Unveiling the Impact and Dynamics of Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Educational Environments: A Comprehensive Narrative Review

Ravina

Research Scholar, Maharishi Dayanand University, Rohtak

ABSTRACT

OCB is a fundamental aspect of all human organizations. This review paper aims to emphasize the significance of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) within educational environments. Educational institutions possess leaders, employees, and tangible and intangible resources. The dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), such as altruism, civic virtue, courtesy, consciousness, and sportsmanship, are highly significant in enhancing the strength of relationships among employees, leading to improved group performance and positive outcomes for organizations. Nonprofit service institutions, such as schools, rely on employees expressing OCB to achieve improvements in their outcomes. Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) aims to mitigate negative behaviors and promote positive workplace behaviors. Research has demonstrated the advantages of critically analyzing the emergence of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in both educational leaders and teachers. This review examines the construct of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in educational settings, specifically addressing its role, types, existence, measurement, and importance. This study offers recommendations for policymakers, administrators, and teachers to facilitate the promotion of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in schools.

Keywords: OCB, dimensions of OCB, organizational effectiveness, educational settings, leadership, intellectual capital

INTRODUCTION

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is an essential cornerstone of any human organization. According to Organ (1997), OCB, also known as Organisational Citizenship Behaviour, can be defined as performance that contributes to the social and psychological context in which task performance takes place (p. 95). Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) refers to a phenomenon in which individuals exhibit behavior that goes beyond the scope of their assigned tasks (Fahmi & Permana, 2019). According to Firouzi et al. (2014), OCB, or Organisational Citizenship Behaviour, can be characterized by three fundamental features. Firstly, it is important to note that OCB is voluntary behavior, meaning that individuals engage in such actions willingly and without any external coercion. Secondly, OCB is deemed to be useful to the organization, implying that it contributes positively to the overall functioning and

effectiveness of the entity. Lastly, OCB exhibits a multi-dimensional aspect, suggesting that it encompasses various dimensions or facets that collectively contribute to the overall construct.

Scholars have highlighted the importance of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) in contributing to the success of an organization. This is because OCB refers to the discretionary actions of employees that enhance the effectiveness of the group (Cohen & Kol, 2004). OCB, or organizational citizenship behavior, has a multidirectional impact on individuals, groups (or teams), and the overall performance of the organization (Poohongthong et al., 2014). When employees engage in Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB), it increases the likelihood of their work group demonstrating superior execution, which in turn improves the overall viability of the organization (Kernodle & Noble, 2013; Schnake & Dumler, 2003). Khalid et al. (2021) found that students observed significant levels of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) in their teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly regarding their assistance in adapting to online learning platforms.

Initially, OCB was primarily investigated within corporate and mechanical contexts. Barnard (1938) first proposed the concept of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) within the framework of the system approach during his examination of organisations. Katz (1964) argued that for effective organizational functioning, personnel should demonstrate three types of behavior: motivation to join and remain with the organization, ability to fulfill job requirements or perform specific roles, and capacity for innovation and initiative beyond assigned duties (Werner, 2002). Organ and his team established and popularised the concept of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) in the early 1980s. Initially, the significance of OCB in public and private sector organizations was not fully recognized when it was first introduced by Bateman and Organ (1983).

In his 1988 study, Organ evaluated organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) using five dimensions: conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, and altruism. Kernodle and Noble (2013) have established these principles for measuring OCB. Subsequently, analysts categorized these dimensions by identifying unique connections observed in different manifestations of an individual's organizational behaviors. In summary, Fajar and Soeling (2017) defined OCB as a concept that explains the underlying behavioral motivations behind employees' natural work performance. OCB, or Organisational Citizenship Behaviour, refers to voluntary actions taken by employees to enhance the effectiveness and viability of an organization (Cohen & Kol, 2004; Fajar & Soeling, 2017; Firouzi et al., 2014). The primary benefit of OCB is its positive influence on the productivity of both individuals and groups, resulting in enhanced organizational outcomes (Poohongthong et al., 2014).

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

This study is a response to feedback received from a researcher during a workshop held at the University of Malaya in 2015, which indicated a lack of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in educational institutions. These statements prompted the authors to conduct a literature review on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in educational settings. The OCB construct's identification in the educational paradigm was found to have reached its 25th anniversary (Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000).

This study aimed to provide a contemporary review of the existing inventory of this narrative. The primary objective of this study is to emphasize the significance of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in various settings, including specialty units, representative bodies, private organisations, and educational institutions. Schools, like any other organization, rely on effective processes and employee performance to achieve their objectives. The concept and theory of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) were developed based on a thorough examination of existing literature.

This process of reviewing available literature allows researchers to gain a deeper understanding of the problem at hand. This theoretical review will utilize the social exchange theory as a sociological perspective to examine the topic (Tamunomiebi & Onah, 2019). According to Homans (1958), social exchange theory was developed to enhance understanding of individual behavior in the context of social interactions. The following sections will provide a literature review on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in educational settings. The review will specifically examine the role, types, existence and importance, measurement, and dimensions of OCB.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Role of OCB in Organizations
Worker anticipation and proactivity contribute to a positive workplace climate (Ong et al., 2018). Thus, companies promote OCB to boost staff performance and production (Hart et al., 2016). Teamwork is linked to OCB (Bizri, 2018; Hanson, 2017; Hanson et al., 2021; Mallick, 2014). OCB strongly impacts organizational productivity and adequacy, increases the likelihood of achieving goals, improves administration, and promotes joint efforts and decision-making. The International Trade Commission says OCB is best for workers and owners since it reduces absenteeism and improves worker satisfaction (Bergeron et al., 2013).

Levels of OCB
Prosocial conduct, which occurs when individuals and teams help colleagues in tasks that sustain the organization, and OCBO, which occurs when a worker directly contributes to the organization's success, are measured in private sector literature. Both sorts of OCB are needed for any organization, including schools. OCBI makes worker partnerships more rewarding (Y. H. Lee et al., 2017; Memon, 2017). OCBI in schools develops when dedicated teachers are friendlier to colleagues. High-engagement instructors with a positive outlook on the organization cause OCBO (Runhaar et al., 2013).

Teacher OCB was positively correlated with student achievement, as was organizational justice. Instructors also found that their leaders directly impacted student achievement, while their colleagues indirectly did (Burns & Dipaola, 2013). The most extensively used organizational citizenship behavior scale (OCBS) was developed by K. Lee and Allen (2002) and measures OCBI and OCBO with 16 items. Leadership, administration, equity/reasonability, social justice, trust, civility, and leader personality were found to promote OCB in an organization. OCB in organizations should improve with these components studied and supported.

Relationship between OCB and intellectual capital

Hanson et al. (2021) found that organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) played a mediating role in the relationship between principal leadership skills (PLS) and the promotion of instructional capacity (IC) in schools. Kianfar et al. (2013) found a significant correlation between organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and organizational identification (IC) in their research conducted at a public institution in western Iran. Organizations possess two types of assets: tangible assets and intangible assets. Productivity in organizations is contingent upon the effective management of both tangible and intangible assets. Intellectual capital refers to a non-physical asset. Bhasin (2012) found that historically, the majority of investments were focused on material assets, accounting for 70% of ventures, while only 30% of investments were allocated towards enhancing intellectual capital. In recent decades, there has been a growing focus on the enhancement, estimation, appraisal, and observation of intellectual capital. Approximately 67% of the investment has been allocated to intangible resources, including research and development, IT, training, and skills and capabilities. The remaining 33% of the investment has been allocated to tangible resources. OCB, or organizational citizenship behavior, has been found to have a positive impact on human resource development. This is achieved through increased employee commitment to the company, improved leadership qualities, enhanced social capital, and the promotion of knowledge-sharing behavior. Karim and Majid (2017) have acknowledged the association between OCB and these dimensions of intellectual capital.

Relationship between leadership styles and OCB in schools

Non-educational OCB studies found a link between leadership styles and OCB. OCB is more common in organizations with impartial assessment procedures (Ahmed, 2016; Muthuraman & AlHaziazi, 2017). Shared, dispersed, transformative, and collaborative leadership styles all promote effective collaborative groups in an organization through supporting leadership actions and open-minded attitudes (Bostanci, 2013). OCB in schools is associated with teachers' perceptions of transformative principals more than transactional principals. Khan et al. (2020) agreed that transformational leadership promoted creativity and innovation in OCB schools. Bodla et al. (2019) found a curving relationship between OCB and dictatorship using social exchange theory. The next section examines research on leadership styles and the OCB characteristics (civility, benevolence, civic virtue, and sportsmanship).

Benevolence, civic virtue. A study in many Pakistani schools found a strong association between transformational, organizational, and behavioral leadership qualities and OCB dimensions of kindness and civic virtue.

- Civility. Transformational, organizational, and behavioral leadership were weakly linked to OCB civility. This shows that some leadership styles struggle to handle teacher burden issues.

Sportsmanship. Organizational leadership qualities are closely correlated with OCB sportsmanship. OCB resembles behavioral initiative (Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009). Motivational behavior is also linked to sportsmanship. They showed that all initiative abilities affected teacher sportsmanship.

OCB in an educational setting

Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2000) created a quantitative method for OCB in educational organizations. Dipaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) studied OCB and school climate with them. Socioeconomic

inequality has modified the operationalization of the OCB (Farh et al., 2004). Later, Dipaola et al. (2005) developed a new scale for assessing organizational civic behaviors in schools (OCBS), which is widely used in research. Since research on OCB at educational institutions is rare, operationalizations of OCB in the literature vary (Oplatka & Stundi, 2011). Polat (2009) examined OCB in Turkish schools, whereas Oplatka (2009) examined its effects on Israeli instructors, students, and schools. They determined that teachers' OCB was crucial to the school's reputation. Khalid et al. (2010) found a correlation between OCB and student advancement.

Job satisfaction, job pressure, organizational fairness, leadership backing, and organizational obligation affect OCB among Nepalese university teachers, according to Maharjan (2014). When employees feel treated fairly and impartially, their OCB rises, improving firm performance. Due to the significant association between payment and OCB, reimbursement fairness is a good OCB forecaster (Owor, 2016). Since principals directly supervise teachers, they should care about their well-being. OCB is substantially correlated with intrinsic and extrinsic prizes (Islam et al., 2015; U. H. Lee et al., 2013; Tufail, 2017). Principals can inspire instructors through performance-based incentives. Supervisors should also promote promotions for teachers to increase morale (Fahmi & Permana, 2019).

OCB scales for schools

Popescu and Deaconu (2013) examined OCB mediation in Romanian secondary schools. OCB is essential for academic institutions, they concluded. Despite students' weak OCB, group OCB is stronger than individual OCB. The 15-item OCB scale by Dipaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) measures educational contexts. A four-point Likert scale with 0.96 reliability was used. Data showed a strong link between school atmosphere and OCB. School administrators who showed collegian leadership had high OCB levels. Primary, middle, and high schools have different OCB levels. They found that organizational structure had a big impact on OCB and that a teacher's improved expertise increased OCB and learning. Dipaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) created a 15-item OCB scale to assess educational environments. A four-point Likert scale with 0.96 reliability was used. Data showed a strong link between school atmosphere and OCB. Schools with collegial administrators had high OCB levels. Primary, middle, and high schools have different OCB levels. They found that organizational structure had a big impact on OCB and that a teacher's improved expertise increased OCB and learning.

Neves et al. (2014) examined Portuguese teachers' views on OCB measurement. They assessed the notion using a 16-item six-point Likert scale. Skewness, kurtosis, and Cronbach Alpha (0.90) for OCB and its submeasurements verified normality. Their study found that the measure helped assess school OCB.

A qualitative study in India by Shaheen et al. (2016) found a new component of teacher OCB: prosocial conduct. According to their study, teachers' OCB has three determinants: Individual, Organisation, and Prosocial. According to p. 1095, parent involvement in school is redesigning and altering teacher behavior. Shaheen et al. (2016) defined prosocial behavior as extra-role behavior oriented by parents as "customers for the school" (p. 1112). However, confusion about a teacher's in-role and extra-role activities might cause doubt for teachers (Oplatka, 2009). This researcher stressed the importance of the study context.

Individuals in India are collectivist. Teachers may have "the desire to develop a feeling of groupness with other members" (Kapoor et al., 2003).

Niqab et al. (2019) tested a new OCB scale in Pakistani secondary public schools. Gaining teachers' perspectives on OCB at their schools helped update and aid educational leaders in impoverished areas, influence continuous improvement processes, develop school capacity, and provide quality education for students. This study found that the OCB scale's three-factor model included supportive leadership (SL), civic virtue (CV), and collaborative problem solving (CPS) as amalgamations of items from four of the five theoretical constructs operationalized on Organ and Ryan's (1995) measurement model. The study confirmed the new OCB instrument's reliability.

OCB and organizational justice in Pakistani schools were studied by Dar and Raja (2014). A sample of school teachers was surveyed using a 12-item Likert scale. His study found a high demand for OCB in educational institutions, which requires familiarity, teamwork, tuning in, and unity. That study showed that bureaucratic supervision of teaching relationships worsens the problem and reduces voluntary behavior. Somech and Ohayon (2020) linked a leader's OCB to the team's. The researchers found this beneficial connection substantial at high organizational justice levels but not at low levels.

Counterproductive work behaviors (CWB)

Whitney et al. (2009) highlighted the impact of generational differences on work-related behaviors, specifically on an individual's core values and manners. Therefore, the workplace can exhibit these differences, which may or may not be advantageous for the organization (Tamunomiebi & Onah, 2019). Generation X refers to individuals born from 1965 to 1980. According to Schwartz et al. (2007), Gen X individuals exhibit higher levels of organizational citizenship behavior (OCBI) and organizational citizenship behavior towards the organization (OCBO) compared to previous generations. This can be attributed to their diverse and global mindset, as well as their strong educational background. Additionally, Gen X individuals are known for their enthusiasm in assisting their colleagues and the organization in matters related to the workplace. Resentments may arise when some teachers assume additional responsibilities to ensure the smooth functioning of the school in the absence of other employees fulfilling their contractual obligations. As a result, employees who consistently exceed expectations may engage in counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) as a response to their perceptions of inequity and injustice.

Organizational factors contributing to teachers' OCB

Gnanarajan et al. (2020) examined factors associated with teacher organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in schools, such as work-family conflict, perceived organizational support, teacher values, teachers' self-efficacy, student behavior patterns, and teachers' pupil control ideologies (p. 95). Gnanarajan et al. (2020) recommended that administrators prioritize the well-being of teachers by preventing excessive workloads and work-family conflicts, offering support for both professional and personal needs, and providing adequate professional development opportunities to address student discipline challenges and mitigate stress-related problems. Administrators should strive to promote a workplace environment that acknowledges and harmonizes the goals of the school with the values held by teachers (Hanson, 2017). According to Medina (2021), administrators should enhance teachers' job satisfaction, self-efficacy, and retention by fostering their sense of worth through recognition and professional development.

Implications and recommendations

Policymakers, public service sector managers/leaders, and educators should proactively examine the variables outlined in the literature relevant to their specific contexts. They should also consider the individual propensities, group dynamics, and organizational elements that are pertinent to their school. The next step in enhancing organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in schools involves employing exploratory research designs to gather data that can verify whether teachers' perceptions of OCB align with the theories in use proposed by Argyris and Schön (1978). The Johari window can be utilized by school personnel to recognize the disparities between their knowledge about themselves, their team, and their school, and the knowledge they lack. This can be beneficial in fostering organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and cultivating positive school cultures (Dick & Dalmau, 2000). Developing organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in schools necessitates a comprehensive comprehension of the processes involved in organizing to establish a shared understanding, incorporating new knowledge into the existing system, and fostering interpersonal cooperation to enhance overall functioning. School leaders should collaborate with faculty members to establish a shared purpose, determine the problem-solving approach of the organization, align individual goals and skills with school objectives and job responsibilities, allocate dedicated time during the work day for team-building activities, foster emotional safety to encourage individuals and teams to question assumptions, and identify specific professional development opportunities for skill enhancement (Hanson, 2017). Gnanarajan et al. (2020) found that high-quality professional development programs for teachers can improve their self-efficacy, and positive outlook at work, and subsequently enhance teacher organizational citizenship behavior (OCB).

Research on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in schools has been relatively recent in the field of cultural development. This research has borrowed variables from previous studies conducted in the private sector on OCB. Additional research is needed to establish a contextually relevant theory for organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in educational institutions. This theory should offer practical constructs that can enhance our understanding of this specific field. Furthermore, studies investigating the concept of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) in educational settings commonly adopt quantitative survey research designs. Further investigation into the contextual factors influencing schools and employees' perceptions and experiences could contribute to the development of constructs for future research (De Geus et al., 2020). Gnanarajan et al. (2020) suggested that future research should focus on examining the association between student behavior patterns and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs).

CONCLUSION

Burns and Dipaola (2013) define OCB in schools as the degree to which educators engage in tasks and responsibilities that are beyond their official job requirements. Numerous researchers have made significant contributions to the examination of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) across different contexts and through the use of diverse metrics after the initial construct development by D. W. Organ in 1988. OCB has become increasingly important in educational institutions worldwide in recent decades (Hanson et al., 2021; Niqab et al., 2019; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000; Somech & Ron, 2007). OCB is a significant and emerging field of study that offers valuable insights into factors that contribute to school improvement (Kernodle & Noble, 2013). Gnanarajan et al. (2020) found associations between OCB and various factors, including job satisfaction, commitment, trust, perceived organizational support,

job efficacy, sense of educational calling, positive school culture and climate, educational leadership skills/styles, and student behavior patterns. Gnanarajan et al. (2020) suggest that the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) can be elucidated through the social exchange process. These dimensions are also influenced by the teacher's relationship with their supervisor, which may differ across cultures. The utilization of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) in educational settings enhances academic achievement among students, fosters professional growth among teachers, promotes effective collaboration within teams, and contributes to the overall improvement of schools.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmed, N. O. A. (2016). Impact of human resource management practices on organizational citizenship behavior: An empirical investigation from the banking sector of Sudan. International Review of Management and Marketing, 6(4), 964–973.

2. Aksel, I., Serinkan, C., Kiziloglu, M., & Aksoy, B. (2013). Assessment of teachers' perceptions of organizational citizenship behaviors and psychological empowerment: an empirical analysis in Turkey. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 89, 69–73.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.08.811

3. Arar, K., & Nasra, M. A. (2019). Leadership style, occupational perception and organizational citizenship behavior in the Arab education system in Israel. Journal of Educational Administration, 57(1), 85–100. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-08-2017-0094

4. Argyris, C., & Schön, D. (1978). Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective. New York: McGraw-Hill.

5. Barnard, C. I. (1938). The functions of the executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

6. Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: the relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". Academy of Management Journal, 26(4), 587–595. https://doi.org/10.2307/255908.

7. Bergeron, D. M., Shipp, A. J., Rosen, B., & Furst, S. A. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior and career outcomes. The cost of being a good citizen. Journal of Management, 39(4), 958–984. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311407508.

8. Bhasin, M. L. (2012). Measurement and disclosure of intellectual capital in a developing country: An exploratory study. Australian Journal of Business and Management Research, 2(8), 63–75. https://doi.org/10.52283/nswrca.ajbmr.20120208a08.

9. Bizri, R. (2018). Diversity management and OCB: the connection evidence from the Lebanese banking sector. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, 37(3), 233–253. https://doi.org/ 10.1108/EDI-03-2017-0059.

10. Bodla, A. A., Tang, N., Van Dick, R., & Mir. (2019). Authoritarian leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, and organizational deviance: Curvilinear relationships. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 40(5), 583–599. https://doi.org/10.1108/ LODJ-08-2018-0313.

11. Bolino, M. C., Varela, J. A., Bande, B., & Turnley, W. H. (2006). The impact of impression management tactics on supervisor ratings of organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27(3), 281–297. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.379.

12. Bostanci, A. B. (2013). The prediction level of teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors on the successful practice of shared leadership. Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 51, 177–194. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/id=EJ1059935.

13. Cohen, A., & Keren, D. (2010). Does climate matter? An examination of the relationship between organizational climate and OCB among Israeli teachers. The Service Industries Journal, 30(2), 247–263. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642060802120158.

14. Cohen, A., & Kol, Y. (2004). Professionalism and organizational citizenship behavior: An empirical examination among Israeli nurses. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 19(4), 386–405. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940410537945.

15. Dar, A., & Raja, N. (2014). Organizational citizenship and organizational justice in Pakistani schools. Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM), 16(1), 156–160. https:// doi.org/10.9790/487X-1614156160.

16. De Geus, P. C. J. C., Ingrams, A., Tummers, L., & Pandey, S. K. (2020). Organizational citizenship behavior in the public sector: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. Public Administration Review, 80(2), 259–270. https://doi.org/10 .1111/puar.13141

17. Dick, B., & Dalmau, T. (2000). Argyris and Schön: Some Elements of Their Models. Australia.

18. Dipaola, M., Tarter, C., & Hoy, W. (2005). Measuring organizational citizenship in schools: The OCB Scale. Educational Leadership and Reform, 4, 319–341.

19. Ertürk, A. (2007). Increasing organizational citizenship behaviors of Turkish academicians: the mediating role of trust in supervisor on the relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behaviors. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3), 257–270. https:// doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733089.

20. Fahmi, I., & Permana, J. (2019). Building Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) through Personality and Work Perception of Teachers. In 2nd International Conference on Research of Educational Administration and Management (ICREAM 2018). Atlantis Press.

21. Farh, J. L., Zhong, C. B., & Organ, D. W. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior in the People's Republic of China. Organization Science, 15(2), 241–253. https://doi.org/ 10.1287/orsc.1030.0051.

22. Firouzi, M., Harati, H., & Shahraki, R. (2014). Probing the effect of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) on social capital (SC). International Journal of Advanced Research in Science and Technology, 3(3), 136–139.

23. Gnanarajan, A. H., Kengatharan, N., & Velnampy, T. (2020). Exploring the prevalence of teachers' organizational citizenship behavior and its determinants: Evidence from an under-researched cultural milieu. Qualitative Research in Education, 9(1), 95–123. https://doi.org/10.17583/qre.2020.4531.

24. Hanson, J. L. (2017). Manage your mindset: Maximise your power of personal choice. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

25. Hanson, J. L., Niqab, M., & Bangert, A. (2021). Educational context of intellectual capital: An exploratory four-factor study. (Vol. 1, pp. 31–62). Springer Nature. Retrieved from http s://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-981-16-1692-1_2 https://doi.org/10.1007/ 978-981-16-1692-1_2.

26. Hart, T. A., Gilstrap, J. B., & Bolino, M. C. (2016). Organizational citizenship behavior and the enhancement of absorptive capacity. Journal of Business Research, 69(10), 3981– 3988. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.06.001.

27. Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. American Journal of Sociology, 63(6), 567–606.

28. Islam, M. S., Akter, S., & Lecturer, F. A. (2015). Factor affecting organizational citizenship behavior of corporate sector in Bangladesh. European Journal of Business and Management, 7, 7–17.

29. Jain, N. R., & Rizvi, I. A. (2018). Impact of corporate citizenship on organizational citizenship behavior of managers: A study from selected Indian banks. Global Business Review, 20(6). https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150917749289.

30. Jayarathna, D. Y. (2019). Impact of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB): Mediating effect of psychological empowerment: A study on apparel sector Sri Lanka. Journal of Business School, 2(4), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.26677/ TR1010.2019.103.

31. Karim, D. N., & Majid, A. H. A. (2017). The effect of high-performance HR practices on knowledge sharing behavior: the mediating role of employee engagement. International Postgraduate Business Journal, 9(2), 74–88.

32. Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. Behavioral science, 9(2), 131–146.

33. Kernodle, T. A. (2007). Antecedents and consequences of organizational citizenship behavior: A hierarchical linear modeling study. Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 68(3-A).

34. Kernodle, T. A., & Noble, D. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its importance in academics. American Journal of Business Education (AJBE), 6(2), 235–239. https://doi.org/https://eric.ed.gov/id=EJ1054332.

35. Khalid, S. A., Jusoff, H. K., Othman, M., Ismail, M., & Rahman, N. A. (2010). Organizational citizenship behavior as a predictor of student academic achievement. International Journal of Economics and Finance, 2(1), 65–71.

36. Khalid, S. A., Rahman, N. A., Darus, N. A., & Shahruddin, S. (2021). Lecturers' Organizational Citizenship Behaviours during COVID-19 Pandemic. Asian Journal of University Education, 17(2), 215–226. https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v17i2.13401.

37. Khan, M. A., Ismail, F. B., Hussain, A., & Alghazali, B. (2020). The interplay of leadership Styles, innovative work behavior, organizational culture, and organizational citizenship behavior. SAGE Open(1), 10–10.

38. Kianfar, V., Siadat, S. A., Hoveida, R., & Abedi, A. (2013). Investigating structural relation of organizational trust, and organizational citizenship behavior to intellectual capital at state universities in the west of Iran. International Journal of Learning and Development, 3(4), 114–122. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijld.v9i2.14919.

39. Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 131–142. https:// doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.131.

40. Lee, U. H., Kim, H. K., & Kim, Y. H. (2013). Determinants of organizational citizenship behavior and its outcomes. Global Business and Management Research. An International Journal, 5(1), 54–65.

41. Maharjan, S. (2014). Factors affecting organizational citizenship behavior. (Unpublished Mini Research). Nepal: University Grants Commission.

42. Malik, M. E., Ghafoor, M. M., & Iqba, H. K. (2012). Leadership and personality traits as determinants of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in the banking sector of Pakistan. World Applied Sciences Journal(8), 1152–1158.

43. Mallick, E., Pradhan, R. K., Tewari, H. R., & and, L. K. J. (2014). Organizational citizenship behavior, job performance, and HR practices: A relational perspective. Management and Labor Studies, 39(4), 449–460. https://doi.org/10.1177/0258042X15578023.

44. Medina, M. R. (2021). Authentic leadership: A study of the relationship between authentic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior among research administrators at research universities. Research Management Review, 25(1), 71–91.

45. Neves, P. C., Paixão, R., Alarcão, M., & Gomes, A. D. (2014). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools: Validation of a questionnaire. The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 17(17e), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2014.20

46. Niqab, M., Hanson, J., Bangert, A., Kannan, S., Sharma, S., & Ghaffar, A. (2019). Measuring organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) in secondary schools in Pakistan and a comparison with factors of a school growth mindset culture. International Journal of Learning and Development, 9(2). https://doi.org/10.5296/ijld.v9i2.14919.

47. Ong, M., Mayer, D. M., Tost, L. P., & Wellman, N. (2018). When corporate social responsibility motivates employee citizenship behavior: The sensitizing role of task significance. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 144, 44–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2017.09.006.

48. Organ, & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. Personnel Psychology, 48, 775–802. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x.

49. Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. England, UK: Lexington Books.

50. Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's constructed clean-up time. Human Performance, 10(2), 85–97. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2.

51. Owor, J. J. (2016). Human resource management practices, employee engagement and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) in selected firms in Uganda. African Journal of Business Management, 10(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM2015 .7954.

52. Polat, S. (2009). Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) displays levels of the teachers at secondary schools according to the perceptions of the school administrators. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1(1), 1591–1596. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro .2009.01.280.

53. Poohongthong, C., Surat, P., & Sutipan, P. (2014). A study on the relationships between ethical leadership, work-life balance, organizational socialization, and organizational citizenship behavior of teachers in Northern Thailand. International Journal of Behavioral Science (IJBS), 9(2), 17–28. https://doi.org/10.14456/ijbs.2014.2.

54. Popescu, A. M., & Deaconu, A. (2013). High-school, organizational citizenship behavior moderator. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 92, 735–740. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.08.747.

55. Runhaar, P., Konermann, J., & Sanders, K. (2013). Teachers' organizational citizenship behavior: considering the roles of their work engagement, autonomy and leader–member exchange. Teaching and Teacher Education, 30, 99–108. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.tate.2012.10.008.

56. Schnake, M. E., & Dumler, M. P. (2003). Levels of measurement and analysis issues in organizational citizenship behavior research. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76(3), 283–301. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317903769647184.

57. Shaheen, M., Gupta, R., & Kumar, Y. (2016). Exploring dimensions of teachers' OCB from stakeholder's perspective: A study in India. The Qualitative Report, 21(6), 1095–1117. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2016.2357.

58. Sharma, J. P., Bajpai, N., & Holani, U. (2011). Organizational citizenship behavior in the public and private sector and its impact on job satisfaction: A comparative study from an Indian perspective. International Journal of Business & Management, 6(1), 67–75. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v6n1p67.

59. Somech, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2000). Understanding extra-role behavior in schools: the relationships between job satisfaction, sense of efficacy, and teachers' extra-role behavior. Teaching and Teacher Education, 16(5), 649–659. https://doi.org/10.1016/ S0742-051X(00)00012-3.

60. Routledge Somech, A., & Ron, I. (2007). Promoting organizational citizenship behavior in schools: The impact of individual and organizational characteristics. Educational Administration Quarterly, 43(1), 38–66. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X06291254

61. Tamunomiebi, M. D., & Onah, G. O. (2019). Organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review of its development in a diversity driven workplace. The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management, 6(1), 41–60. Texas Education Agency. (2016). Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System.

62. Tufail, M. S., Muneer, S., & Manzoor, M. (2017). How organizational rewards and organizational justice affect the organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior: Analysis of Pakistan service industries. Retrieved from http://www.ci tyuniversity.edu.pk/curj/Journals/Journal/special_aic_16/18.pdf.

63. Walumbwa, F. O., & Schaubroeck, J. (2009). Leader personality traits and employee voice behavior: mediating roles of ethical leadership and work group psychological safety. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(12), 75–86. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015848.

64. Werner, J. M. (2002). Dimensions that make a difference: Examining the impact of in-role and extra-role behaviors on supervisory ratings. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79, 98–107. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.1.98.

65. Whitney, J. G., Greenwood, R. A., & Murphy, E. F. (2009). Generational differences in the workplace: Personal values, behaviors, and popular beliefs. Journal of Diversity Management, 4(3), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.19030/jdm.v4i3.4959.