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Abstract

Teachers’ organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) is the teacher behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognised by the formal reward system. The factors found to be determining Teachers’ OCB are different, hinging on country-culture specific nature. Research studies in the sphere of Teachers’ OCB have heretofore been overlooked in Sri Lanka and other similar Asian countries. Hence, this study aims at exploring the degree of prevalence of teacher OCB and its dominant determinants among the teachers in Sri Lanka. The study draws on in-depth qualitative data from interviews and the participants included a convenience sample of teachers and principals employed in secondary schools. The data were analysed deductively using content analysis method. The findings reveal that the teachers’ propensity to perform OCB - towards students, school and their colleagues - is on the decline. The determinants, such as work-family conflict, perceived organizational support, teacher values, teachers’ self-efficacy, student behaviour patterns, and teachers’ pupil control ideologies, seem to be dominant attributing to the low levels of teachers’ OCB.

Keywords: organizational citizenship behaviour, perceived organizational support, pupil control ideology, self-efficacy, student behaviour patterns
Explorando la Prevalencia del Comportamiento de Ciudadanía Organizacional en Profesores y sus Determinantes: Evidencias de un Medio Cultural Poco Investigado

Ariyaratnam Harry Gnanarajan  
St. John's College Jaffna

Navaneethakrishnan Kengatharan  
University of Jaffna

Thirunavukkarasu Velnampy  
University of Jaffna

(Recibido: 28 de julio de 2019; Aceptado: 25 de febrero de 2020; Publicado: 28 de febrero de 2020)

Resumen

El comportamiento cívico organizacional de los profesores (CCO) es el comportamiento de los docentes que es discrecional, no reconocido directa o explícitamente por el sistema formal de recompensas. Los factores que determinan el CCO de los profesores son diferentes, y dependen de la naturaleza específica de la cultura del país. Hasta ahora, los estudios de investigación en la esfera del CCO de los docentes se han pasado por alto en Sri Lanka y otros países asiáticos similares. Por consiguiente, el presente estudio tiene por objeto explorar el grado de prevalencia del CCO del profesorado y sus determinantes dominantes entre los profesores de Sri Lanka. El estudio se basa en datos cualitativos detallados procedentes de entrevistas y los participantes incluyeron una muestra de conveniencia de maestros y directores empleados en escuelas secundarias. Los datos se analizaron de manera deductiva utilizando el método de análisis del contenido. Las conclusiones revelan que la propensión de los profesores a realizar CCO - hacia los estudiantes, la escuela y sus colegas - está disminuyendo. Los factores determinantes, como el conflicto entre el trabajo y la familia, el apoyo organizativo percibido, los valores de los maestros, la autoeficacia de los maestros, las pautas de comportamiento de los estudiantes y las ideologías de control de los alumnos de los maestros, parecen ser los factores dominantes que se atribuyen a los bajos
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The Education System in Sri Lanka is facing various challenges, and is operating in a highly multifaceted context. Commenting on an appalling situation that exists in schools and that leads to the demoralization of teachers, a study on Educational Planning and Management by the National Education Commission Sri Lanka (2016, p.32) states:

The school system has got bi-polarized. The small schools are getting smaller and smaller and finally get closed down. The large popular urban schools are getting larger and larger and become unmanageable. The classes in these schools are overcrowded, sometimes having more than 50 children in a class. In small rural schools the number of pupils is low and very uneconomical to run. There are 1652 schools with less than 50 pupils. In these schools teachers are demoralized.

In a world in which the teachers are constantly challenged by overcrowding, inadequate funding, and lack of public support, cognitive coaching, which was found to increase Teacher efficacy, a determinant of organizational citizenship behaviour, may provide means of changing school culture and creating an educational community in which teachers believe they can make a difference (Edwards et al., 1998).

By contributing to resource transformation, innovation, and adaptability, organizational citizenship behaviours improve organizational efficiency and effectiveness (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Williams & Anderson, 1991). They can enhance an organization’s success by enabling it to allocate its financial and human resources more effectively (Organ, 1988; VanYperen et al., 1999). However, the determinants of the OCB are country/culture-specific in nature and are less focused on nations with a collectivist culture. Therefore, the present study fills a hiatus by examining the factors contributing to OCB among the teachers in an under-researched collectivist nation, Sri Lanka.

**Literature Review**

The term “Organizational Citizenship Behaviour,” first coined by Dennis Organ and his colleagues (cf. Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ, &
Near, 1983), is defined as an “individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognised by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organisation” (Organ, 1988 p.4). This definition draws on Chester Barnard’s concept (Barnard, 1938) of the “willingness to cooperate,” and Daniel Katz’s (Katz, 1964; Katz & Kahn, 1966) distinction between dependable role performance and “innovative and spontaneous behaviours.”

The impact of OCB on the success of an organization has been recognized by the researchers as organizations cannot anticipate through formally stated job descriptions all the behaviours needed to achieve goals (George, 1996). OCB contributes to organizational functioning and success by creating social capital, increasing efficiency, and enhancing productivity (Bolino et al., 2002; Koys, 2001; Rego & Cunha, 2009). A number of studies (Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Ehrhart et al., 2006; Koys, 2001; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Walz & Niehoff, 2000) have shown that OCBs contribute to a variety of unit or organizational effectiveness measures, including production quantity, efficiency, profitability, and the reduction of costs.

In the educational settings, OCB was found to be essential for the smooth functioning of schools (Elstad et al., 2012). The relationships between OCB and some particular measures of student achievement are evident in the previous studies (Burns & DiPaola, 2013), and OCB is perceived by teachers who perform it to have influence not only on students’ achievements, but also on improved school discipline and school image (Oplatka, 2009). Displaying OCB may strengthen teachers’ sense of empowerment, responsibility, competence, accomplishment, and their feelings of self-esteem (Dormann & Zapf, 2004). OCBs influence the social and psychological environment of organizations, and they in turn influence the technical core (Diefendorff et al., 2003).

A number of empirical studies have attempted to indentify the determinants of OCB, such as: satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983), commitment (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986), perceptions of fairness (Bies et al., 1993; Folger, 1993; Moorman et al., 1993; Tepper & Taylor, 2003), perceptions of pay equity (Organ & Konovsky, 1989), intrinsic and extrinsic job cognition (Williams & Anderson, 1991), moral development (Brabeck, 1984), contextual factors (Karambayya, 1990), and group cohesiveness and socialization experiences (George & Bettenhausen, 1990).
In the educational settings, a number of OCB determinants have been identified, such as job satisfaction (Sesen & Basim, 2012; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000; Zeinabadi, 2010), commitment (Elstad et al., 2012; Nguni et al., 2006; Sesen & Basim, 2012; Zeinabadi, 2010), job efficacy (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Jimmieson et al., 2010; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000a), sense of educational calling (Oplatka, 2006; Oplatka & Golan, 2011), organizational trust (Chughtai & Buckley, 2009; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Elstad et al., 2012), perceived organizational support (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Lambert, 2000; Mauseth, 2007; Somech & Ron, 2007), school culture (individualism-collectivism) (Somech & Ron, 2007), school climate (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Garg & Rastogi, 2006; Oplatka, 2006; Vashti et al., 2013), and educational leadership (Koh et al., 1995; Nguni et al., 2006).

While OCB is frequently studied in the areas of business administration, the social sciences, economics, and psychology, the researches conducted in the realm of education are very few. It is stated that OCB studies have been ignored in the areas of education (Bogler & Somech, 2005; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001). This was later reiterated by the study conducted by Zeinabadi in 2010. Only a few studies have examined OCB among teachers, despite its positive impact on the effectiveness of schools (Burns & DiPaola, 2013; DiPaola & Hoy, 2005). Further, cross-cultural research in OCB has begun and is proceeding fast, with indications that the structure of what is perceived as OCB varies somewhat across cultures (Organ, 2015). Thus, the dearth of OCB studies in the field of education, and the culture-specific nature of OCB lead to the research question, which factors could be attributed to teachers’ OCB in Sri Lanka? (a context which had been subject to intimidating consequences of the civil conflict), and pave the way for the objective of the current study.

**Method**

**Participants**

The participants of this study were teachers and principals employed in the schools in the Jaffna District, Sri Lanka. A convenience sample of eighteen teachers and seven principals – twelve females and thirteen males, age ranging from 25 to 50 - was interviewed. All the participants were either
Trained Teachers or graduates with professional qualifications – who teach different subjects and classes. All of them varied in their experience in teaching ranging from five to twenty-five years. The interviews were held either in their schools or at a place of their convenience during their off-hours. When there was enough information to execute the study (O’Reilly & Parker, 2013; Walker, 2012), and when further coding was no longer feasible (Guest et al., 2006), data saturation was considered. New themes stopped emerging after about 14 interviews and an acceptable interpretative framework was constructed after 20 interviews—the stage of thematic and theoretical saturation. Five more interviews were conducted to confirm that further interviews were not adding to the findings or repeating what was already found in the previous interviews.

**Instruments and Procedure**

The participation in the interviews was entirely voluntary, and the interviews were conducted in Tamil, their first language. At the outset, the interviewees were requested to tell about themselves - the basic information about them – their place of work, the subjects teaching, age, teaching experience, and the classes they teach. After that, a set of open-ended questions were asked to find out how far they demonstrate OCB during the course of their teaching career, and to elicit the possible factors that might determine their display of OCB or its deficiency. Each interview lasted about 45 minutes.

**Data Analysis**

The method of content analysis was used to identify themes and patterns from the transcriptions of the interview, and it was deductive. The following codes were developed based on the previous studies by Somech & Drach-Zahavy (2000) on OCB dimensions in school context to analyse the interview data:

1. OCB toward students
2. OCB toward school
3. OCB toward colleagues

The codes on determinants of Teacher OCB were developed based on the three levels of categorization by Somech (2014):
**Codes on determinants of teacher OCB**

Individual-level
1. Job satisfaction
2. Organizational commitment
3. Job efficacy
4. Sense of educational calling

Dyadic-level
5. Organizational trust
6. Perceived organizational support

Organizational-level
7. School culture
8. School climate
9. Educational leadership

The interview data were scanned through for any of these codes, and if any themes found, they were categorized under these codes. Any observations or factors that could not be categorized under these codes were assigned new ones (Appendix A).

**Findings and Discussion**

**Teacher OCB Dimensions**

**OCB toward students**

The study revealed that most of the teachers in the context of the study showed less evidence to demonstrate extra-role behaviours owing to a number of reasons. The Interviewee 2, who is a principal of a secondary school, has this to say about teachers’ unwillingness:

> Nowadays, it’s very difficult to enable the teachers to stay after-school hours to conduct extra classes for slow-learners. They are not prepared to conduct such classes even for a pay. They are only prepared to work from 7.30 a.m. to 1.30 p.m., and making them to stay after-school-hours is a herculean task. Even if they consent to take up such responsibilities, they would be for the sake of school’s
request, and will not be voluntary. However, there are some teachers who would willingly oblige.

Dealing with the problems of students, one teacher (Interviewee 14) realized and acknowledged his inadequacy to spend more time with them owing to his own personal commitments. Though he is inwardly willing to go beyond extra-miles for the betterment of his pupils, he is unable to do so. This is evident in the following lines:

I need to spend more time which I don’t; I need to get more personally interested in the student’s problems but I don’t. I have enough problems of my own which I should first settle.

OCB toward school

The study also revealed evidence of teachers’ reluctance to go the extra mile for the welfare of the school, where they are employed. The Interviewee13’s lack of interest in helping the school was evident when she said,

I’ve been continuously asked to help decorate the school-hall for many years for the annual prize-giving, and I’m fed up of doing that job, so I have asked the management to give that responsibility to some other person.

OCB toward colleagues

The study also revealed teachers’ lack of interest to extend a helping hand to their co-teachers. The Interviewee 11, who is unable to receive help from his colleagues as they have more responsibilities than him, said,

Colleagues are unable to help because they have bigger heaps on their tables.

He also said,

I like to write the lesson-plans the way I like at a time I choose. The work will remain undone if I wait for my colleague to sit with me and plan out a common lesson plan.
These lines echo the futility of anticipating something good from others – may be due to lack of time to both or his / her in-built unwillingness to help others.

These findings endorse the observations by a team of international consultants in 1989 on the importance of motivating the staff and improving their ‘morale.’ The Canedcom International Consultants (1989) commenting on the Education System of Sri Lanka underpin the necessity to empower schools and “develop the leadership skills of principals to establish clear goals for their schools, motivate their staff and create locally organizational climate to improve staff morale” (Educational Planning and Management, National Education Commission, 2016, p.12).

**Teacher OCB Determinants**

While scanning through the interview data for any codes on antecedents of OCB, perceived organizational support and teachers’ self-efficacy were identified from the above prescribed codes as factors determining teachers’ propensity to perform OCB. The factors like sense of educational calling, organizational trust, school culture, school climate, and educational leadership were not attributed by the respondents to their absence or lack of OCB. However, new codes, such as work-family conflict, teacher values, student behaviour patterns, and pupil control ideology were identified as prominent factors that, according to many respondents, determine their OCB.

**Work-family conflict**

An unanticipated code on the determinant of Teacher OCB that didn’t come under the data analytical frame of the current study, or Somech’s (2014) categorization of antecedents of Teacher OCB, is the work-family conflict, which seemed to determine the extra-role behaviours of teachers in the context of the present study.

A number of respondents seemed to attribute factors relating to their family obligations to their inability to go the extra mile for the wellbeing of their school. A respondent (Interviewee 6), who couldn’t find time to finish the work in school and had to take home to finish them, had this to say resulting in work-family conflict:
When we take our work home it affects the family life. A planned dinner gets cancelled. I sometimes have to take back my promise to take my kids to the park. This results in a lot of stress and unhappiness and disappointment.

The previous studies have also affirmed that there is negative correlation between work-family conflict and OCB. Bragger et al. (2005), who used 203 teachers as subjects from the Northern New Jersey and the New York Metropolitan area, USA, found that work-family conflict can effectively predict and has a significantly negative impact on teachers’ OCB. Most recently, the study conducted by Wang, Lee, & Wu (2017) among the employees working in the hospitality industries in Taiwan revealed that work-family conflict is negatively related to OCB.

However, there is inconsistency in the research results with regard to the negative correlation between work-family conflict and OCB. The study conducted by Beham (2011) among Spanish employees in various industries found that there were no significant relationships between work-family conflict and any of the three dimensions of OCB. This heightens the necessity to engage in further research on the link between work-family conflict and OCB.

**Perceived organizational support**

Most of the respondents who exhibited low level of OCB seemed to report less support from their superiors as well. A respondent’s (Interviewee 9) perceived organizational support is evident from these lines:

I was suddenly taken very ill during the fifth period. Sneezing uncontrollably, eyes swollen, I went to ask the Principal to allow me to go home early. I was insensitively asked to get the written permission from my three sectional heads.

This association between perceived organizational support and teacher OCB was evident in the previous studies too. The study by Mauseth (2007), whose data consisted of 21 private schools and 194 individual teachers in the north-western United States, found a strong relationship between perceived organizational support and teacher OCB.
A very recent study (Uzun, 2018) conducted among 234 teachers working in the public high schools in Giresun city center of Turkey reiterates this positive relationship between perceived organizational support and teacher OCB.

The relationship between perceived organizational support and OCB could be understood in terms of the social exchange process.

In general, research findings suggest that positive, beneficial actions directed at employees by the organization and/or its representatives contribute to the establishment of high-quality exchange relationships (e.g., Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994) that create obligations for employees to reciprocate in positive, beneficial ways (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1986; Shore & Wayne, 1993). (as cited in Settoon et al., 1996)

The results of the study conducted by Settoon and his colleagues (1996) suggest that both in-role and extra-role behaviours are associated with the nature of the relationship with the supervisor, and whenever the relationships between supervisors and subordinates are based on mutual trust and loyalty, interpersonal affect, and respect for each other, the subordinate’s performance too will be higher in terms of in-role and extra-role behaviours. Perceived organizational support makes employees to engage in more OCBs because they feel a positive orientation toward the organization than because they feel obligated to reciprocate the organization’s support (Kurtessis et al., 2017). However, there has also been inconsistency among the results of the previous studies conducted regarding the relationship between perceived organizational support and OCB. The results of a comparative cross-cultural meta-analysis (Chiaburu et al., 2015) suggest that this relationship can vary across cultures. They suggest that positive influence that perceived organizational support has on OCB is stronger in some cultural settings. This raises the need to study, in different cultural settings, the strength of the relationship between perceived organizational support and OCB.

**Teacher values**

Values are beliefs pertaining to desirable end states or modes of conduct that transcend specific situations, and guide selection or evaluation of behaviour,
people, and events (Schwartz, 1992 & 1994; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987 & 1990; Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995). Values are related to a range of mundane behaviours (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003).

A respondent (Interviewee 3), who is a principal of a secondary school, attributed teachers’ individual innate tendency, which, the researcher recognizes as teachers’ individual values, to the decline of teacher OCB. He had this to say regarding teachers’ resistance to change:

```
Whenever I try to introduce any novel or innovative programmes to the school, or even when I try to make any changes to the existing ones in order to increase their efficiency to avoid resource wastage, I always find teachers’ reluctance and unwillingness prevent them to accept. An inbuilt resistance to change would never allow them to act.
```

Schwartz and Sagiv (1995) identified 10 distinct value types under the four dimensions - Self-Transcendence, Self-Enhancement, Openness to Change, and Conservation - structured in patterns of conflict and compatibility. The teachers referred to above seemed to lack in their openness to change values, or seemed to be inclined towards conservation values.

Most of the prior values-OCB research has focused on the prosocial (Penner et al., 1997; Rioux & Penner, 2001) or other-oriented (Meglino & Korsgaard, 2004; Moorman & Blakely, 1995) nature of citizenship behaviour, given its positive connotation as the “good soldier” syndrome. Others have pointed out that some people who engage in OCBs might more accurately be deemed “good actors” (Bolino, 1999), who perform apparently other-oriented deeds in the service of self-interest (Bolino et al., 2006). Support has been found for both motives (Rioux & Penner, 2001), suggesting that people can have different reasons for engaging in the same citizenship behaviour.

**Teachers’ self-efficacy**

A positive relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy and their OCB was observed from many of the responses. A number of respondents, who demonstrated low tendency to exhibit extra-role behaviours, articulated less
evidence in their perceived expectation of succeeding at a task or a responsibility in the school, reflecting their lack of self-efficacy. An interviewee (Number 5), who seemed to report lack of confidence in his ability to make students submit their assigned tasks on time, said:

> It’s indeed a struggle for me to make students comply to school’s expectations and deadlines. Some of the students don’t complete their homework assignments in time, and it’s very difficult to find ways and means to make them obey.

Several studies have advocated this association between self-efficacy and OCB (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Jimmieson et al., 2010). For instance, Jimmieson and her colleagues (2010) found that teachers’ job efficacy was positively associated with civic virtue (volunteering for roles and tasks that are not mandatory), which is a dimension of OCB, and professional development (acquiring new knowledge and skills that contribute to work). In the same way, Somech and her colleagues (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000a) found that teachers with high self-efficacy displayed high levels of OCBs toward their colleagues and the organization. A very recent study conducted by Choong et al. (2019) among 411 teachers in secondary schools indicated that teachers’ self-efficacy dimensions - general teaching and personal teaching - are positively related to OCB.

**Student behaviour patterns**

“A class with no behaviour problems can by no means be assumed to be a well-managed class” (Slavin, 2015, p.272). Teachers frequently state that being able to control and manage their classrooms is one of their main priorities (Merrett & Wheldall, 1993).

A very recent qualitative study conducted by Ergunay & Adiguzel (2019) too identified handling indiscipline of students as a major challenge. One of the teachers interviewed said: “the main challenge was their problematic behaviors. I tried a lot to build an authority in the classroom but I could not manage it, particularly in 8th grades” (Ergunay & Adiguzel, 2019, p.300).

A teacher’s challenge is evident when he reveals his difficulty in handling student misbehaviours. One of the respondents (Interviewee 7) of the current study had this to say:
Class control is getting more difficult. The respect teachers had is waning. The students nowadays have different behaviour patterns. Handling their misbehaviour in the classroom and in the school has become a challenge. Indifference and inattentiveness of some children during lessons make teaching exasperating.

Though there have been no researches conducted on the relationship between student behaviour patterns and teacher OCB, the current study gives room for the need to study its relationship as student behaviour patterns have been identified as a prominent factor in the study context.

Further, discipline issues rate consistently among the strongest of teacher stressors (Lewis et al., 2005). As a result of dealing with chronic work stress, teachers tend to develop a common behavioural and attitudinal perspective on work. This perspective represents a major negative departure from the qualities, attitudes, and behaviours perceived as essential to effective classroom instruction (Blase, 1986). This negative departure from essential behaviours could include teachers’ OCB as well.

**Pupil control ideology**

School discipline has been a central concern in discussions of educational policy across a range of countries (Smyth & Quail, 2017).

According to National Child Protection Authority Sri Lanka (2017), most teachers and principals believe in the effectiveness of corporal punishment. Some evidence suggests that this is due to reasons such as their own experience of it in childhood, because senior teachers use it, and because they do not know of any other strategies to handle misbehaviours. In fact, a majority of teachers did not receive any formal training in classroom management, including the use of positive disciplining.

In Sri Lanka, there is absence of specific practice-based training on positive discipline (Pathirana, 2006), and teachers seem to be still struggling to identify alternative disciplinary methods to replace the vacuum created by the banning of corporal punishment by the Ministry of Education, Sri Lanka (Pathirana, 2017).

Most of the respondents in the present study seemed to be oriented towards custodial approach to student discipline. This is evident in the
following lines which reflect a teacher’s (Interviewee 8) dependence on the ability of his co-teachers to handle disciplinary issues using corporal punishment:

Teachers in this school have been used to the ‘traditional’ methods of punishment. They feel that discipline is on the decline from the time the management has taken a ‘zero tolerance’ stance towards corporal punishment. They feel that they can do little to discipline a child now.

Teachers with a humanistic orientation have fewer problems with classroom discipline and are able to foster interest in the learning process (Kounin & Gump, 1961). The humanistic pupil control ideology has proven rewards in the classroom and this focus on caring makes a difference in the lives and performance of students (Vail, 2005).

Custodial schools as compared to humanistic schools appear to have (1) teachers who have low morale, reflecting low job satisfaction with respect to both task achievement and social needs satisfaction, and (2) teachers who do not work well together, resulting in minimal group achievement (Lunenberg, 1984). Schools with a custodial pupil orientation had significantly greater teacher disengagement, lower levels of morale, and more close supervision by the principal than those with a humanistic, pupil-control orientation (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

Therefore, taking into consideration the findings of the present study and of the existing literature, it could be anticipated that the schools with custodial orientation, due to teacher disengagement and lower levels of morale, would demonstrate less OCB. In other words, the teachers who are humanistically oriented in their pupil control ideology, would engage in more OCBs.

**Implications for Practice & Conclusion**

Schools can derive significant benefit from understanding the OCB and its determinants, so that they can establish environments that encourage this behaviour and increase school effectiveness (Somech & Bogler, 2002; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000b). The present study suggests that school leadership and other authorities in the field of education – the Department
of Education at Divisional, Zonal, and Provincial Levels - could establish appropriate environments for teachers to promote or cope with the OCB determinants identified by the present study as dominant in the study context: work-family conflict, perceived organizational support, teacher values, teachers’ self-efficacy, student behaviour patterns, and teachers’ pupil control ideologies.

School leadership can ensure that teachers are not overburdened by too many responsibilities that might interfere with their personal or family domain resulting in work-family conflict, which was found to determine teachers’ OCB significantly in the study context.

Perceived organizational support cares about one’s personal wellbeing, and offers assistance or aid if needed in a stressful or difficult situation (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). School leadership can ensure that teachers’ personal wellbeing is cared about and they are supported emotionally, especially in times of crisis, high pressure, difficulties, and heavy workload. Principals can offer positive feedback to the teachers and make them feel that they are valued. They can be offered an opportunity to participate in decision-making processes in the school (regarding implementation of educational projects or new teaching methods).

As for teacher values, school leadership can cherish and preserve positive value systems that promote teacher OCB so that the teachers experienced and the novices could be influenced by them.

It was evident in a past study (Jimmieson et al., 2010) that teachers’ self-efficacy was positively related to their professional development behaviours. Therefore, the school leadership can take measures to organize appropriate professional development programmes for teachers to develop their self-efficacy in order to promote OCB.

Teachers should be enlightened and trained in the current strategies and techniques to handle students’ inappropriate behaviour patterns, so that it will not negatively impact teachers’ OCB.

School leadership should ensure that teachers’ pupil control ideologies are inclined towards humanistic orientation, and can conduct ongoing training programmes for teachers so that positive and non-punitive disciplinary measures could be adopted to handle students’ indiscipline.

Thus, if the OCB determinants dominant in the study context are either promoted or addressed by school leadership or other educational authorities
concerned, teachers will be encouraged to go the extra mile for the betterment of the students and school.
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### Appendix A

Table 1

| Code                      | Descriptions                                                                                                                                 |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| OCB toward students       | “behaviours directly and intentionally aimed at improving the quality of teaching (e.g. learning new subjects that contribute to the work) and helping students to improve their achievements (e.g. staying an extra hour, helping disadvantaged students).” (Somech, 2014, p.34) |
| OCB toward colleagues     | “behaviours intentionally directed at helping a specific teacher (e.g. orienting a new teacher, assisting a teacher with a heavy workload).” (Somech, 2014, p.34) |
| OCB toward school         | “constitute a more impersonal form of behaviour, behaviour that does not render immediate aid to any one specific person but benefits the entire team or the school as a unit. These behaviours seem to represent innovative and initiative activities (e.g. making innovative suggestions to improve the school; volunteering for roles that are not a part of the job).” (Somech, 2014, p.34) |
| Job satisfaction          | An individual’s positive attitudes and beliefs regarding several aspects of the job or the profession (Organ, 1990).                           |
| Organizational commitment | Relative strength of the individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization (Mowday et al., 1982).                     |
| Job efficacy              | A person’s perceived expectation of succeeding at a task or obtaining a valued outcome through personal effort (Bandura, 1986).                |
| Code                     | Descriptions                                                                                                                                 |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Sense of educational calling | “A sense of ‘educational calling’ refers to teaching as a timeless and unbounded career, as opposed to other occupations in which the employee is given a defined amount of time to accomplish his or her role tasks” (Somech, 2014, p.50) |
| Organizational trust    | “one party’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the belief that the latter party is (a) competent, (b) reliable, (c) open and (d) concerned” (Mishra, 1996, p.265). |
| Perceived organizational support | refers to a set of global beliefs that the employee has about the organization, and generally includes the extent to which the organization values one’s individual contribution, cares about one’s personal wellbeing, and would offer assistance or aid if needed in a stressful or difficult situation (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). |
| School culture          | Organizational culture represents the normative system of shared values and beliefs that shapes how organization members feel, think, and behave (Schein, 1990). |
| School climate          | Organizational climate is a set of properties of the work environment, generally referring to the degree to which an organization focuses on, emphasizes, and is assumed to be a major force in influencing employee behaviour (Anderson & West, 1998; Schneider et al., 2005). |
| Educational leadership  | The role of the principal and his leadership styles |