a mixed research design incorporating qualitative research with observation methods can be employed to examine teachers' more natural behaviors in-depth.
2. The same research can be extended to include both administrators and teachers in selected project schools.

### **6.2 Recommendations for Practitioners**

1. The perception of uncertainty arising from individual concerns is higher for female teachers. In this regard, it is recommended to actively involve female teachers in the decision-making and management processes within schools.
2. Teachers working in public schools exhibit higher uncertainty related to managerial issues. To mitigate or minimize chaotic situations, administrators can be provided with communication and crisis management seminars.

### 5. References

- Arastaman, G.(2022). Evren ve Örneklem. N. Cemaloğlu (Ed.), *Bilimsel Araştırma Teknikleri ve Etik* (s.175-191). Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık
- Bakioğlu, A., & Demiral, S. (2013). Okul yöneticilerinin belirsizlik durumlarını algılama ve karar verme tarzları. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 38(38), 9-36.
- Beraha, A. (2014). *Stratejik esnekliğin çevresel belirsizlik ile ilişkisi üzerine bir çalışma* (Doctoral dissertation, Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara).
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, K. E., Akgün, E. Ö., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2018). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Bloom, N. (2009). The impact of uncertainty shocks. *econometrica*, 77(3), 623-685.
- Can, A. (2016). *Bilimsel araştırma sürecinde nicel veri analizi*. (4. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Clampitt, P. G., DeKoch, R. J., & Cashman, T. (2000). A strategy for communicating about uncertainty. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 14(4), 41-57. Cramer, F. (1998). *Kaos ve Düzen, Sırat Köprüsü'ndeki Hayat*. (Çev. Veysel Atayman). İstanbul: Alan Yayıncılık. (1998).
- Çamlıbel, N. D. (2003). *Belirsizlik ortamında planlama düşüncesi 'sinerjetik toplum - sinerjik yönetim ve sinerjist planlama modeli' örnek olay: 17 Ağustos - 12 Kasım 1999 depremleri sonrası kaos ve kendi - kendine organizasyon süreci*. (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi), Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Daft, R. L. (2015). *Organization theory and design*. Cengage learning.
- Eren, E. (2020). *Örgütsel Davranış ve Yönetim Psikolojisi*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş.
- Freel, M. S. (2005). Perceived environmental uncertainty and innovation in small firms. *Small Business Economics*, 25(1), 49-64.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS For Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*, 11.0 Update (4th Ed.), Allyn and Bacon, Boston.
- Gifford, W. E., Bobbitt, H. R. & Solum, J. W. (1979). Message characteristics and perception of uncertainty by organizational decision makers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2 (3), 458-481.
- Gleick, J. (1996). *Kaos Yeni Bir Bilim Teorisi*. (Çev. Fikret Üçcan). Ankara: TÜBİTAK Popüler Bilim Kitapları. (1987).
- Güravşar Gökçe, S. (2014). Proje yönetim bileşenleri ile belirsizlikten kaçınma eğilimi arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemeye yönelik RTB1 bölgesinde bir araştırma.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
- Jackson, S. (1989). Does job control control job stress?. Sauter, S. L., Hurrell Jr, J. J. & C. L. Cooper (Eds.). *Job control and worker health*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 25-53.
- Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Nobel Yayınları.

- Karavardar, G. (2011). Aile işletmelerinde kurumsallaşma, yetki devri ve belirsizliğe tolerans. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1 (1), 157-179.
- Mertler, C. A., Vannatta, R. A., & LaVenita, K. N. (2016). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: Practical application and interpretation*. Routledge.
- Neyişçi, N. B. (2008). *Türkiye'deki Mesleki Eğitim Ve Öğretimin Güçlendirilmesi Projesi (MEGEP) İçindeki Okul Yöneticilerinin, Belirsizlikten Kaçınma Davranışlarını Gerçekleştirme Düzeyleri*. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Norton, R. W. (1975). Measurement of Ambiguity Tolerance. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 39(6), 607-619.
- Öge, S. (2005). Düzen mi düzensizlik (kaos) mi? Örgütsel varlığın sürdürülebilirliği açısından bir değerlendirme. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* (13), ss. 285-303.
- Özdemir, M. Ve Doğruöz, E.(2022). Bilimsel araştırma desenleri. N. Cemaloğlu (Ed.), *Bilimsel Araştırma Teknikleri ve Etik* (s.65-102). Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Polat, M. (2015). *Yöneticilerin açık liderlik özellikleri ve sosyal ağları benimseme durumlarının örgütsel belirsizlik üzerindeki etkileri: Fırat Üniversitesi örneği/The effects of open leadership characteristics and adoption of social networks situations of administrators on organizational uncertainty: The case of Fırat University*. (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Elazığ: Fırat Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Sargut, S. (2015, Ağustos). *Kültürler Arası Farklılaşma ve Yönetim*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., ve Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, 8 (2), 23-74.
- Tınaztepe, C. (2010). *The Effect Of Desire For Change On The Relationship Between Perceived Uncertainty And Job Related Affective Well-Being*. (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Toytok, E. H. ve Yavuz, M. (2020). Okullarda Örgütsel Belirsizlik Düzeyini Belirleme Ölçeği'nin Geliştirilme Çalışması. *Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 17(2). 799-823.
- Yazıcıoğlu, Y. & Erdoğan, S. (2004). *SPSS Uygulamalı bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Detay Yayıncılık.
- Yavuz, M. (2019). *Okullarda Örgütsel Belirsizlik Düzeyinin Belirlenmesi*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Siirt Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Siirt.

**Open Access** This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

